United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 2015 No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God of grace and goodness, thank You for giving us another day.

Your divine wisdom and power are abundantly sufficient for our many needs. Endow the Members of this assembly with a loyalty that never waivers and a courage that never falters as they seek to fulfill the high and holy mission which has been entrusted to them.

May it be their purpose, and all of ours, to see to the hopes of so many Americans, that we authenticate the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy with the work we do.

Grant that the men and women of the people's House find the courage and wisdom to work together to forge solutions to the many needs of our Nation, and ease the anxieties of so many.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CALLING FOR ZHU YUFU RELEASE ON TIANANMEN SQUARE ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1989, pro-democracy demonstrators were killed by Chinese troops while peacefully advocating for government accountability and political and economic reforms.

In the aftermath, the Chinese Government arrested large numbers of protesters and their supporters, prohibited other demonstrations, expelled foreign journalists, and have prohibited discussion or remembrance of these events ever since.

Today is a solemn reminder of the state of human rights in China 26 years after Tiananmen Square.

Since 2011, Zhu Yufu, a Chinese democracy advocate, Christian dissident, and poet has languished in prison simply for expressing his democratic beliefs. Today, I urge his immediate and unconditional release.

As part of the Defending Freedoms Project, my colleagues and I will continue to shine a light on Zhu Yufu's case and that of other prisoners of conscience. I applaud Zhu Yufu and his fellow champions of freedom for their courage. We thank them for their courage. They are not alone.

URGING SUPPORT FOR SANCHEZ-YOUNG SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR TERMINALLY ILL ACT

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, imagine that your loved one was diagnosed with terminal leukemia on January 1. They will undergo chemotherapy, need daily medical care and attention, and be unable to work.

Without any income, they apply for Social Security disability insurance benefits and are quickly approved. However, due to an archaic, bureaucratic law, your loved one will have to wait 5 months before receiving any benefits. If you were diagnosed with a terminal illness on the first week of the new year, you wouldn't receive disability benefits until this week, the 21st week of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish this was just a hypothetical example, but this happened to an Albuquerque resident and my friend, Jeremy Sanchez, who had to wait months before receiving the benefits that he earned, after being diagnosed with leukemia.

That is why I, along with my colleague Congressman ISRAEL, am introducing the Sanchez-Young Social Security Disability Insurance for the Terminally Ill Act, which would repeal the 5-month waiting period for the terminally ill and ensure that SSDI protects the most vulnerable recipients when they need it most.

I urge my colleagues to support this sensible bill.

HONORING LAKE COUNTY FOREST PRESERVE

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

Printed on recycled paper.

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of the Lake County Forest Preserve District and their 100-year vision for protecting Lake County's unique and precious environment.

Led by Executive Director Ty Kovach, they have assembled a bold, 100-year vision for how to preserve our wildlife and this natural resource, not just for us today, but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. Speaker, the Lake County Forest Preserve District wants to ensure future generations can reap the benefits from a healthy and resilient environment and understand that the only way to ensure a better future is to make changes today. Their education and leadership on conservation issues will go a long way to protecting this incredible resource.

Mr. Speaker, I thank them for their efforts and humbly stand by their side to continue to champion the importance of protecting our environment.

And that is just the way it is.

EXTEND FLORIDA'S GULF COAST OIL DRILLING BAN TO YEAR 2027

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in support of new legislation I am cosponsoring with my friend Congressman DAVID JOLLY to extend Florida's Gulf Coast oil drilling ban to the year 2027.

The drilling ban currently extends 125 miles off much of Florida's Gulf Coast and as far as 235 miles in some areas, but it is set to expire in 2022. There are some in the Senate trying to reduce the ban to just 50 miles as soon as next year.

This legislation reaffirms our commitment to protecting Florida's precious Gulf Coast beaches and will protect the environment, our economy, and military operations in the Gulf.

An oil spill like Deepwater Horizon just 50 miles off of northwest Florida's beaches would be devastating for our region. We can't allow that to happen and should pass this legislation to extend the drilling ban and protect Florida's Gulf Coast beaches.

RECOGNIZING PENN STATE CREAMERY ON 150 YEARS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY calls it ''some of the best ice cream I have had outside of my hometown of Bakersfield.''

The majority leader, of course, is referring to the ice cream produced at Penn State University's Berkey Creamery. I am proud to rise today in recognition of the creamery's 150th anniversary.

The creamery, located in the Rodney A. Erickson Food Science Building on Penn State University's main campus, was first established in 1865.

Penn State is home to the largest university creamery in the United States, using more than 4.5 million pounds of milk each year, supporting Pennsylvania's robust dairy industry.

To help celebrate their 150th anniversary, the creamery has launched a social media contest, which allows fans to select the special sesquicentennial flavor. Voters have a few days left to choose between birthday cake, strawberry cheesecake, or red velvet.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud graduate of Penn State University, I congratulate the Berkey Creamery on 150 years of creating countless memories, and especially the hard-working student employees and the 23 full-time employees that make the operations such a great success.

RECOGNIZING TAMPA BAY ESTUARY PROGRAM

(Mr. JOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tampa Bay Estuary Program and the great work they have done since their founding in 1991.

The Tampa Bay Estuary contains one of the most vibrant and productive ecosystems along the Gulf Coast because the unique mix of saltwater from the Gulf and freshwater from rivers and uplands have created abundant nurseries for juvenile fish and other sea life. More than 70 percent of all fish, shellfish, and crustaceans spend some critical stage of their development in these near-shore waters protected from larger predators that swim the open sea.

Very importantly, scientists at the Southwest Florida Water Management District have found that Tampa Bay now supports over 40,000 acres of sea grass beds. Tampa Bay is Florida's largest open water estuary. Due to the great work of the program, Tampa Bay's water quality is now as good as it was in 1950.

I want to thank the leadership of Tampa Bay's estuary program, particularly Executive Director Holly Greening, for her vision not only for the estuary program, but for the entire Tampa Bay community.

Tampa Bay is coming back to life, again assuming its position as the shimmering economic and environmental centerpiece of the vibrant southwest Florida region.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK JOHNSON

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Chuck Johnson, a man who kept me and countless other public servants in Montana honest and accountable as the capitol bureau chief and longtime political reporter.

Chuck's 43-year journalism career began in 1977. In the decades since, Chuck has been the primary educator of government, politics, and ethics for generations of Montanans.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Chuck as a State senator and had the distinct pleasure of traveling with him across Montana. He is a straight shooter and a true professional.

In the era of online and 24-hour news outlets that push agendas and competition for cliques, Chuck's modus operandi was to tell the truth, tell the facts, and let the people of Montana decide. I urge future journalists to study his work and learn what they can from this true Montana professional.

I wish Chuck fair winds and following seas in his retirement. Bravo Zulu.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0912

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 15.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am certain it comes as no surprise to anyone in this body that, as we go through this appropriations season, I come back to the floor working to make another cut to get our spending levels down. The bill we have before us, the T-HUD approps, is a $55.3 billion bill. That is discretionary funding.

□ 0915

Now, credit should go to the subcommittee chairmen and to those who have worked on this to get the spending levels down because this is $9.7 billion below the President's request. That is really quite remarkable. And my amendment, which is another 1 percent reduction—a penny out of a dollar—would save our taxpayers $598 million and would reduce the 2006 outlays by $369 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you look at budget authority and you look at the outlays, those are significant numbers. They are significant also, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the debt. We are $18.3 trillion in debt; and, quite frankly, I think that that is too much debt for us to ask our children and grandchildren to handle.

I think it is imperative that we, as stewards of the taxpayers' money, put these issues on the table and say, ''Yes, there are great things we would like to do,'' ''Yes, there are projects that would be wonderful,'' but we have to be responsible to the taxpayers.

This is not Federal money. It doesn't just grow on trees. What we have to realize is that it all comes from taxpayers. They are overtaxed. They feel the Federal Government is overspent, and they want to see the spending brought under control. I agree with them. That is why I bring this amendment forward.

Mr. Chairman, I think, also, we have to look at the fact that our economic security, our fiscal security, and our national security are all closely linked. Because of that, Admiral Mullen said that the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt. We have to get serious about reducing this debt.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the bill that is in front of us is a responsible bill that adheres to the budget caps set by law and passed by this body. We set priorities in this bill, and we made targeted cuts to overhead, salaries, expenses, and also duplicative programs, Mr. Chairman. Many programs are also held at last year's level or below. Again, we made some tough decisions.

The problem is, when you are doing, frankly, an across-the-board cut with this amendment, it would have some, frankly—and I know it is well intentioned—it would have some harmful effects on the priorities set by the Members of this House. Again, we have cut programs, but based on hearings, on meetings, on discussions, and on careful reviews of, again, the budget justifications and also the audits.

This amendment, and I know it is very well intentioned, would hit, for example, air traffic control operations and cause unnecessary flight delays. It could hurt our most vulnerable populations by, for example, affecting assistance to over 50,000 residents, including elderly and disabled populations.

Now, I am not telling you that there are not areas that can be reduced. We have done that. As a matter of fact, we have been in debate, and we have heard a lot of debate about some people saying that we have done too much of that. But we have done so after hours and hours of deliberations, of talking, of conversations, of study, and of hearings. So, again, I know it is a well-intended amendment, and I am a huge admirer of the sponsor of this amendment, but I have to respectfully urge a ''no'' vote precisely because of the time we have spent to make the right reductions as opposed to across-the-board reductions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our subcommittee for yielding, and I want to join him in opposing this amendment.

This is an indiscriminate amendment. It cuts programs in transportation and housing without any thought as to their relative merits. It is the opposite of intelligent appropriating.

For example, this would result in fewer air traffic controllers, fewer pipeline safety inspectors, and the eviction—literally, the eviction—of elderly and disabled tenants. More generally, investments in our transportation and housing infrastructure would be altered. The associated jobs would be lost.

This bill is already underfunded, Mr. Chairman. It has got to be revisited when we have a budget agreement that lets us do a decent job with this bill.

So this amendment goes in exactly the wrong directions. It would encourage the agencies not to do more with less, but to do less with less, and it would be a body blow to our constituents and our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you why this is the right approach. Our States, who can't go print money in order to balance their budget, utilize across-the-board cuts. Look at Tennessee, Massachusetts, Washington State, New Jersey, and Colorado. They all employ this. Here is why, if you want to engage State employees and Federal employees, and bring the agencies into the process, you say: Okay. We have set your budget levels, we have appropriated your money, now we are coming to you. You are a part of the team, and we need you to engage in how we best save taxpayer money.

This is why it works in the States. When I was in the State senate in Tennessee, if we didn't balance the budget, we didn't go home. It is time for the Federal Government to dig deep and engage these employees. You can talk with rank-and-file Federal employees. I have done it many times. They say we know how we can save money, but they are not incentivized to do so. Let's challenge them. Let's engage them. Let's have them bring forward their best ideas.

A penny on a dollar? Absolutely. We are doing this for the children. We are doing this for future generations. We are doing this for our Nation's fiscal health, and we are doing it to preserve our sovereignty to get these debt levels down.

It is time for us to do that. It is responsible budgeting. It is time for everybody to be a part of the team, putting this Nation back on the road to fiscal health, to a balanced budget, and being respectful of the taxpayer and a good steward of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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 gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the 5th or 14th Amendment to the Constitution or title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to prohibit the use of Federal funds to stop, investigate, detain, or arrest people on highways based on their physical appearance in violation of the Fifth and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is the same amendment I successfully offered to the fiscal year 2015 T-HUD appropriations bill and was agreed to by a voice vote on the House floor and was included in the fiscal year 2015 omnibus bill. I ask the same for the current amendment, which, like the one passed by the House last year, seeks to prevent profiling by law enforcement officials and to ensure that citizens are not stopped, investigated, or detained based on their color or other inherent physical appearance.

The Supreme Court, in Whren v. United States, held that profiling based on physical appearance on highways violates equal protection of the laws. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, whose 50th anniversary we celebrated in 2014, enforces the 14th Amendment and applies to funding for all Federal agencies and departments. My amendment carries out this title VI mandate as expressed in transportation funding in particular.

Federal guidance regarding the use of race by a Federal law enforcement official finds that racial profiling is not merely wrong, but is also ineffective. Not only Blacks and Hispanics are affected, but many others in our country as well, given the increasing diversity of American society.

The United States Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that Whites are stopped at a rate of 3.6 percent, but Blacks at 9.5 percent and Hispanics at 8.8 percent, more than twice that of Whites. The figures are roughly the same regardless of region or State.

In Minnesota, for example, a statewide study of racial profiling found that African American, Hispanic, and Native American drivers were stopped and searched far more often than Whites, yet contraband was found more frequently in cars where White drivers had been stopped.

In Texas, where disproportionate stops and searches of African Americans and Hispanics were found to have taken place, it was also found that Whites more often were carrying contraband.

Earlier this Congress, I reintroduced the Racial Profiling Prevention Act, my bill to reestablish a popular Federal program aimed at reducing racial profiling. This bill permits States to apply for grants to develop racial profiling laws, to collect and maintain data on traffic stops, to fashion programs to reduce racial profiling, and to train law enforcement officers.

Nearly half the States participated in the program when it was in existence, which shows both the need and the interest in our country in tackling this civil rights issue. I got this program included in the surface transportation law in 2005, but that program expired in 2009. I will try to get this bill included in the surface transportation reauthorization bill we will be writing this year, but in the meantime, a formal prohibition on racial profiling is in order. Meanwhile, Congress should have no hesitation in carrying out the 14th Amendment and the 1964 Civil Rights Act mandate regarding Federal funding of transportation, and neither the House nor the Senate hesitated last year.

Considering our country's history and increasing diversity, we are late in barring profiling at the national level. At the very least, Federal taxpayers should not be compelled to subsidize the unconstitutional practice of profiling by law enforcement officials in the States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment, especially in light of recent issues in cities like Ferguson and Baltimore.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the rule entitled ''Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing'', published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on July 19, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 43710; Docket No. FR-5173-P-01) or to carry out the notice entitled ''Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Assessment Tool'', published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on September 26, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 57949; Docket No. FR-5173-N-02).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 0930

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment intended to prevent yet another costly overreach by the Federal Government into the jurisdiction of local towns and communities.

Last Congress, during debate on this bill, the House passed an amendment of mine to prevent funds for HUD's proposed new regulation that will allow bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., to get in the middle of local planning and zoning and prohibit community development block grant funds from going to communities that need them.

The amendment seeks to once again defund and block this new regulation that was not approved by Congress. HUD's misguided rule would grant the Department authority to dictate local zoning requirements in any community across the country that applies for a community development block grant.

According to reports, in 2012, this rule would have negatively impacted more than 1,200 municipalities throughout the country, causing these communities to forfeit millions that are meant to help the neediest of families.

Once again, this flawed proposal by HUD will increase local taxes, depress property values, and cause further harm to impoverished communities that are actually in need of these funds.

These burdensome zoning rules that would be imposed by HUD bureaucrats on localities would be derived from tracked resident data based on citizens' race, sex, religion, and other federally protected demographics.

Multiple watchdog groups have raised serious and valid concerns about HUD's proposal. A trial run of this rule already took place in New York. It failed miserably, and a local county was initially forced to forego $12 million in funds that would have benefited the community due to the impractical and unrealistic requirements associated with the misguided agency regulation.

The county had intended to use a large portion of these block grant funds to establish public housing for individuals in need. But recently, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled in favor of the county and granted a stay against HUD's attempts to reallocate those millions.

This new regulation that is sitting at OMB is very dangerous and, worst of all, unnecessary. The Federal Government already has the authority to withhold grant money from communities that violate the law. And to clarify, I do mean the actual law in the United States Code, as opposed to overreaching executive dictums.

American citizens and communities should be free to choose where they would like to live and not be subject to Federal neighborhood microengineering at the behest of overreaching Federal bureaucrats.

Further, HUD officials shouldn't be holding hostage grant moneys aimed at community improvement based on its unrealistic utopian ideas of what every community should resemble. Local zoning decisions have traditionally been, and should always be, made by local communities, not bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment because it keeps the Federal Government out of your backyard and prevents the Feds from reorganizing communities to a fantastical standard.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment because it aims to treat municipalities and individual citizens

as capable and intelligent, rather than disenfranchised, divided, and coddled groups in need of protection from a problem that does not exist.

As always, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The rule in question, HUD's rule, is intended to help communities more fully comply with the law and to avoid costly and time-consuming legal challenges.

The charge that this rule injects HUD into local planning and zoning conditions is simply inaccurate. Nor does it set up additional hurdles to Federal funding. That is inaccurate too.

The rule allows for communities to better understand local conditions and to create locally decided and implemented solutions.

I don't understand why we would want to revert back to a standard that relied on drawn-out litigation rather than simply presenting communities up front with information on local housing conditions and letting them address their needs. I know my local officials prefer community developed solutions over decrees that are judicially imposed.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee, to express his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for the time.

Let's talk about what we are really actually talking about. We are trying to fight racial segregation. That is what this is all about. Our Nation, the Nation I love, held slaves for 246 years and did Jim Crow segregation for another 100 years, and that created racial segregation patterns which this Member is trying to stop us from correcting. This is deeply offensive.

I just want to say that when I think about the progress that our Nation has made so that when we say ''all men are created equal'' and when we say ''liberty and justice for all,'' that it will be true. This amendment is saying no, we are not going to allow it to be true; we are going to keep residential segregation based on race; we are going to make communities balkanize.

When I hear somebody say something like the Federal Government should stay out of local affairs, that sounds like some states' rights talk from 1955. That sounds like something really offensive to me.

Look, we need HUD to help implement affirmatively furthering fair housing rules. We need that. We need HUD to expand its efforts to fight discrimination and promote equal opportunity in every community.

Too often in this country, too many people's economic opportunities, their life chances, are limited by where they live. And yes, the Federal Government should promote equality and should promote fair housing. Affirmatively furthering a fair housing rule helps to do that. Why we would want to strip it out makes absolutely no sense to me.

I urge Members to understand what is going on right here and to very fervently vote ''no'' on the Gosar amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, how dare the opposition create and instigate racism. This is about decisions made at the local level and the local level knowing what is best for their communities. There is nothing of the sort that the gentleman from Minnesota brought up in regard to that attitude that I brought forward.

This is an overreach of the Federal Government instilling in our local communities where, how, and when people are going to live. That is the wrong way to be. Instead of building cripples like we are doing right now with the Federal Government, we ought to make sustainable communities that are based on local ideas and principles.

I ask all Members to vote for this amendment because it definitely rejects the overreach of the Federal Government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to permit air transportation service between midnight and 6 a.m. at Ronald Reagan National Airport (DCA).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would prohibit Federal funds from being used to permit airline service between midnight and 6 a.m. at Ronald Reagan National Airport.

Last month, I held a widely attended community meeting with standing room only on airport airplane noise with residents of Palisades, Foxhall, Georgetown, Hillandale, and other impacted neighborhoods in the District of Columbia. Representatives of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, the Federal Aviation Administration, and residents sat on a panel while we discussed airplane noise that has completely disrupted the life of this community.

Over the last 18 months, D.C. residents have reported an increase in air traffic activity during nighttime and early morning hours, breaking the sleep of children and adults alike. During this time period, one airline added two flights that arrive at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport after midnight and three flights that depart before 5 a.m.

As of now, there is no congressional prohibition, none whatsoever, on nighttime flights at Ronald Reagan National Airport. Until recent years, however, flights at this airport could not land after 10 p.m. or take off before 7 a.m.

My amendment gives airlines greater latitude without introducing continuing sleepless nights for residents. Congress can settle this issue in the Nation's Capital to provide relief to those residents who suffer from airline noise night after night and early morning after early morning.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I will have to oppose this amendment.

I am actually concerned about the potential unintended consequences of this amendment. We don't know all of the potential impacts of this amendment, from safety to capacity to, frankly, the effect on local economics.

We have made in this bill an effort not to legislatively direct specific flight restrictions or flight paths. As you can well imagine, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of these issues out there, but we have made the decision to not do that.

And again, we just don't know all of the potential unintended consequences, so I would respectfully have to urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman yielding.

I would simply add an observation about the situation that this and other

amendments we may be considering today point to with respect to the pending FAA authorization. It is expiring at the end of this fiscal year.

Our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee are exploring options to reform the FAA. One of them includes separating the FAA from the Department of Transportation and allowing the FAA more independence over the use of its resources.

This is an important time to encourage our colleagues to think very carefully about that, about whether a more independent FAA, one that does not have to rely on annual appropriations, would be as attentive to concerns such as our colleague raises today, concerns about noise, concerns about flight paths.

We ought to move very cautiously in this area. I have misgivings about the piecemeal approach, but I believe there is an important message that is being delivered to the leadership of the FAA. I strongly urge the Administrator to ensure the FAA is more attentive to the concerns that are raised by communities when developing their new flight procedures.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, while I understand the concerns of my friend on the other side of the aisle, and I appreciate the remarks of my friend on this side, I do alert the House to the fact that I am at least speaking from precedent.

I understand that all over the United States there are people who may have similar concerns. But remember, we are talking about a jurisdiction which in recent years has had no flights between 10 and 7, and now there are some airlines that have taken advantage of the fact that there are no limit on slots at Reagan National Airport.

This is a community in the Nation's Capital that is metropolitan in scope. The Nation's Capital is different from many other communities. I ask the House—and I certainly appreciate the remarks concerning possible privatization of FAA—to bear in mind that it is Congress that is ultimately the arbiter of such concerns.

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

□ 0945

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Tank Car Standards and Operational Controls for High-Hazard Flammable Trains'' published by the Department of Transportation in the Federal Register on May 8, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 26643 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which would prohibit funds for the implementation of the Department of Transportation's bungled new regulations for rail tank car standards.

I am strongly in favor of robust standards and best practices which actually improve the safety and efficiency of oil-by-rail transport. However, the new tank car rule completely missed the mark.

Instead of utilizing the expertise and practical experience of the rail, oil, and manufacturing industries, the Obama administration developed a series of special interest regulations at the behest of extremist environmental groups that seem more intent on thwarting the American energy renaissance than on actually creating a safer rail network.

In fact, the only reason these new regulations were even proposed is because of a misguided lawsuit filed against the DOT by the Sierra Club.

Analytics firm ICF International estimated the cost of these new regulations to top $42 billion, which will be laid on the backs of individual consumers and hard-working Americans. I repeat, $42 billion will be lost to our economy as a result of this new rule. These costly regulations will be reflected not only in the price we pay at the pump, but also in the price of manufacturing the millions of products that use plastics and chemicals derived from American petroleum.

The most egregious part is that these regulations don't even address the root cause of these accidents, which are related to track conditions and human error.

This new rule is nothing more than regulation in search of a problem. Department of Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx said as much in 2014 when he admitted: ''The truth is that 99.9 percent of these oil shipments reach their destinations safely.''

These new and overreaching mandates require railroad companies to unnecessarily increase their steel tank walls and will require significant upgrades and retrofitting for an estimated 154,500 tank cars. In fact, The Wall Street Journal has reported: ''The steel jacket alone would lower a car's 30,000-gallon capacity by about 800 gallons, forcing shippers to deploy more cars, according to rail industry analysts.''

Clearly, this is an unintended consequence of these new regulations for a .01 percent problem, which actually increases this .01 percent user accident rate percentage by requiring significantly more railcars to actually haul the amount of oil.

In addition, the aggressive timeline proposed by the DOT for completing these retrofits is unrealistic and could harm consumers by disrupting the production and transportation of goods that play major roles in our economy, including chemicals, gasoline, crude oil, and ethanol.

If Democrats and this administration were really concerned about rail safety for transporting oil, they would approve the Keystone pipeline. Pipelines are the safest way to transfer crude.

Our country is in the midst of an energy renaissance which is driving a much-needed economic revival in American manufacturing. We should be pursuing thoughtful, fact-based best practices, instead of adding artificial constraints on the growth of the American energy sector focused on a 1 percent problem that is caused by user error.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment which would prohibit the implementation of this extraneous new rule and to insist that the Department of Transportation pursue a more feasible, data-driven approach that has safety standards in mind.

I thank the chair and ranking member for their leadership on this bill.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise, honestly, in some disbelief that this amendment is actually being offered.

Members of Congress and industry stakeholders have been calling for months for the DOT to complete its rulemaking to update the integrity of tank cars that carry energy products and other hazardous materials. The DOT got the final rule out on May 8, and now, today, the gentleman wants to stop the implementation of that rule in its tracks.

There have been countless examples of derailments involving trains that carry crude oil and other energy products. These incidents have resulted in explosive fires that burn for days. The incident that occurred in Quebec resulted in the preventable deaths of almost 50 people.

U.S. and Canadian transportation officials have worked hard to try to improve the safe transportation of these dangerous products. The railroad industry wants stronger cars. Safety groups want stronger cars. Communities desperately want stronger cars.

We ought not to delay the implementation of this long-awaited rule, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I am now happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-

BALART), our distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also need to first recognize and thank the sponsor of the amendment. I am grateful that he is so vigilant as the Federal Government does have a tendency to overregulate and to, frankly, sometimes do so, I would say, irresponsibly. However, in this case, I have to oppose his amendment.

We have seen some horrific accidents recently associated with crude oil, and I think most Americans would agree that we need to do what we can in a reasonable fashion to try to stop that from happening.

While I am grateful for the sponsor of the amendment for always being vigilant on making sure the government doesn't overregulate, in this case, again, I respectfully have to oppose his amendment and urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure everybody understands that user error and train track applications are the ones that have actually caused these problems.

When you actually look at a solution to a fact-based application, we ought to be spending more time on engineering errors and track conditions than we are over something that is misguided, like these tank car metals.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Gosar amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ___. Section 5309(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting ''or as merited by ridership demands'' after ''weekend days'';

(2) in paragraph (4)(A) by inserting ''or includes performance features that otherwise ensure reliable travel times for public transportation operating in a separated right-of-way in a shared-use facility'' after ''peak periods''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(C)(iii) by inserting ''or as merited by ridership demands'' after ''weekend days''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of a number of Western Representatives, I am proud to offer this bipartisan amendment, along with Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. DEGETTE.

As we know and as has often been mentioned here on the floor, transportation is the lifeblood of this country. It moves people, goods, ideas, and information. Denver, Boulder, Fort Collins, and Broomfield, in my district, are some of the fastest growing cities in the country.

The majority of our tourists—over 46 million in 2014—make their way through the Denver Metro area; but the very things that make our State a popular home as well as a popular tourist destination—including hiking, biking, hunting, fishing, skiing—challenge growth and infrastructure as well.

Despite that fact that these cities are growing at significant rates and tourism is heavily congesting space, many of the major thoroughfares intersecting the region have not been expanded in decades.

Highway 70 West, our major tourism artery to our world-class ski resorts, stretches from the Denver Metro area out to our 14,000-foot peaks. I–25 North takes our visitors north of Denver and through Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins, all the way to Wyoming.

These two highways are effectively the only major arteries traveling north and west of Denver and the only option for residents and visitors to my district to even get out of Vail, Breckenridge, or Fort Collins; and in some places, these highways narrow to as little as two lanes, meaning hard-working constituents who commute every day across my district might wait for hours every day just to go back and forth.

Tourists, likewise, spend long times waiting to get out of their destination towns or to their our attractions.

Worse yet, Mr. Chairman, is a lack of a clear solution. You cannot simply expand a road that winds up some of the steepest peaks in the United States, and it is very costly to expand a tunnel under a large mountain.

One of the only good options that we have for quick, reliable, and affordable mass public transportation is bus rapid transit systems. On Highway 36, our main artery from Boulder to Denver, we recently began operating a BRT system with huge success.

This system shares a HOT lane with high-occupancy vehicles that allows for expedited and assured arrive times. It is used by hundreds of people every day for their commutes. That tool, however, was recently taken out of the toolbox for States across the West.

A hugely problematic change to our surface transportation and authorization MAP–21 bill 3 years ago was the heavy restrictions placed on project eligibility for capital investment grants that build BRT systems nationwide.

Unfortunately, for the first time in history, Congress required that BRT systems have access to an exclusive lane and operate as regularly during nonpeak weekday hours and weekends as they do during peak hours. That simply doesn't match the reality on the ground in places like Colorado and Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, we need access to these grants. The ability to create and innovate in transportation should be encouraged by Congress; yet we are removing the very critical area of investment for BRTs under the current MAP–21 rule, barring them from BRT eligibility because we don't have the capacity to add additional lanes, nor does it make any sense to reserve a lane solely for bus traffic, nor does it make any sense in our commuter and tourism corridors to have buses every couple of minutes on, let's say, a Tuesday at 2 p.m. or on a Sunday at 9 p.m. Ridership and data should drive these decisions, not Washington bureaucrats and not Congress.

My amendment would allow our States and localities the flexibility we need to create the best possible surface transportation system in our area. There simply isn't a one size fits all when it comes to growth and infrastructure.

I encourage this body to take into account the needs of States like Colorado and Arizona.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Did the gentleman invoke his point of order or reserve a point of order?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Florida reserved a point of order.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, instead of giving top-down directives from Washington, we should be allowing for the equity of Federal resources and take into account local needs. What works for some transportation corridors might not work for others. We simply have different needs with regard to our computing patterns and tourism patterns in other areas of the country.

I am proud to bring up this amendment with a strong bipartisan coalition of Members, which includes Representatives COFFMAN, PERLMUTTER, SCHWEIKERT, DEGETTE, MCSALLY, and KIRKPATRICK, because we can't effectively discuss funding levels like those in the underlying bill without first putting in place equitable policies that encourage innovation for their disbursement.

I ask that my colleagues work with me and the coalition of Members I have named to find and enact a fix as we move forward with the transportation reauthorization later this summer.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to see if he will be willing to work with us with regard to finding a fix on this policy issue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I know the gentleman is very committed and has worked awfully hard. I look forward to working with him on this.

Again, I know how passionate he is about this, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. POLIS. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

□ 1000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Federal Transit Administration's Rapid Growth Area Transit Program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, fiscally responsible amendment that will ensure scarce transportation dollars are going towards highways, bridges, and other critical infrastructure that are in desperate need of repair.

The Obama administration's budget request for the fiscal year 2016 included $500 million for a new discretionary grant program for bus transit. The administration made the same new request in fiscal year 2015 for this same misguided program. This request was rejected in its entirety last year, and the proposed rapid growth area transit program received no funding in the CR/Omnibus. With significant infrastructure needs, including road and bridge maintenance, now is not the time to spend $500 million on a new discretionary bus transit program.

In fact, the Obama administration actually proposed two new programs this year that sought funding from the highway trust fund, both of which asked for $500 million for each. The committee made clear in the committee report that they chose to fund the new $500 million Fixing and Accelerating Surface Transportation, or FAST, program in this bill. If I had to fund only one of these two new programs, that is exactly the one I would have funded.

So I applaud the chairman, ranking member, and committee for the choice they made, and also for apparently choosing not to fund the proposed rapid growth area transit program once again in this legislation.

Having said that, there are no detailed summaries of the particular program accounts because authorizing language has not yet been passed. In addition, nothing is said about the proposed $500 million new discretionary bus transit program in the bill or the committee report. My amendment is also necessary to prevent funds from being transferred to this account.

A recent economic analysis found: ''Over the past few decades lawmakers have diverted more trust fund resources . . . thus starving general purpose roads of funds,'' and, ''Transit—including light rail, trolleys, and buses—marks the largest diversion. In 2010 alone, it received 17 percent, or $6 billion, of Federal highway user fees, even though it accounted for only 1 percent of the Nation's surface travel. Despite receiving a portion of Federal user fees for decades, transit has failed to reduce traffic congestion or even maintain its share of urban travel. For example, between 1983 and 2010, traffic volumes in the Nation's 51 major metropolitan areas increased by 87 percent, peak travel times in those areas increased by 125 percent, and transit's share of passenger miles fell by one-fourth.''

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to once again repeat what I said a little while ago. I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work. It is evident that he spends the time and he does his homework. I am greatly appreciative of that. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, implement, or enforce section 193 or section 414 of this Act.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading to be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. SANFORD for his leadership as it relates to this amendment and helping us try to end these outdated and failed policies toward Cuba. I rise in support of our amendment, and I am very proud to cosponsor this simple, bipartisan amendment. This amendment would strike two provisions included in this bill that would further limit travel to and from Cuba via flights and ferries. Not only are these provisions inappropriate policy riders, they would deny Americans the right to travel to Cuba.

I understand some of my colleagues, including our subcommittee chair, have a personal interest in Cuba, yet personal interest should not stall progress nor interfere with what is good for the American people. I am joined by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and a diverse coalition of organizations and businesses in strong opposition to this and other attempts to undermine efforts to normalize relations with Cuba.

Not only are the current provisions in this bill wrong for diplomacy, they are patently antibusiness. That is why this amendment is supported by the United States Chamber of Commerce, Orbitz, the American Society of Travel Agents, and the broad-based coalition Engage Cuba.

These provisions that are currently in the bill set us back 50 years. They would eliminate flights that airlines have already invested in and would kill a new market for maritime carriers. Simply put, these provisions are an affront to Americans' basic freedom. Cuba is the only country in the world, including North Korea, Iran, China, and Vietnam, where Americans cannot freely travel. The President's announcement to expand travel was a step in the right direction.

We should be passing the bipartisan and bicameral Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act, H.R. 664, which I am proud to cosponsor with my colleague Mr. SANFORD, rather than moving backwards with these misguided provisions.

Opponents to normalize the relations are quick to claim that renewed engagement somehow rewards the Cuban Government. That couldn't be more wrong. In order to engage on issues like human rights and democracy, Americans should be able to do just that. This amendment allows that.

Those who are serious about moving our relations forward to the betterment of both Americans and Cubans know that increased exchange and formalized relations are the path we need to be on. A majority of Americans and Cubans agree: we need a 21st century approach to our relations with this nation 90 miles away from our shores.

This is 2015, my colleagues, not 1960. The rest of the world is doing business with Cuba, allows its citizens to travel to Cuba, and also has normal diplomatic relations with Cuba. The United States is isolated. This amendment begins to thaw that freeze and to keep our country moving forward in this next decade and, further, to become part of the world family who understands that Americans should, like other citizens in other countries, have a right to travel wherever they so desire.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I intend to strike the last word so as to give the speakers more time.

Ms. LEE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, my comments will be brief. It is quite simple. The concept is this: if I travel on Delta Airlines to Moscow, it does not mean that I support Putin; if I travel on Royal Caribbean to Shanghai, it does not mean I support the Chinese regime.

This bill is fundamentally, as my colleague from California has pointed out, about Americans' right to travel. It is, secondarily, about something we talk about as Republicans, which is balance of power. If we don't want the President overstepping his bounds, we shouldn't overstep our bounds as Members of Congress. That is precisely what this bill does in trying to proscribe the President, though he has full authority within the licensing, within the Department of Commerce, to do as he has done.

Finally, I think it is about American opportunity. Why should we have Canadian or Mexican jets traveling to a country that we are allowed to travel to rather than American jets?

Ms. LEE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, just a couple things from the debate that we have heard. The sponsor of the amendment talked about that this may be a personal issue for some. Mr. Chairman, let me be very frank and very clear: this is not a personal issue.

Let me also talk about what the language in the bill does that this amendment is trying to take out. It doesn't deal with the overriding issue of policy versus whether we like the President's policy or not. It deals with one specific issue and one specific issue only, Mr. Chairman: whether we should condone, whether we should approve, whether we should permit the trafficking of confiscated—in other words, stolen—property.

When the gentleman from my side of the aisle said that, you know, this is an issue about traveling to other countries, when we travel to Russia, we should be able to do that, that is fine. But is he also saying, which is what this amendment says, that we should condone the use of stolen, confiscated property, property that was stolen and confiscated illegally from Americans? So if you support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, what you are saying is it is okay to do business on property that was stolen from Americans.

Now, I can understand having differences of opinion on overall policy, but the language in the mark deals specifically with confiscated—in other words, stolen—properties from Americans. For the life of me, I would never understand how anybody can justify doing business on confiscated, stolen property and then try to obfuscate the issue talking about policy, which is not what is in the mark.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), a distinguished gentlewoman from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

As the chairman points out, do we really want to trample on the property rights of innocent Americans whose properties were illegally stolen by the Cuban regime?

The gentleman from South Carolina is correct, the concept is simple, but the concept he doesn't seem to understand is this: it is not about travel to Cuba. This is about protecting American properties that were illegally seized by the Castro government. We are selling out these legitimate property claims to thousands of American citizens. Respect for private property rights, Mr. Chairman, has been a consistent American policy since the founding of our Republic.

The Cuban regime illegally confiscated property from American citizens. Our citizens have not been compensated, and we know there is no respect for the rule of law in Cuba. If an American's property has been seized, what does that American do? Well, there is no fair court for recess. Let me tell you what the Inter-American Law Review has noted about the Cuban regime's confiscation of U.S. assets. It says it is the ''largest uncompensated taking of American property by a foreign government in history.''

So this is what this amendment is about. If this amendment to strike the use of confiscated property were to pass, we would be, in essence, allowing and condoning the trafficking of stolen goods. Currently, there are over 8,800 claims certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which is under the U.S. Department of Justice. American citizens whose properties were seized illegally—almost 9,000 have filed claims—the Castro regime doesn't care. These certified claims, are they just small? No. They are worth approximately $8 billion.

This body must protect the interests of those citizens, of all of our citizens, so I implore our colleagues to not support these misguided attempts to normalize relations with the Cuban regime on the backs of American citizens. We are better than that. We must not allow this amendment to pass. We are about protecting American private property rights. This language in the bill protects American citizens, constituents that we represent in our congressional districts.

Is this Chamber really going to side with a Communist tyrant in Cuba over American citizens? The Cuban regime should not be allowed to use American properties stolen from our citizens for its commercial benefit. If the U.S. endorses such a practice, what message will we be sending to other rogue regimes who would love to be confiscating American properties?

So, if we want to help the Cuban people, and I am sure that all of us do, let's not give their oppressors more resources to violate their rights. We are here to protect private property rights of American citizens. We must reject this amendment, and rather than striking the provisions directly, which my colleagues could have done, they are offering limitation amendments that would prohibit funds to enforce those same provisions. Let's not do this.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Let's not trample on the rights of American citizens.

□ 1015

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Three quick points. If you follow this logic, then no American plane should fly into Saigon, no American plane should fly into China, no American plane should fly into Russia, because indeed property was confiscated at the time of the Russian revolution, the Chinese taking, or, for that matter, what happened in Vietnam. There are American properties there.

This is not about American property rights. This is about legalistically trying to undo that which has been changed.

The other thing it is about is, again, legalism. What the bill actually says is if a boat docks in the previous 180 days within 7 miles of a port or property where there may be land somewhere connected.

This is a legalistic attempt to undo what the President has proposed.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last

word in order to express my strong support for this amendment and my appreciation to our colleague from California for offering it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill, and the language that we are trying to strike out reads: ''None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate new scheduled air transportation originating from the United States if such flights would land on, or pass through, property confiscated by the Cuban Government, including property in which a minority interest was confiscated, as the terms confiscated, the Cuban Government, and property are defined in'' the paragraphs below.

This is just a job killer for Americans. We have a hundred thousand Americans who are visiting Cuba illegally. You know how they get there? They go to Mexico. Who gets the business? Mexican airlines. They go to Canada. Who gets the business? Canadian airlines. Or, any other country in the world that has normal travel relationships with Cuba.

You are just cutting off the ability for American enterprise to get access to Cuba, where everybody wants to go, because there are family feuds going on here, because it is including property which has a minority interest.

How are the airlines, how are the people going to decide what property has been confiscated, who is the ownership title? Those are big legalistic problems in the United States when we confiscate property to build freeways or railways.

This amendment really screws up the ability for America to be involved in a business that Americans want to do. They want to travel. Censorship of American travel—this is just ridiculous in these days.

What is the message to the world? Do we prohibit our citizens from going to countries that are communist countries? You can go to Vietnam, China, and Russia, but you can't go to Cuba because there is a lot of feuding going on in Florida.

In fact, Florida is going to benefit from this because where are the airports that these scheduled airlines are going to leave from? They are Tampa, they are Miami, the businesses in your State.

So if you want to give American jobs to Americans, and you want commerce to occur, and you don't want to continue this censorship of Cuba, then vote for this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. A couple of points I would just like to make.

First of all, confiscated property 50 years-plus ago should be part of negotiations in terms of bilateral discussions as it relates to normalizing relations with Cuba. What is in this bill right now is what we have indicated, and which is why we offer this amendment.

This bill prohibits Americans from traveling to Cuba. It eliminates jobs in America, and it eliminates economic growth through our maritime industry and our airline industry.

Once again, all of the issues that occurred 50 years ago are subject to discussion based on any bilateral negotiations taking place.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Could I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just make three last points. As was correctly pointed out by my colleague from California, indeed this is about American jobs. It indeed is about, again, this larger notion of private property rights.

I would stand my private property rights record up to anybody. I believe strongly in private property rights and legal code, which is why Ms. LEE is correct: should there be bilateral relations between Cuba and the United States, this would be part of that discussion.

But the idea of creating a legal hurdle for an airline not to be able to fly from Miami or Tampa to Havana—and instead, those jobs go to other places around the globe—makes no sense to me.

Finally, I would simply say this. We have tried 50 years of one policy, and it hasn't worked. It was Ronald Reagan who encouraged travel to the Eastern Bloc countries. I think it would make sense in this instance.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of things that, by the way, you will notice, at very few times actually deal with language in the mark, the language in the bill. By the way, for example, that this is going to hurt American jobs.

To argue, Mr. Chairman, that American companies will benefit from trafficking in stolen property that was stolen from American companies I think is probably the definition of an oxymoron, number one.

Number two, there is a lot of obfuscation. The language in the bill doesn't say that Americans can't travel. The language says that they cannot use trafficking in, make a profit from, property that was stolen from Americans. Stolen from Americans.

So I understand that the gentleman says that his property rights record is as good as any, but, Mr. Chairman, the language in the bill deals with a specific issue, and one specific issue alone: Should we condone, should we allow, should we permit, should we encourage the trafficking, the profiting from stolen property—property that was confiscated from Americans, whether there are certified claims or not.

If you support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, you are saying it is okay for folks to traffic in property that was stolen from Americans, illegally stolen from Americans. I think, frankly, that is a sad day.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating to come here to the floor and listen to colleagues who struggle to support free trade agreements with our allies come to the floor and advocate for expanded trade with one of our enemies, taking advantage of properties stolen from American citizens.

I heard that we have a personal interest in this matter—and I do. I am an American citizen. I was born here. And I want to do justice by American property owners.

Shouldn't we resolve these 8,818 claims before proceeding? Shouldn't we do justice by these families, these businesses whose property was stolen with no due process, with no hearing by the Castro government?

Whose side are we on, Mr. Chairman? That is the question here. As Americans, do we want to be on the side of those who were aggrieved by a tyrannical regime—American citizens—or do we want to reward that regime by allowing others now to profit over those stolen properties? That is the question that we need to ask ourselves today.

This is not about travel. No one is here advocating for restricting travel to Cuba. Many people travel to Cuba today legally, and that would not change. But I cannot stand for violating the property rights of my fellow American citizens.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, again, before I yield back, as Mr. CURBELO just mentioned, this is not an issue of travel. This is not an issue of the overriding policy. This is not an issue of even arguing whether President Obama has been a good negotiator or a horrible negotiator on anything. This is about whether we want to condone, permit, accept, in violation of everything that the United States stands for, the trafficking of stolen property, property illegally confiscated from American citizens.

If you support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, you are supporting, you are condoning, you are assisting, you are helping trafficking and the profiting on property that was stolen from Americans.

This cannot stand. This should not stand. I would respectfully ask for a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. 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 gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to take any actions with respect to the financing of a new passenger rail project that runs from Orlando to Miami through Indian River County, Florida.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, All Aboard Florida was presented as a private passenger rail project that would run from Miami to Orlando, and vice versa, along Florida's east coast.

The project was initially sold to the public as the first privately funded and operated passenger train. However, that story soon changed, as All Aboard Florida decided to pursue a $1.6 billion loan from the Department of Transportation. Apparently, because the loan requires a strict Environmental Impact Statement to be completed, All Aboard Florida decided to also apply for $1.75 billion in tax-exempt private activity bonds from the Department of Transportation.

□ 1030

The U.S. Department of Transportation has moved to green light this financing option, even though they have absolutely no statutory authority to do that, and the environmental impact study has yet to be completed. We don't even know if the project is safe or feasible yet.

Furthermore, these trains will move through our small beach towns at speeds of up to 110 miles per hour, with virtually no—none, nada—buffer separating it from our communities.

All Aboard Florida envisions 32 trains running per day, on top of 20 freight trains. That is a lot of traffic. Given how close this track is to our adjacent roads and surrounding neighborhoods, obviously, there are serious safety concerns. Why should you ask taxpayers to be on the hook for this train?

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment to stop the Department of Transportation from funding this train.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, here we go again, trying to destroy passenger rail in this country. I don't understand why Republicans refuse to support transportation infrastructure.

Let me tell the gentleman from Florida that our competition is not Georgia, and it is certainly not Alabama. It is Europe. It is Japan. It is China. The people in Florida support All Aboard Florida. This is a system that will go from Orlando to Miami. The studies indicate it is an economic boom to our State.

I just for the life of me don't understand why, without vision, the people perish? Why is it that you can go to Europe and you can get on a train to go from London to Paris—2 hours, 1 hour and 15 minutes—and we don't want that same system here?

Our competition is spending close to 8 percent—8 percent—of their economics for passenger rail, and we fight about 1 percent; yet we can spend close to $300 billion for tax breaks; yet we don't even want to encourage public-private partnerships.

Shame on you. The people in Florida need to be able to move around our State, and this is not just a Florida issue; it is a national issue. Here we are, $2 billion that could fix Amtrak; yet we can do a tax break for close to $300 billion and don't pay for it. I don't understand.

What is wrong with the people's House? Why is it that we don't support transportation infrastructure? This is not just a Florida issue. When we had 9/11, Amtrak was the only entity that was moving people. When we had Katrina, we had over 3,000 people die because they couldn't move around the area.

We need a train that leaves New Orleans to go to Orlando and on down to Miami. That is the future.

Shame on you.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, shame on me for asking the Department of Transportation to follow the law, respect the Constitution of the United States, and make economically sound decisions.

This is not a partisan issue, in response to that allegation. In September, I wrote the GAO, along with my colleague from Florida, Representative PATRICK MURPHY, asking them to study the project to ensure taxpayer funds were not at risk.

A recent independent economic analysis conducted by Dr. John Friedman concludes that, even under all optimistic assumptions, AAF will generate losses of more than $100 million and will be unable to service its debt burden. Dr. Friedman has a Ph.D in economics, is a distinguished Brown University professor and former Economic Council special assistant in the current Obama administration.

The Department of Transportation has been unable to explain where they get their authority to authorize bonds for this project. That is because they don't have any authority. They say title 23 funding has been given to the project in the past, which could trigger the bond authority, but have been unable to state where title 23 funds were ever spent, on what projects, and when.

This is just common sense. Now, it might not make some congressional sense to some people, but this is common sense and a simple ask that the Department of Transportation follow the law and not violate the law to help a special interest and put the taxpayers on the hook for $1.75 billion.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POSEY. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of these funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to redesign the Phoenix Metroplex regional airspace.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would prevent the FAA from moving forward with plans to redesign the Phoenix metroplex airspace. Let me explain why it is important to my city.

Imagine living in a quiet neighborhood, then waking up one morning to discover dozen of planes suddenly have been roaring over your head. Next, imagine the frustration of running a business, raising a family, or even trying to get a good night's sleep when your windows are constantly rattling because of the noise of passing aircraft.

Finally, imagine that all of this discomfort was both needless and avoidable, that it was caused by out-of-

touch bureaucrats who rerouted major flight paths over your community without bothering to consult the people that live there.

Unfortunately, for thousands of Phoenix residents, this is not a hypothetical situation. In September of last year, the FAA instituted new flight paths for the aircraft departing from Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, without any notice for anybody, without any notice to our neighbors. For too many members of my community, these changes have meant more noise and a lower quality of life.

Disturbingly, the FAA altered these flight paths without seeking local input, failing to consult with the community members or civic leaders in the Phoenix area. Not only that, but the FAA also failed to provide a report that was mandated by the previous Congress on Sky Harbor on last year's FAA bill about how it planned to do and change with the patterns. It is now more than 2 months overdue, with no response yet from the FAA.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't how our government is supposed to run, and this is not how the FAA is supposed to operate.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative GALLEGO. I appreciate that.

Let's put some facts around this. Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport is the tenth busiest airport in the United States, but we have something that is a little unique—and think about this because this is coming to your neighborhood, too.

We actually have a downtown airport. Our city grew up around an airport, so it makes traffic patterns and the mechanics dealing with it quite unique. Also, our big county has about 4.2 million people in it. It is either the third or fourth most populous county in the United States—so a huge population. Remember, Arizona has been attributed as the most urbanized State in the country.

I have a downtown airport, and then the FAA goes and starts to change the flight patterns. When it becomes one of the biggest issues at all of our congressional offices, they are arrogant; they don't return calls. We point out the fact that they are violating last year's law, and they just grin at you and then walk out of the meetings with this sort of arrogant vanity.

This is the process we, as Members—and remember, there are seven congressional districts that touch this Phoenix metroplex area that all care about this. This is our opportunity to at least get our voices heard.

I am going to ask the chairman, please consider what is happening to 4.2 million people in the Phoenix area. The fact of the matter is there is well-established corridors where you don't have to have the effects on the neighborhoods, and we can still be moving to the NextGen if I could find someone at the FAA who would actually listen to our concerns.

Just to finish, this amendment is very straightforward. It would just simply ensure the FAA does not proceed with the redesign of the regional airspace around Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport until these issues are resolved in the local neighborhoods.

Experts tell us that if the flight paths in Phoenix are eventually altered, then the entire metroplex airspace will also need to be revisited. By asking them to slow down, consider the overall effect of what is happening now, we are actually going to do them a favor by not having them to revisit it later on.

Instead of rushing forward, the FAA should do the prudent thing and wait until our communities' concerns have been fully addressed.

In closing, let me just offer a word of warning. For those of you who think this is exclusively a Phoenix problem, just wait because your city could be next, and then you will be dealing exactly with the same FAA relationship that we are dealing with right now, someone who is not responsive to the concerns of both the local politicians, the Members of Congress, and the citizens.

Mr. GALLEGO. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I would be concerned about the unintended consequences of the amendment. We don't know all the potential impacts of this amendment, from safety to capacity to local economics.

While I sympathize with both these gentlemen and I pledged to work with the gentleman and his community and the FAA to find a resolution, we have made an effort in this bill not to legislatively direct specific flight restrictions on flight paths.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOYCE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply want to add—or to reiterate, I might say—that our subcommittee's fiscal year '15 report required the FAA to work with the Phoenix community on this issue and to report back to the committee on these efforts. We are still waiting for that report.

Again, let me reiterate what I said earlier. The FAA must be more proactive in responding to concerns that are raised by communities. These are legitimate concerns, and the FAA needs to be accountable.

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to support Amtrak's route with the highest loss, measured by contributions/(Loss) per Rider, as based on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Fiscal Years 2014-2018 Five Year Plan from April 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1045

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It would eliminate funding for the absolute worst performing line at Amtrak, the Sunset Limited, which runs from New Orleans to Los Angeles.

The Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 required that Amtrak operate without any Federal operating assistance after 2002. I have since then offered this amendment each year.

Amtrak was supposed to be free of Federal operating subsidy; yet despite this commonsense requirement that Amtrak cease their fiscal irresponsibility and mismanagement, instead, they turned to continuing this line that costs the taxpayers $405.67 for every single ticket that is bought, for every single trip. That is $405.67 to subsidize the travels of passengers from New Orleans to Los Angeles, a trip that takes nearly 48 hours, assuming the train is on time.

I believe this is exceedingly unlikely also because it has a terrible record of being on time. According to Amtrak's most recent monthly performance report, the Sunset Limited was only on time 42 percent of the time; yet 100 percent of the $405 was paid for the ticket.

This places the Sunset Limited as one of the top 10 worst ontime routes for any of Amtrak's routes in its latest performance report.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, taxpayers should be happy when the train is not running, but not running on time, and the cost to the taxpayer is prohibitive. Why does it run this route when Amtrak loses an average of $41 million a year?

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simply to help Amtrak make the tough decisions that they appear to be incapable of doing themselves. I think it is the first step to instilling a small measure of fiscal discipline in Amtrak. Failure to do so will only continue Amtrak along this process rather them being a north-south provider on both coasts.

I hope my colleagues will join me. Certainly, I know they are taxpayer

advocates that believe as I do. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Our colleague from Texas has offered amendments like this in the past, an attempt to micromanage Amtrak from the floor of the House. I don't think it is a good idea.

We had a vigorous debate last night on the importance of investing in inner city passenger rail. Of course, he will get no quarrel from me or other colleagues, I suspect, in arguing for improved service and arguing for making the service more attractive.

What we are dealing with here—and have been through this whole debate—is a number of colleagues who simply want to defund passenger rail in this country, overlooking the fact that every mode of transportation is subsidized to some degree and that the national interest requires diverse modes of transportation.

Colleagues seem intent on singling out passenger rail for elimination, and we have had amendments offered to this bill that would do just that.

This one is more about micromanagement. It is more about a specific route, the Sunset Limited. This would eliminate the Sunset Limited's long-distance route. It serves communities along the southern tier of the United States. Actually, it serves more than 300,000 passengers annually in five States: Louisiana, Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and California.

It is no way to run a railroad, if I might say so, and I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, that is 300,000 times $405.67 for every single ticket.

I am not trying to micromanage, nor am I trying to kill Amtrak. I vote for Amtrak; I am for Amtrak, but they also want more and more and need more and more resources to help in their north-south line in the East Coast and the West Coast.

What they are doing is bleeding off their hard-earned money, using the subsidy rather than doing what their original mission should be.

Mr. Chair, I think I support all of Amtrak, and I am for it. This is not micromanaging. It is showing them the obvious things which they need to accomplish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 210 of this Act with respect to the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that removes the exemption that the Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles currently has from the requirement to have a resident of public housing or Section 8 on its governing board.

I am offering this amendment because I have learned that HACoLA is not in compliance with requirements outlined in this exemption, which has directly resulted in a lack of meaningful engagement by residents of the housing authority on important policy issues affecting the effectiveness of the programs that it administers.

In 1998, Congress passed a law requiring that the governing body of a public housing authority must include at least one member who is directly assisted by the housing authority. This provision was an important recognition of the need for the perspective and participation of tenants in the governance of public housing authorities. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to support any Amtrak route whose costs exceed 2 times its revenues, as based on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Fiscal Years 2014–2018 Five Year Plan from April 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, once again, I stand in trying to help Amtrak to effectively manage its system by taking away those routes that are cost prohibitive.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate funding for Amtrak's long-distance routes, which have total direct costs that are more than twice the revenue that they generate. Every single long-distance route that Amtrak provides—those of over 400 miles in length—operates at a loss every month. Eleven routes cost double the amount of revenue they create.

Oh, by the way, Mr. Chair—and this is true since 1997 when I came to Congress—these routes are ineffective and waste valuable taxpayer money, as well as money that could be used in the system for highly used routes for the safety and security of their passengers on north-south routes.

Some argue that many travelers cannot afford to fly and they need a less expensive travel alternative. However, for most of these routes, bus tickets and plane tickets are less expensive, more efficient, and more frequently on time.

Combined, these 11 routes cost the American taxpayer about $500 million in fiscal year 2014 alone. Four lines cost over $50 million each. I think it is clear that government-subsidized rail service on Amtrak does not make economic sense if they have enough money to bleed off $500 million with routes that cost twice in expense what they generate in revenue, so I am offering this amendment again.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by our friend from Texas. This amendment outdoes his last one.

We are now talking about eliminating nine routes, with a total ridership of over 2 million people: the Cardinal and Capitol Limited routes from D.C. to Chicago, through West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana; the Southern Crescent, New York City to New Orleans; the Coast Starlight, along the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington.

To elaborate further on our opposition, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I appreciate him referencing the Coast Starlight.

This is a self-fulfilling prophecy. Congress has created a difficult situation for Amtrak, consistently short-changing maintenance and capital.

As my good friend from North Carolina points out, all modes of transportation in this country are subsidized by the public. Amtrak is no exception. It provides a variety of services for people.

We are watching on the West Coast ridership increase. It provides an important opportunity for businesspeople. If you talk to businesspeople in Seattle, in Portland, they would say they would like the Federal Government to invest more. It has made a big difference for how they conduct business.

Part of the strength is having a network. Make no mistake, we are, in fact, going to have a passenger rail network in the United States, despite consistent efforts to chop away and minimize it.

China, 6 years ago, had no high-speed rail. Today, they are moving more passengers than the entire air fleet in the United States. We will have higher speed rail, but the question is whether we are going to build on what we have got—American built, American managed—or we will wait until it deteriorates, gets so bad that we end up with a design-build to China, paying more, shipping the profits and the work overseas.

I would suggest it is far better to protect what we have now, build on the progress, not undo the network, and most certainly reject this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE. I oppose the gentleman's amendment. This amendment has far-reaching implications, and it would shut down 9 of 15 long-distance routes.

I do not believe that an appropriations bill is the place to do this. This would need to be carefully debated and discussed by the committee of jurisdiction.

For these reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, look, I made a mistake. I came here from business. I came here as somebody that had to operate within the bounds of common sense and doing things that made sense with money and opportunities.

I will just say to you, Mr. Chairman, I am going to stay after this issue. I am all for Amtrak, but not when they continue to have routes that cost twice what the revenue is.

This is what our airlines did for a long time. They provided service, and they went broke, and then we want to turn around and say we are going to subsidize the airlines. Marketplace ideas work, and that is why we are a capitalist country.

I urge my colleagues to think over this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1100

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to enforce section 47524 of title 49, United States Code, or part 161 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, with regard to noise or access restrictions or to enforce section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, with regard to access restriction on the operation of aircraft by the operate of Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, California.

Mr. SCHIFF (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the amendment that I am offering along with my southern California colleague, Mr. SHERMAN.

The amendment would allow the Burbank Bob Hope Airport to implement a nighttime curfew between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. and restore local control to the community that has been denied to them for decades.

Thousands of residents of southern California's San Fernando Valley who live under the flight paths or near the terminals at the Bob Hope Airport endure the house-shaking noise of air traffic during the day and suffer the jarring interruption of their sleep that is caused by a roaring jet taking off or landing.

I want to also distinguish this measure. I know my colleagues have heard some other curfew measures today, and without detracting from them, I want to point out that the facts of this one are quite different. This is, I think, a unique case in the case of Burbank airport.

When Congress passed the 1990 Airport Noise and Control Act, ANCA, it intended to permit airports to implement noise restrictions if they met certain requirements. At that time, Congress exempted several airports from the law's requirements for FAA approval of new noise rules if they had preexisting noise rules in effect to address local concerns. So airports were grandfathered in when ANCA was passed; but because of a mistake, Bob Hope Airport, which had a curfew in place, did not get grandfathered in.

The Bob Hope Airport in Burbank was one of the first airports in the country, in fact, to impose a curfew and has a long history of curfews but, unfortunately, was not given the protection of the grandfather provision of ANCA that several other similar airports received. This amendment would correct this inequity and put Bob Hope on the same footing as several other airports across the country that had curfews before ANCA's passage.

It doesn't set a precedent in terms of other airports, and this would be uniquely confined to the situation involving Bob Hope. By correcting the omission of not allowing Bob Hope Airport to implement on a permanent and mandatory basis curfew which it had, in effect, informally in the 1980s, we would return local control to the community that has sought it for years.

It is also important for my colleagues to understand the impact this will have on aviation in southern California. There will be no impact on commercial flights—zero. Almost all commercial airlines already voluntarily abide by the voluntary curfew at Bob Hope, and the impact on general aviation will be limited to two nighttime landings. The impact, however, will be significant for people trying to get sleep that are disrupted by those small number of flights.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from southern California (Mr. SHERMAN), my colleague.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for putting forward this amendment.

Bob Hope is a local neighborhood airport. Only through a technicality was it denied a curfew. All the commercial carriers already adhere to that curfew. We have a handful of nighttime flights that could easily go through one of the larger airports in the Los Angeles area.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a good balance between the needs for commercial aviation on the one hand and the need to sleep on the other.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one final point. This amendment had bipartisan support last year. It came within just three or four votes of passage. Because of the unique situation facing the Burbank Airport, I would urge unique consideration of correcting the injustice when Bob Hope was not grandfathered as it should have been.

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

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to authorize exempt facility bonds to finance passenger rail projects which do not use vehicles that are reasonably expected to be capable of attaining a maximum speed in excess of 150 miles per hour between scheduled stops as defined in section 142 of title 26, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, exempt facility bonds are special tax-exempt financing instruments designed to help raise funds for important infrastructure projects like airports, waste management facilities, highways, and other transportation needs.

In fact our current law, 26 U.S.C. Section 142, clearly lists 15 specific categories of projects that can receive financing through the use of exempt facility bonds.

One area where the law restricts the ability of the Department of Transportation to authorize exempt facility bonds is to finance passenger rail, which it limits to high-speed rail that can reasonably attain the speed of 150 miles per hour between stops. Yet the Department of Transportation has decided to ignore the law and authorize bonds for projects that clearly do not qualify.

Whatever views Members have on passenger rail, my amendment would simply ensure that the Department of Transportation follows the law in authorizing the use of tax-exempt bonds, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. All in Florida received a private activity bond allocation to issue these bonds. There is no provision in this particular section of U.S. Code that requires a passenger rail project to achieve 150 miles per hour. This amendment would prevent DOT from taking any potential further steps on this very, very important project. If for some reason, let's say the project needed a small extension, DOT could not process it.

Now, the passenger rail line that would link Miami to Orlando, frankly, is an important project to the State of Florida and one that I fully support, Mr. Chairman. We have to remember it is being done by the private sector. So I don't think that we should be looking at creating any unnecessary restrictions, any barriers or uncertainty for this project as it moves forward. It is a project—potentially, I think, the first of its kind in the country—where you have the private sector assuming most, if not almost all, of the risk. You have the private sector who is going to be involved in it. The numbers can't be made up, cooked or anything, because it is the private sector who is doing this and who will ultimately be held accountable by their shareholders.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask for a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, there is nothing in this amendment that adds any restrictive impediments whatsoever. It only requires that the Department of Transportation follow the law when they allocate these funds.

Although this is being called a private project, the taxpayers will be on the hook for over $1.7 billion—that is $1.7 billion. So I think it is important in the interests of protecting our taxpayers, certainly, that we make sure the Department of Transportation follows the law.

If there weren't a propensity already demonstrated not to follow the law, then I would not have to bother with this amendment. But it is clear there are some intentions to violate the provisions of the law and do things that they are not authorized to do. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to bring accountability and protect taxpayers for $1.7 billion.

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

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

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for necessary expenses for the ''Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses'' is hereby reduced by $1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, my heart goes out to the chairman and ranking member for the task that they have been given. People have appropriately condemned and opposed many of the provisions. As people dig into the bill, the more they see, the worse it looks: slashing TIGER grant funding, no funding for high-speed rail, cutting Amtrak, and overall reductions. No wonder it has drawn a veto threat. But it is definitely not the fault of the committee. They have been given an impossible task. They have been requested to finance the Federal Government's transportation responsibilities in 2015 with 1993 dollars.

Our country is falling apart while we are falling behind the rest of the world. We are of a generation when some of us can remember the United States having the finest infrastructure in the world. We had rail passenger service, airlines, superb highways and transit. Those days have long since passed. We are watching the deterioration of transit. The squabbling here over Amtrak is really dealing with a failing system because it is a symptom of our inability to invest in the future—just one, but a very glaring symbol.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, in the 55 months that my Republican friends have taken over Congress, we have not had a single hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, for our responsibility for funding transportation. We have not increased the gas tax in 22 years.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 6 months, six Republican States have raised the gas tax, and we can't even have a hearing on a proposal that is supported by the U.S. Chamber, by the AFL–CIO, by the AAA, the truckers, contractors, transit, bicyclists, and everybody in between. As a result, we continue to limp along.

What did we do late last month? We extended the transportation funding for the 33rd time on a short-term basis. What country ever became great building its infrastructure 6 months at a time? We will be dealing with this in another 2 months.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we deal with this bill as best we do, because it is not adequate. I am going to oppose it. But the bill is a symptom of the failure of my Republican colleagues to face what other entities have done, including red Republican States.

Why don't we come back next week and put the Ways and Means Committee to work for a week, inviting in the people who build, maintain, and use our infrastructure, listen to them, let the committee do its work, and come up with a proposal that will adequately fund our infrastructure?

□ 1115

Then we can have the authorizing committee not mess around with a couple of months' extension but get down

to work to fashion a 6-year, comprehensive transportation bill that will put hundreds of thousands of people to work in communities all across the country, making them more livable, making our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

We shouldn't be caught in this trap of our own making. Let's step up, invest in the future, and do our job.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to make a loan in an amount that exceeds $600,000,000 under title V of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 821 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing program, or RRIF program, provides direct loans and loan guarantees to finance the development of railroad infrastructure. Under the program, the Federal Railroad Administration is authorized to provide direct loans and loan guarantees of up to $35 billion to finance development of railroad infrastructure.

Since 2002, the Federal Railroad Administration has made 35 loans which demonstrate the importance of this program to our Nation's railroads. No doubt about that. However, only five of these loans have ever met or exceeded $100 million. Two of those were to Amtrak. In fact, prior to this year, the largest RRIF loan ever made was to Amtrak in 2011 for $562 million.

My amendment ensures funds are spent responsibly on viable railroad projects and taxpayer risk is minimized by limiting loan amounts to $600 million.

I urge my colleagues to support my fiscally responsible amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the Department of Transportation from making a Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing loan that exceeds $600 million, as the chairman said.

Now, I know that $600 million, frankly, is a lot of money, and it sounds like a lot of money because it is; but when we are dealing with financing of railroad projects, it is just really not. This low loan ceiling is way too restrictive, and it would eliminate valuable projects, by the way, including some safety projects from being even considered for a loan. It has really far-reaching effects, and it could impact, frankly, every railroad entity in America. For example, there are railroads that are using this RRIF loan for positive train control—for positive train control.

So, again, it is unduly restrictive. I think it could have some far-reaching, negative effects. So I would respectfully ask for a ''no'' vote. I cannot support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding.

I simply want to underscore his opposition to this amendment. It would block Amtrak's loan request for $2.5 billion for new Acela high-speed train sets. This loan would make it possible to upgrade Amtrak's best and most profitable service, but one that is severely stressed.

We need to remind ourselves that the cars in which people died in Philadelphia were 40 years old. We desperately need the kind of investment that this loan would make possible. As the chairman has stressed, this may turn out to be the way that we can fund positive train control. It may be the only way, given other limitations in the bill, other limitations in Amtrak funding.

It would prevent loans that exceed $600 million for other purposes, including safety purposes. This is a very, very ill-advised amendment. I urge colleagues to reject it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that this could be restrictive. Well, I just want to point out that never, ever before this year in the history of this program have they ever loaned $600 million under this program, and so I don't think it is unduly restrictive.

I mentioned discussing some other amendments, and I am staring down the barrel of taxpayers being on the hook for $1.7 billion on one program that clearly is not going to be able to repay the loan, so it is going to fall on the shoulders of the taxpayer.

I think it is just common sense that we take this measure on behalf of our honest, hard-working taxpayers at home. They work hard and play by the rules. I think we should respect that.

There are some people that just consider the Federal Government to be a big pinata, and everybody is going to take their whack at it and get all the goodies and the candy and the money that falls out of it, but this money has got to be paid back some day. We are not going to do it. We are not going to be around here to do it. It is going to be paid back by our children, and I think we need to act responsibly and think about their future.

I urge my colleagues to please support this commonsense amendment for better accountability in our government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POSEY. 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 Florida will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 191

In the Senate of the United States, June 3, 2015.

Whereas Joseph Robinette ''Beau'' Biden, III, born in Wilmington, Delaware and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Syracuse University law school, served our country as an attorney in the Department of Justice for seven years, including assisting the nation of Kosovo in rebuilding their criminal justice system;

Whereas Beau Biden served his beloved State of Delaware for eight years as Attorney General;

Whereas Beau Biden joined the Army in 2003 at the age of 34, rose to the rank of major in the Delaware Army National Guard's Judge Advocate General Corps, deployed to Iraq in 2008 and received the Bronze Star for his service;

Whereas Beau Biden leaves behind a beloved wife, Hallie, and two children, Natalie and Hunter;

Whereas Beau Biden was the eldest son of the former Senator from Delaware and current Vice President of the United States and President of the United States Senate, Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the untimely death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the Vice President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of he House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War.

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

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The Committee resumed its sitting.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment by Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

Amendment by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment by Mr. STIVERS of Ohio.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) 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 166, noes 255, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—166

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Hardy
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)

NOES—255

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Comstock
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meng
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westerman
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Adams
Brady (TX)
Conyers
Doyle, Michael F.
Jackson Lee
Meeks
Nugent
Rice (NY)
Smith (NJ)
Stewart
Wilson (FL)

□ 1151

Messrs. SHIMKUS, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, CALVERT, WEBER of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. STIVERS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PALAZZO, GOHMERT, and FARENTHOLD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett

Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—189

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Brady (TX)
Conyers
Doyle, Michael F.
Jackson Lee
Massie
Nugent
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1157

Messrs. MULLIN, RICE of South Carolina, and BOST changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 299 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) 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 Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded that the 2-minute voting limit will be strictly enforced. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and a result was announced. The vote was subsequently vacated by order of the Committee, and the amendment was disposed of by rollcall No. 308.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 247, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

AYES—176

Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Yarmuth

NOES—247

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Adams
Brady (TX)
Doyle, Michael F.
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Noem
Nugent
Rokita
Stewart

□ 1203

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 301, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, on June 4, 2015 I inadvertently voted "yea" on rollcall No. 301. I would like to state that I intended to vote "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 266, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—160

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Emmer (MN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rokita
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—266

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Brady (TX)
Doyle, Michael F.
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Stewart

□ 1207

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 283, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—143

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
Lamborn
Latta
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOES—283

Abraham
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Brady (TX)
Doyle, Michael F.
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1211

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 286, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—139

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOES—286

Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly

Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Brady (TX)
Doyle, Michael F.
Graves (LA)
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Stewart

□ 1214

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 222, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—202

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Brady (TX)
Cramer
Doyle, Michael F.
Jackson Lee
Keating
Nugent
Stewart

□ 1219

Messrs. HILL and YOUNG of Iowa changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 305 on H.R. 2577, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that proceedings on rollcall No. 300 be vacated to the end that the Chair resume proceedings on the request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) at the end of the current series of postponed proceedings.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 247, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

AYES—176

Abraham
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—247

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Boyle, Brendan F.

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Brady (TX)
Cramer
Doyle, Michael F.
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Stewart
Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1225

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 198, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—224

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—198

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost

Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Adams
Brady (TX)
Cramer
Doyle, Michael F.
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Scott, David
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1228

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 230, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—184

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gosar
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—230

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—18

Adams
Beatty
Brady (TX)
Cramer
Crawford
Doyle, Michael F.
Fincher
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Jackson Lee
Napolitano
Nugent
Scott, David
Stewart
Tiberi
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1237

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ZELDIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, 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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has ordered the bill H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, reported favorably to the House today with an amendment, and will file its report on the bill in the House early next week. The bill is currently expected to be considered in the House later in the week.

Mr. Speaker, the classified schedules of authorizations and the classified annexes accompanying the bill are available for review by all Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in room HVC–304 of the Capitol Visitor Center. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration by the House.

I recommend that Members wishing to review the classified annex contact the committee's director of security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of appropriately cleared committee staff to assist Members who desire assistance during their review of these classified materials.

I urge interested Members to review these materials in order to better understand the committee's recommendations. The classified annexes to the committee's report contain the committee's recommendations on the intelligence budget for fiscal year 2016 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of House rule XXIII, which only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath provided for in the rules.

In addition, the committee's rules require that Members agree in writing to a nondisclosure agreement. The agreement indicates that the Member has been granted access to the classified annexes and that they are familiar with the rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of that information and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

ON THE PASSING OF JOSEPH ROBINETTE BIDEN, III

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House and, further, that it be read in full.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 299

Whereas Joseph Robinette ''Beau'' Biden, III, born in Wilmington, Delaware and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Syracuse University law school, served our country as an attorney in the Department of Justice for seven years, including assisting the nation of Kosovo in rebuilding their criminal justice system;

Whereas Beau Biden served his beloved State of Delaware for eight years as Attorney General;

Whereas Beau Biden joined the Army in 2003 at the age of 34, rose to the rank of major in the Delaware Army National Guard's Judge Advocate General Corps, deployed to Iraq in 2008 and received the Bronze Star for his service;

Whereas Beau Biden leaves behind a beloved wife, Hallie, and two children, Natalie and Hunter; and

Whereas Beau Biden was the eldest son of the former Senator from Delaware and current Vice President of the United States and President of the United States Senate, Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the untimely death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives communicate this resolution to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the Vice President of the United States.

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise in support of this resolution that celebrates the life of Beau Biden, the son of our Vice President, my State's former attorney general, and my good friend.

This past weekend, Beau Biden left this world far too young, at the age of 46. My home State of Delaware and this country suffered a loss that is deeply painful and deeply personal.

Beau won our hearts when, as a young boy, he and his brother survived a car accident that killed his baby sister and his mother. His father, JOE, was sworn in to the United States Senate at Beau's hospital bedside.

After the accident, JOE held his children tight because he knew how fragile life was. And the rest of Delaware did the same with the entire Biden family.

We watched Beau grow into a young lawyer and then elected him twice to be our attorney general, where he became a champion of protecting the most vulnerable among us. We were filled with pride as we watched him join the National Guard and deploy to Iraq.

We were inspired by his example as a loving husband to Hallie, a doting father to Natalie and Hunter, and, as always, a devoted son and brother. Family for Beau, like JOE, was everything.

□ 1245

Beau was a truly giving person. He appreciated the good in others in a way that we all should. He leaves a legacy that calls on each of us to be more gentle in our judgments and more gracious with our thanks. Beau was one of the best of the good guys.

Back in my home State of Delaware, people are hurting. It feels like every person you meet has been wounded by this loss, and just wishes there were something we could do to support our friends, the Bidens.

It is they who are comforting us. They have shown us the courage to believe that there is something more enduring than grief. Love endures. Beau and his family, through their love for each other, have shown us that.

So as we say good-bye to this distinguished American, this genuinely good man, we say to him: Until we meet again, Beau. May God hold you in the palm of his hand.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2015

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 6, 2015, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

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

There was no objection.

IN MEMORY OF MARINE LANCE CORPORAL JOSHUA BARRON

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Marine Lance Corporal Joshua Barron from Spokane Valley, Washington.

Joshua, tilt rotor crew chief, died on May 18 of injuries sustained during a training exercise. He was 1 of 22 Marines aboard the Osprey that came down in Hawaii near Bellows Air Force Base.

Joshua was raised in Spokane Valley and graduated from University High School in 2009. Those who knew him called him a superhero, an all-American kid, the best our Nation has to offer. During his service, he earned the National Defense Medal, a Global War on Terrorism Medal.

The Spokane area was Joshua's home for his entire life, and it is with a heavy heart that the community that raised him and loves him now says our good-byes.

My prayers are with the Barron family as they lay their son to rest this Friday.

When he left for the Marines, he left his family a message that read, ''Because you're worth it.'' This is a testament to the selfless spirit of this fine, young man.

Thank you for everything, Joshua. You're worth it. Rest in peace.

IN MEMORY OF OFFICER GREGG BENNER

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Gregg Benner of the Rio Rancho Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on March 25.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and loved ones of Officer Benner as they mourn the loss of a husband, a father, grandfather, and friend who was taken from them far too soon.

Officer Benner dedicated his life to protecting his community and his country. From his career in the Air Force to the Rio Rancho Police Department, Officer Benner put his health and safety on the line to make us safer, and he leaves behind a legacy of valor and service.

The loss of any police officer is a painful reminder of the dangers they face. While we are shaken by Officer Benner's loss, we can take comfort in the memories he has left behind for all those who knew him and the example that he set.

While a tragedy such as this is unexpected and shocking, the response has brought out the best of the residents of Rio Rancho who have displayed an outpouring of support and sympathy.

My thoughts and prayers are with Officer Benner's family, fellow officers, and the entire Rio Rancho community. I hope they find peace in the most difficult time.

Officer Benner, may God bless you, and may you rest in peace.

HONORING DR. JUAN M. ORTIZ

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to wish a happy and healthy 90th birthday to Dr. Juan Ortiz.

As one of the oldest full-time practicing M.D.'s in the U.S., Dr. Ortiz has provided exemplary care to his family, friends, and patients in our south Florida community. Dr. Ortiz has always shown impeccable leadership in both his professional and charitable endeavors, and his reputation for excellence is widely known.

When he is not treating his patients locally, you will find Dr. Ortiz volunteering his medical services during catastrophes in remote locations throughout Central America, the Caribbean, and Africa.

Not only is Dr. Ortiz a seasoned medical professional, but he is also a poet, a writer, and an avid traveler, with destinations extending as far as Antarctica.

Dr. Ortiz, once again, I would like to express my appreciation for your contributions and your service to south Florida. I wish you a happy and healthy 90th birthday.

URGING SUPPORT OF H.R. 2615 AND H. RES. 291

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2615 and H. Res. 291, both of which I introduced earlier this week.

Nearly a century ago, the United States purchased the Virgin Islands from Denmark for its geopolitical importance. The citizens of the Virgin Islands of the United States commemorate the events of that date, March 31, 1917, each year.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 291 asks the United States Postal Service to create a commemorate stamp in honor of the centennial.

The purpose of H.R. 2615 will form a bipartisan congressional commission to research, plan, develop, and carry out activities the commission considers appropriate to commemorate the 100th anniversary.

The commission will bring a national awareness to the events commemorating the centennial, engage lawmakers here in Congress, as well as the administration, and a new national discussion around the relationship and place of the Virgin Islands with the United States.

The coming centennial anniversary of the inclusions of the Virgin Islands in America affords us an opportunity to revisit this history and our ongoing relationship. It is also an opportunity to highlight the enormous contributions to the United States by Virgin Islanders and the richness of our Virgin Islands heritage.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ERIK HITE

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of Erik Hite, a Tucson police officer and former Air Force member who was killed in the line of duty 7 years ago this week, as well as the great work of his wife, Nohemy, following his tragic death.

Erik was a model public servant and an exemplary cop. To honor his memory and his commitment to family, Nohemy founded the Erik Hite Foundation in 2009 to support construction of a daycare facility for the children of police officers, firefighters, military personnel, and other emergency responders. The foundation also runs enrichment and outreach programs that offer a safe and positive environment for these children.

Today, the facility cares for up to 45 children a day in a flexible setting that matches the around-the-clock hours that men and women of law enforcement are assigned. It has become a lifeline for many families who sacrifice to protect and to serve our community, just like Erik did.

Though nothing can make up for Erik's tragic death, Nohemy has kept his spirit and the ideals he lived for alive through her amazing efforts. She has shown tremendous courage and perseverance, and I commend this incredible woman for the difference she continues to make in southern Arizona.

REMEMBERING THE APOLLO-SOYUZ TEST PROJECT AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL TOM STAFFORD

(Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a momentous event in this Nation's history and honor the men and women who worked so diligently to make it happen.

The Apollo-Soyuz test project, which took place in July of 1975, was the first international human spaceflight, a joint operation between two rivaling superpowers: the United States and the Soviet Union. The Apollo-Soyuz test project was so successful, many historians attribute the handshake in space between Apollo Commander Tom Stafford and Soyuz Commander Aleksey Leonov to be the beginning of the end the cold war.

Lieutenant General Tom Stafford was born in Weatherford, Oklahoma, in 1930. After graduating from the Naval Academy, earning his wings from the Air Force in 1953, and graduating from the Air Force Experimental Flight Test Pilot School, Stafford went on to serve as a pilot on Gemini 6, a commander of Gemini 9, commander of Apollo 10, and, finally, commander of the Apollo-Soyuz test project.

Thomas Stafford is a true patriot, a man who served this country in inspiring ways for over 60 years. I want to congratulate him on his accomplished service and his distinguished career.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA LADY GATORS SOFTBALL TEAM

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Florida, in Gainesville, Florida, the Lady Gators softball team. The Lady Gators won the Women's College World Series in Oklahoma City last night, defeating Michigan 4–1. This is the Lady Gators' second national championship in 2 years. It is a back-to-back national championship.

Again, congratulations to the Lady Gators' awesome softball team and their coach, Tim Walton, for his great coaching and leadership.

I would just like to end by saying it is great to be a Florida Gator.

CONGRATULATING VIC STORY, JR., ON BEING NAMED 2015 SWISHER SWEETS/SUNBELT EXPO FLORIDA FARMER OF THE YEAR

(Mr. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Vic Story, Jr., on being named the 2015 Swisher Sweets/Sunbelt Expo Florida Farmer of the Year. This is a tremendous honor and one he truly deserves.

As the head of his family's citrus business, Mr. Story has demonstrated a lifelong commitment to the citrus industry. He is not only a successful grower, but he is widely regarded as a leader in Florida agriculture.

He has played a key role in educating the media, the general public, and elected officials like me about the importance of citrus to the State of Florida and this country. He has taught me a lot, and I am proud to count him both as an adviser and a friend.

On behalf of the 17th District of Florida, Florida's heartland, I would like to commend Mr. Story for his contributions to the industry and to his community. I wish him the best of luck as he competes with other State winners in October for the title of Southeastern Farmer of the Year.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN GLENN SULMASY

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a career of service both to our country and to those preparing to defend it.

Since 1988, Glenn Sulmasy has served our Nation as an officer in the United States Coast Guard. Since 2001, Captain Sulmasy has served on the faculty of the United States Coast Guard Academy as a professor of law and risen to the chairmanship of the department of humanities.

In each role, Captain Sulmasy has worked tirelessly to engage and educate cadets, faculty, government officials, and the public on national security law, public policy, and international conflict. He is a recognized expert in these areas.

Captain Sulmasy's expertise has not been limited to the academy. He is the author of multiple books and countless publications, a noted academic on the topic of national security, and a fellow in Homeland Security and National Security Law for the Center for National Policy here in Washington, D.C. There is no doubt his knowledge has been an asset to our Nation as it struggles to understand the security intricacies of our current world.

His commitment to the protection and defense of our Nation is commendable. And as he prepares to retire from the Coast Guard Academy, I join with countless other Americans in thanking him for his service and wishing him the best of luck in the future.

□ 1300

CONGRATULATIONS TO MINNESOTA'S TOP SPELLER MAXWELL MEYER

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Minnetonka's Maxwell Meyer, who is a seventh-grader at Minnetonka Middle School East, for his performance at the Scripps National Spelling Bee.

Maxwell was among the 49 survivors of the preliminary round last Wednesday when 234 other spellers were eliminated. Maxwell then spelled both of his words right in the nationally broadcast semifinal round on Thursday and, unfortunately, came up just short of the finals after failing to score enough points on a written vocabulary test.

The National Spelling Bee, Mr. Speaker, showcases some of the brightest, most dedicated young students across the country, and Maxwell makes his community and the State of Minnesota proud.

To reach this stage of the spelling bee takes countless hours of hard work, learning the skills and knowledge to be an accurate speller. For some, that means even reading the dictionary.

Maxwell's efforts had folks all over the State of Minnesota cheering him on, and we congratulate him on his success.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT, THE HONORABLE BILL SHUSTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Anthony DeThomas, Legislative Correspondent, the Honorable BILL SHUSTER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony, issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY DETHOMAS,
Legislative Correspondent.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO AUTHORIZE WAR IN IRAQ AND SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleagues WALTER JONES of North Carolina and BARBARA LEE of California, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 55 in order to force this House and this Congress to debate on whether U.S. troops should withdraw from Iraq and Syria. We introduced this resolution under the provisions of section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution.

As all of my House colleagues know, last year, the President authorized airstrikes against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria on August 7. For over 10 months, the United States has been engaged in hostilities in Iraq and Syria without debating an authorization for this war.

On February 11 this year, nearly 4 months ago, the President sent to Congress the text for an Authorization for Use of Military Force, or an AUMF, on combating the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere, yet Congress has failed to act on that AUMF, or bring an alternative to the House floor, even though we continue to authorize and appropriate the money required for sustained military operations in those countries.

Frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. This House appears to have no problem sending our uniformed men and women into harm's way. It appears to have no problem spending billions of dollars for the arms, equipment, and air power to carry out these wars. But it just can't bring itself to step up to the plate and take responsibility for these wars.

Our servicemen and servicewomen are brave and dedicated. Congress, however, is the poster child for cowardice. The leadership of this House whines and complains from the sidelines, and all the while it shirks its constitutional duties to bring an AUMF to the floor of this House, debate it, and vote on it.

Our resolution, which will come before this House for consideration in 15 calendar days, requires the President to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq and Syria within 30 days or no later than the end of this year, December 31, 2015. If this House approves this resolution, Congress would still have 6 months in which to do the right thing and bring an AUMF before the House and the Senate for debate and for action. Either Congress needs to live up to its responsibilities and authorize this war,

or by its continuing neglect and indifference, our troops should be withdrawn and come home. It is that simple.

I am deeply, I am deeply troubled by our policy in Iraq and Syria. I do not believe it is a clearly defined mission with a beginning, a middle, and an end, but rather just more of the same. I am not convinced that by enlarging our military footprint, that we will somehow end the violence in the region, defeat the Islamic State, or address the underlying causes of the unrest. It is a complicated situation that requires a complicated and more imaginative response.

I am also concerned by recent statements by the administration about how long we will be engaged in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere fighting the Islamic State. Just yesterday, on June 3, General John Allen, the U.S. envoy for the U.S.-led coalition fighting ISIL, said that this fight may take ''a generation or more.'' He was speaking in Doha, Qatar, at the U.S.-Islamic World Forum.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert for the RECORD a Times of Israel article entitled, ''Islamic State Fight May Take 'Generation or More'—US Envoy.''

[From the Times of Israel, June 3, 2015]

ISLAMIC STATE FIGHT MAY TAKE 'GENERATION OR MORE'—US ENVOY

As key Iraqi province falls to Islamic State, Gen. John Allen says failure to defeat group would 'wreak havoc' on humanity

The Islamic State group is a ''global threat'' which will take a generation or more to defeat, Washington's envoy for the US-led coalition fighting the jihadists said Wednesday.

Despite ''strategic momentum'' against IS—'' or Daesh as he called it—General John Allen conceded that the fight would continue for several years in a keynote speech to the US-Islamic World Forum in Doha, Qatar.

And he added that if IS was not defeated it could ''wreak havoc on the progress of humanity.''

''This will be a long campaign,'' he said.

''Defeating Daesh's ideology will likely take a generation or more. But we can and we must rise to this challenge. In an age when we are more interconnected that at any other time in human history, Daesh is a global threat.''

In a wide-ranging speech, Allen added that IS also poses a new type of threat because of its ''depravity.''

''As someone who has spent nearly four decades as a United States marine, I have come closer than many to the reality of inhumanity.

''But I have never seen before the kinds of depravity and brutality in this region that ISIL represents and, in fact, that ISIL celebrates,'' he added, using an alternative acronym for IS.

Allen was speaking the day after attending talks in Paris with ministers from around 20 coalition countries.

The meeting followed the fall of the city of Ramadi, the capital of Iraq's largest province Anbar, to IS. That loss has been described as the worst defeat for the coalition since it formed nearly a year ago.

US Pentagon chief Ashton Carter blamed Iraqi forces, saying there was ''an issue with the will of the Iraqis to fight,'' in comments that angered Baghdad.

Iraq on Tuesday pleaded for more global support in the fight against IS.

The loss of Ramadi in Iraq plus the ancient city of Palmyra in Syria has led some to question the effectiveness of the US-led coalition in recent weeks.

Allen said the coalition had achieved some gains against the extremists.

He noted that IS had been defeated in many places in Iraq and that it has ''lost over 25 percent'' of the populated territory it once held in the country.

Another area of coalition success, Allen claimed, was its ability to disrupt the group's access to finance.

''We are sharing information to block their assets to the global financial system. We are uncovering their points of access in the region and abroad for financial support,'' he said.

He said the coalition had gained valuable intelligence on the organisation's financial enterprises, but admitted that ''Daesh still maintains financial resources''.

These included extortion, looting, kidnapping for ransom, and human trafficking, said Allen.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to invest a generation or more of our blood and our treasure in this war, then shouldn't Congress at least debate whether or not to authorize it?

According to the National Priorities Project, based in Northampton, Massachusetts, which is in my congressional district, every single hour the taxpayers of the United States are paying $3.42 million for military actions against the Islamic State—$3.42 million every hour, Mr. Speaker.

This is on top of the hundreds of billions of tax dollars spent on the first war in Iraq. And nearly every single penny of this war chest was borrowed money, put on the national credit card, provided as so-called emergency funds that don't have to be accounted for or subject to budget caps like all other funds.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we always seem to have plenty of money or the will to borrow all the money it takes to carry out wars? But somehow, we never have any money to invest in our schools, our highways and water systems, or our children, families, and communities? Every day, every single day, this Congress is forced to make tough, serious, painful decisions to deprive our domestic economy and priorities of the resources they need to succeed. But somehow, there is always money for more wars.

Well, if we are going to continue to spend billions on war, and if we are going to continue to tell our Armed Forces that we expect them to fight and die in these wars, then it seems to me the least we can do is stand up and vote to authorize these wars, or we should end them. We owe that to the American people. We owe that to our troops and their families. And we owe that to the oath of office that each of us took to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

I want to be clear, Mr. Speaker: I can no longer criticize the President, the Pentagon, or the State Department when it comes to taking responsibility for this war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. I may not agree with the policy, but they have done their duty. At every step of the way, beginning on June 16, 2014, the President has informed Congress of his actions to send U.S. troops to Iraq and Syria and to carry out military operations against the Islamic State. And on February 11 of this year, he sent to Congress the draft text of an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, while I disagree with the policy, the administration has done its job. It has kept the Congress informed, and as military operations continue to escalate, they sent an AUMF to the Congress for action.

It is this Congress, this House, that has failed and failed miserably to carry out its duties. Always complaining from the sidelines, the leadership of this House failed to act last year to authorize this war, even as it escalated and expanded nearly every month. The Speaker said it wasn't the responsibility of the 113th Congress to act, even though the war started during its tenure. No, no. Somehow it was the responsibility of the next Congress, the 114th Congress.

Well, the 114th Congress convened on January 6, and it still hasn't done a single, solitary thing to authorize the war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. The Speaker asserted that Congress couldn't act on the war until the President sent an AUMF to Congress. Well, Mr. Speaker, the President did just that on February 11, and still the leadership of this House has done nothing to authorize the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. And now the Speaker is saying he wants the President to send Congress another version of the AUMF because he doesn't like the first one. Are you kidding me?

Well, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't work that way. If the leadership of this House doesn't like the original text of the President's AUMF, then it is the job of Congress to draft an alternative, report that revised AUMF out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, bring it to the floor of the House, and let the Members of this House debate and vote on it. That is how it works.

If you think that the President's AUMF is too weak, then you make it stronger. If you think that it is too expansive, then set limits on it. If you are opposed to these wars, then vote to bring our troops home. That is what we are here to do. That is what we are charged to do under the Constitution. And that is why Members of Congress get a paycheck from the American people every week—to make the hard decisions, not run away from them.

All I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that the Congress do its job. That is the duty of this House and of the majority in charge of this House—to simply do its job, to govern, Mr. Speaker. But instead, all we witness is dithering and twiddling and complaining and whining and blaming others, and the complete and total shirking of responsibility over and over and over and over again. Enough, enough.

So with great reluctance and frustration, Representative JONES and Representative LEE and I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 55. Because if this House doesn't have the stomach to carry out its constitutional duty to debate and authorize this latest war, then we should bring our troops home. If the cowardly Congress can go home each night to their families and loved ones, then our brave troops should receive that same privilege.

Doing nothing is easy. And I am sad to say that war has become easy, too easy. But the costs in terms of blood and treasure are very, very, very high.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and demand that the leadership of this House bring to the floor of this House an AUMF for the war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria before Congress adjourns on June 26 for the Fourth of July recess.

Congress needs to debate an AUMF, Mr. Speaker. It needs to do its job.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from North Carolina, Congressman WALTER JONES.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for always being out front on this issue, and I am delighted to join him. As he said in many of his comments, the House has a responsibility to the men and women in uniform and to the American people.

I have the privilege to represent Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station. I have over 70,000 retired veterans in the Third District of North Carolina. They are frustrated too. They believe sincerely that we must meet our constitutional responsibility and have this debate. And as you have said, Mr. MCGOVERN, be for it or be against it, but have the debate. That is what is absolutely frustrating.

I joined you and BARBARA LEE in a letter to Mr. BOEHNER in September. On August 27 we wrote a letter to the Speaker of the House asking him to please allow a debate on reauthorization of our involvement in the Middle East. Then on September 25 I wrote by myself to the Speaker of the House and asked again for the debate.

As you have stated, he did say publicly that because of the forthcoming election in 2014, that he thought it would be proper to have the debate in 2015, which you have already stated.

□ 1315

In 2015, the Speaker of the House said he was waiting for the President to submit the AUMF. As you have stated, the President did submit an AUMF, which many of us in both parties for different reasons were dissatisfied with, but it was the vehicle with which to go to the committee, to have the debate, and then to bring to the floor for a debate of the full House.

I quote frequently down in my district what James Madison said: ''The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.''

He didn't say the executive branch. He said the legislature, we in the House and we in the Senate. He didn't say the President. He said the legislature. If we don't bring it forward ourselves and if the Speaker wants the President to submit the AUMF—which he has already done, but now, as you stated, he is asking for another AUMF.

I do not understand. Our Nation has spent $1.7 trillion or $1.8 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan combined. This is the first war in Iraq, not the continuation that we are into now. We are spending billions and billions of dollars every day. As you say, we have cut programs left and right. Even our veterans are concerned about their benefits being cut, and many of them did serve in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I take it upon myself to go to Walter Reed. I will go to my grave regretting that I voted to send our kids to Iraq, which was an unnecessary war initially, very unnecessary, but we went; 4,000 of our kids died, and 30,000 were wounded, and 100,000 Iraqis were killed. Anyway, that is history now. I know we can't change history, but, hopefully, we can learn from history.

The people are frustrated. I talk about this down in my district, Mr. MCGOVERN. That is why I support this H. Con. Res. 55. I don't know how many billions of dollars we are expending in Afghanistan. I know that that is a different subject, but I want to make my point.

The billions of dollars that we are expending in Afghanistan is just so ironic that John Sopko, who is the Special Inspector General of Afghan Reconstruction, talks about how the waste, fraud, and abuse is ongoing. We have had marines from my district who were sent to Afghanistan to train the Afghans to be policemen and soldiers, and the people they were training turned the guns on them and killed them.

We are sending our young men and women into these Middle East countries and other countries, and we don't have an end to the plan. I am not a military person, but I have heard from military leaders. If you have a strategy, that means you have an end point to your strategy, but we don't have an end point to our strategy. That is why it is so important that we bring it up.

What you are trying to do is to force a debate on an AUMF to get this Congress to reengage itself. I am like you, sir. I get tired of funding all of these programs. In fact, on FOX today, they were talking about the weapons that we have given to the Iraqis, and their army is disbanding half the time. The weapons that we have given them—from machine guns to Humvees—are now in the hands of ISIS, and we are now bombing the equipment that we sent to the Iraqi Army. It does not make any sense.

Just a couple more points, and then I am going to yield back to you your time.

I want to thank you and BARBARA LEE—and that is why I joined you—because I see the frustration of the marines down in Camp Lejeune. They have been deployed three, four, five, six, seven times, and they know that they might be called upon again, and they will go.

Just like all of those who serve in our services, they will go back and go back and go back; but, as you have said many times and as James Madison said, it is our responsibility, not the President's responsibility, to initiate these AUMFs.

I hope that the President will follow with what the Speaker has asked him for, which is for a second AUMF. If he sends a second AUMF, then there is no excuse that our leadership of the Republican Party has—and I am a Republican—to not bring it to the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN, I thank you again. I am pleased to have thought to join you in this effort. We need to meet our constitutional responsibility. I go to Walter Reed. I see the broken bodies, and I see the amputated legs.

I have signed over 11,000 letters to families in this country who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq. I want to fulfill my duty as a Member of Congress and follow the Constitution and have the debates on spending blood and money in these foreign countries.

Thank you for allowing me to be a small part of this.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina for his eloquent statement and for his passion on this issue and for his courage on this issue because I know that it is not easy to stand up and raise some of these questions. He has done so consistently, and I think the country owes him a debt of gratitude, so I thank the gentleman for that.

I think, as Mr. JONES pointed out, there is a constitutional principle at stake here. We have a responsibility when it comes to matters of war, and it is a little bit puzzling to me that we have a lot of complaining in this Chamber by some in saying that the President is not consulting enough with Congress or he is doing too many things with executive actions; yet, when it comes to the issue of war, we don't want to have anything to do with it. It is just too easy to do nothing.

I know that these issues are uncomfortable—they are complicated; they are difficult—but our job is not to run away from an issue if it is uncomfortable. We have to deliberate on a lot of issues that are important to the American people and to the national security of this country.

I don't think it takes any courage for a Member of Congress to be quiet on this issue and cheer the White House on if the military operation is going well or criticize it if it is not, but never have to take a vote. That is not leadership; that is cowardice. That is shirking our responsibility.

I don't care whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. We all, for the

sake of protecting the integrity of this institution, should insist that we assume our proper role when it comes to issues of war. War is a big deal. It is a big deal—at least it should be a big deal.

As I said earlier, what bothers me is that, in this Chamber and in this city, it has become easy. We don't talk about it. We had a debate on the defense authorization bill last week. A number of us tried to bring amendments to the floor to kind of force this issue, and we were told this is not the place to talk about the war—the defense authorization bill, which authorizes a lot of the funding for this war.

If that is not the place to talk about it, then where is the place to talk about it? With every attempt that we have launched to try to force a debate on the floor, we have been frustrated. We have been told you can't do it. Here we are in June, and we have been at war now for many, many months. The time has come for us to stand up and be heard on this issue.

Look, I have great reservations about the White House's policy in Iraq and Syria. I don't support much of what the President is doing right now. I know his heart is in the right place, but I don't think that the ultimate answer here is to expand our military footprint. I have reservations.

Even if you believe that you ought to give the President all of the power in the universe to do whatever he wants around the world, you still ought to support what Congressman JONES and Congresswoman LEE and I are trying to do, and that is to make sure that Congress has a role in this, that we authorize whatever action is going to take place from this point forward.

Again, you could vote to expand the President's authority. You could vote to limit the President's authority. You could vote to say we don't believe the President should have any authority to launch even more wars in the Middle East. That is what the debate should be about.

We should be talking about the specifics of our policy. I mean, is there a clearly defined mission here? I don't see it. A clearly defined mission has a beginning, a middle, and an end; but we ought to have that debate.

How does this all end? We were told initially, Oh, it won't be that long; then it was a few years. Now, it is going to be a generation or two. The length of time that we are going to be expected to be engaged here gets longer and longer and longer and longer with each passing month. Isn't that worth a discussion? Isn't that worth a debate?

We debate a lot of things on this House floor that I would say are pretty trivial. We debate a lot of legislation that we know is going nowhere. Why can't we take the time to debate this issue of war? Why can't we take the time to do what is right by our servicemen and -women, who are being put into harm's way, to make sure that we are getting it right with regard to Iraq and Syria and the war against the Islamic State? Again, I know it is uncomfortable; but so what? We need to do our job.

I will just close by reiterating something that Congressman JONES said, and that is that we have a lot of needs here in the United States. We can't get a long-term highway bill passed. We have tens of millions of fellow citizens in the United States of America, the richest country on the planet, who are hungry. We have some schools that are in disrepair.

Quite frankly, our kids deserve a heck of a lot better. We have infrastructure needs. I can go right down the list of the things that we need to do. We have people who are unemployed, and we have people who are homeless. We need more housing for people.

There are so many things that we have to do, and we are told we can't do any of it because we don't have the money; but, when it comes to wars that never end or wars that are going to last generations or more, we are an ATM machine.

If the money is not there, we will give you an IOU. We will put it on our credit card. People talk about the deficit and the debt; yet we are adding all of these billions and trillions of dollars because of these wars that are not paid for. No one says anything about that around here, but that is one of the biggest contributors to our debt. We ought to realize that.

When we talk about national security, I would just say to my colleagues that national security also includes the quality of life for people here in this country, whether people have a job, whether people have access to a good education, whether people have health care, whether people have food, whether they have shelter.

All of those things are important parts of our national security and our national defense. We are neglecting them on a regular basis, but we are spending every cent we have on these wars overseas.

This deserves a debate. Again, we would prefer that an AUMF come before the full House under regular order, where the House Foreign Affairs Committee would report out a bill, and we would just debate it, but we have been patient long enough, and nothing has been forthcoming.

Here we are in June with still no promise that anything may be coming—more excuses. That is why we introduced this privileged resolution. We are going to force a debate, and we are going to force a vote. We will do it again and again and again and again until this Congress lives up to its constitutional responsibilities.

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

□ 1330

THREATS AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZINKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much going on these days, and I would just like to take up a very important issue that is going on right now.

There was an interview by our President that was discussed in the L.A. Times, an article by Christi Parsons and Michael Memoli, and I saw part of the interview on television. The headline of this story is ''Obama Raises Possibility of Allowing U.N. Vote on Palestinian Statehood.'' Their subheadline says, ''Obama makes veiled threat about Palestinian statehood in an interview.''

The article says, ''President Obama took a step toward a tougher line with Israel in an interview released Tuesday, raising the possibility that the U.S. will allow a United Nations vote on issues related to the Palestinians if the two sides make no meaningful movement toward peace.''

In an interview with an Israeli television station, Obama noted that his administration has ''up until this point'' quashed such efforts at the U.N., while insisting that the Israelis and Palestinians must negotiate a resolution; but he said it is a challenge for the U.S. to keep demanding that the Palestinians negotiate in good faith if no one believes the Israelis are doing the same.

Further down, it says, ''Obama's critical tone toward Netanyahu, describing him as someone who is 'predisposed' to 'think perhaps that peace is naive', appeared to return to the tough language that marked administration statements earlier this spring around the time of the Israeli election. More recently, the White House had seemed to be trying to mend fences.'' Well, obviously, that is not the case now.

I thought it might be important, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at some of the comments that have been made by folks who say they are leaders, and we know them to be leaders of the Palestinians because Mr. Obama is getting some terrible advice.

I don't know who is advising him. Maybe he is still skipping those briefings, and who knows where it is coming from, but somebody needs—somebody, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, somebody close to the President—to start advising him on the position of the Palestinians. They cannot make their position more clear.

Prime Minister Netanyahu stood right here at the second level and made the statement, in essence, that, if Israel lays down its arms, there is no Israel; if the Palestinians lay down their arms, there will be peace.

They will not do so, and they continue to teach their children about how evil and horrible these Jews are, these Israelis are, that they need to be wiped off the map. They continue to name streets and holidays for those who would kill innocent Israeli children, innocent Israeli moms and dads as they

sit having coffee. Oh, they think that is wonderful; let's make them heroes because they killed innocent Israelis.

Yet this President continues to want to help the Palestinians have a big spot in Israel, a massive spot, which Israel has already seen makes their nation indefensible, while the President seems not to be getting the message of their position: they want to wipe Israel off the map.

Some quotes, this is from Yasser Arafat, the previous PLO leader. He said: ''We plan to eliminate the State of Israel and establish a purely Palestinian state. We will make life unbearable for Jews by psychological warfare and population explosion. We Palestinians will take over everything, including all of Jerusalem.''

Now, the current Palestinian President has made clear—and his statement is: ''We cannot compromise on Jerusalem.'' They are taking all of Jerusalem.

Also, this quote, that they would never recognize a Jewish state. The quote is: ''First of all, let me make something clear about the story of the Jewish state,'' he told Dream 2 TV on October 23, 2011. He is quoted: ''They started talking to me about the Jewish state only 2 years ago, discussing it with me at every opportunity, every forum I went to—Jewish or non-Jewish—asking: 'What do you think about the Jewish state?' I've said it before, and I'll say it again: I will never recognize the Jewishness of the state, or a 'Jewish state.' ''

Another quote: ''Hamas kidnapped—or rather, captured—a soldier and managed to keep him for 5 years, and that is a good thing.''

Another quote from President Abbas: ''In a final resolution, we would not see the presence of a single Israeli—civilian or soldier—on our lands.'' Of course, their lands, they anticipate getting all of Israel. They intend to wipe the Israelis off the map.

''Whoever wants resistance, whoever wants jihad, the direction for jihad is well-known and clear.'' This is Mahmoud Al-Habbash, the Palestinian Minister for Religious Affairs. He said, ''Those who send young people to Syria or elsewhere to die for a misdirected cause must stop and understand that Jerusalem is still waiting. Jerusalem is the direction, Jerusalem is the address.''

Another quote—Hamas, a group designated by the State Department and European Union as a foreign terrorist organization. They, of course, are well respected in the area the Palestinians are occupying.

Saeb Erekat, the Palestinian diplomat's chief negotiator, said, ''Hamas is a Palestinian movement, is not and will never be a terrorist organization.'' Well, we know the facts dictate otherwise.

We keep coming back to this point, Mr. Speaker. As long as the leaders of the Palestinians continue to say that terrorist organizations are peaceful, in their view, even though they want to kill Israelis, wipe them off the map, and as long as they continue to say they will never recognize an Israeli state, a Jewish state, they will never allow them to exist, they will continue to push to wipe them off the map, how in the world can the President of the United States act like he is a friend to Israel, yet say we want to accommodate their getting a vote that will make Israel indefensible to people that want to destroy them?

Here are some more quotes. The following are excerpts from an interview with Hamas MP and cleric Yunis Al-Astal, which aired on Al-Aqsa TV on May 11 of 2011. He said: ''The Jews are brought in droves to Palestine so that the Palestinians—and the Islamic nation behind them—will have the honor of annihilating the evil of this gang.''

''All the predators, all the birds of prey, all the dangerous reptiles and insects, and all the lethal bacteria are far less dangerous than the Jews.''

Here is another: ''In just a few years, all the Zionists and the settlers will realize that their arrival in Palestine was for the purpose of the great massacre, by means of which Allah wants to relieve humanity of their evil.''

Here is another from this Hamas member and cleric: ''When Palestine is liberated and its people return to it, and the entire region, with the grace of Allah, will have turned into the United States of Islam, the land of Palestine will become the capital of the Islamic Caliphate, and all these countries will turn into states within the Caliphate.''

Another great quote from these wonderful leaders, another leader said: ''I swear that if we had a nuke, we'd have used it this very morning.''

Those are the people that the President of the United States thinks are being extremely reasonable, and he considers that Netanyahu, in wanting to keep a country in which they can live without being wiped off the map, is being unreasonable.

Netanyahu has made very clear, they want peace; but how can they sit down with people who will not even acknowledge they have a right to exist? That is not a precondition. That is a condition for wiping them off the map as a threat to mankind if they are not willing to recognize that genocide is inappropriate.

They are war criminal wannabes. When people make clear that they are going to commit murder or genocide, how long do you have to wait before it is okay to stop them? Well, the President has made clear it may be time to move out of the way so that these Palestinians that want to obliterate Israel can have their will.

One thought came back to mind. Back in my days as a felony judge, when you have somebody who is driving a car and people say, ''Hey, we just need a ride to this location. Once we get there, we are going to murder some people, but we don't need anything from you. We just need a ride,'' the person that drove that car, knowing that those people made those comments about wanting to kill people when they get to that location, they are also guilty of murder.

I am not accusing anybody. I am raising questions. If the United States says, ''Here, Palestinian terrorist groups, we want to provide you the vehicle to have a powerful place right in the middle, a huge section of Israel. We want to give you that place, and you have made clear, we know you have made clear, once you are there, you are going to wipe out Israel,'' does that make the United States' leaders that facilitate that, does that make them accessories? I am just asking.

Mr. Speaker, you can advise the Parliamentarian, I am not accusing anybody. I am just asking the question.

The President needs to be advised by somebody that people are threatening murder, genocide, and those are not the people whose side we should be on trying to accommodate to reach that goal. It is a difficult time, and it is a scary time.

Many of us believe what Scripture says, to whom much is given, of them much is required.

I have mentioned a number of times the elderly West African gentleman who advised me when I was over there with Mercy Ships: We were so excited when you elected your first Black President, but we have continued since then to see America get weaker, and you have got to go back to Washington and tell your friends there that, when America gets weaker, we suffer.

Then we see the stories of to whom much is given. This United States of America, that our leaders in this administration, according to articles, a Catholic Bishop in Nigeria, that this administration is saying: We are not going to help you stop Boko Haram, these radical Islamists; we are going to let them keep killing innocent Christians, kidnapping, and sexually raping, abusing Christian girls. But, if you will change your laws and accommodate same sex marriage and pay for abortion, then we will be willing to come help.

□ 1345

I was advised by some other Members of Congress who got back from a trip to East Africa, where they were told by leaders in East African nations the same thing that they are being told by the people in this administration: Oh, yeah, we will help you with radical Islam, but only if you change your laws to violate your strongly held Christian beliefs that same-sex marriage is wrong. And also, start providing abortions, also violating your strongly held religious beliefs.

Only if you will violate your Christian beliefs will we be willing to come help you. If there is a God as the Bible talks about, there will be a price to this Nation for acting in such a way.

I have a dear friend—I think the world of him—a man named Sean

Hannity. I don't usually get to see his program live. Again, last night in the wee hours I was watching a replay of Sean's program, and he was talking about, once again, a terrorist with ties to a mosque in the Boston area.

Of course, I had done some research on this and found research that had been done by others. I found an article by Ryan Mauro back from December 2013.

I know when I was questioning the Director of the FBI, Director Mueller, before our Judiciary Committee, I was incredulous that the Russians, of all people, could advise the United States twice that the older Tsarnaev had been radicalized long before he ever killed people and maimed people during the Boston Marathon.

We had been advised twice. When we took no action the first time, then they advised the FBI that the older Tsarnaev had been radicalized, and you need to check into it. And the best I can find out is the FBI interviewed Tsarnaev, and he said he wasn't a terrorist—imagine that—and they talked to his mother and she said her son was not a terrorist.

And I challenged him and said, in effect: You didn't even go to the Boston mosque where Tsarnaev attended to find out, to investigate if he had been radicalized? And he challenged me. He said that wasn't true. I said: What part wasn't true? And he said: We did go to the mosque there.

I didn't hear the little tag-on line he put after that until I heard a replay. My staff had to say: You apparently didn't hear what he said after he said ''We did go to the mosque.'' So I had to listen to the replay. What he said: ''We did go to the mosque in our outreach program.''

In the outreach program. We talked about that before. It took years before the FBI finally suspended their partnership with CAIR after, years before, the FBI had found evidence that was utilized in the Holy Land Foundation trial, the largest terrorist prosecution case in American history.

CAIR was named as an unindicted coconspirator. They tried to have their name removed from the pleadings, but the Federal judges at the district level and at the United States Court of Appeals both said there is plenty of evidence to support CAIR being a coconspirator supporting terrorism. So no, we are not going to strike their names from the pleadings. There were other names that were challenging as well.

So I was surprised it took years for the FBI to decide to suspend their outreach program, their partnership with CAIR. And yet, according to Director Mueller, they continued that outreach program to that mosque.

But I did challenge him with one final question. I held up these documents here, the Articles of Organization. This is with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that they got these Articles of Organization. And it is organizing a group called the Islamic Society of Boston, which established the mosque in Boston that Tsarnaev attended, that the latest terrorist attended.

My friend, Sean Hannity, was asking the question about this mosque because he was shocked, like I was previously, as to why there had not been more investigation.

This article from 2013 pretty well tells the tale: ''Clarion Project: Islamic Society of Boston.'' It says:

''The Islamic Society of Boston's teachings are largely based on Islamists like Muslim Brotherhood spiritual leader Yousef al-Qaradawi and Sayyid Qutb, the Brotherhood cleric who influenced Osama bin Laden, as reported in 2008 that the Muslim Brotherhood and the Pakistani Islamist group Jamaat-e-Islami 'are the prominent belief systems. The popular web sites used by members, and recommended by mosque leaders, are mostly fundamentalist, and rabidly homophobic.' ''

So we already knew that. Osama bin Laden had said that the writings of Qutb, particularly the booklet ''Milestones,'' helped radicalized him.

If our FBI training materials had not been purged, as have our intelligence training materials and other training materials, if they had not been purged of material that CAIR found offensive—CAIR being the entity that the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and a U.S. District Court said there is plenty of evidence to support their being coconspirators in terrorism. They found some language offensive and so there were—well they classified it. I thought it was ridiculous, and I won't say an approximate amount. They found many pages to be offensive to them, this coconspirator in terrorism, according to the pleadings in the Holy Land Foundation trial, and so they were removed. As one intelligence officer told me: We blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemy.

They don't even know. Our FBI should go into the mosque and talk to people there. They should have asked: Well, look, do you know Tsarnaev? Was he reading Qutb—well, they call him an Egyptian martyr, but he was a terrorist. He promoted terrorism, and he wrote this booklet that has helped radicalize people.

But if you know what radicals believe, then you are able to ask the questions and get to the bottom. And so you are not just going to the mosque to sit down and pat each other on the back and have some food together. You are actually investigating whether somebody is going to kill people at the Boston Marathon in the future so you can save their lives. But they didn't know enough to do that because they are not properly trained anymore because CAIR gets offended when we try to properly train them.

This article goes on and says:

''Their writings and teachings were fanatical.''

This is from Sheikh Ahmed Mansour in 2013. He is talking about the Islamic Society of Boston's teachings in the mosque. He said:

''The writings and teachings were fanatical. I left and refused to go back to pray. I left Egypt to escape the Muslim Brotherhood, but I had found it there.''

The Muslim Brotherhood advises this administration. And for the incompetent people that say: ''Well, Gohmert never gives names; he just says they advise the President,'' they don't know how many times I have given names. Mohamed Elibiary from Plano was on the top advisory group for Homeland Security.

Imam Magid, the president of the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, or ADAMS—I am sure John Adams would appreciate that—he was president of that. He was part of a group that was named as a coconspirator in the terrorist prosecution trial of the Holy Land Foundation. He advised the President regularly. He gave him advice, according to the media. He gave advice to the President about his speech back in 2011, where the President inaccurately said everybody agrees to going back to the pre-1967 boundaries. No, they didn't.

If you are Imam Magid, and you are part of what was named as a coconspirator in terrorism, maybe you think that, but certainly the parties didn't agree to that.

Anyway, this article goes on:

''In 2004, the Islamic Society of Boston Web site had a section titled: '40 Recommendations for the Muslim Home.' It said to 'hang up the whip where the members of the household can see it,' and that children are to be 'hit' if they refuse to pray once they are 10 years old.

''The section also said regarding wife beating, 'Hitting is not the way to discipline; it is not to be resorted to except when all other means are exhausted or when it is needed to force someone to do obligatory acts of obedience,' '' which apparently include of a sexual nature.

The article says:

''One of the founders of the Islamic Society of Boston is Abdurrahman Alamoudi, who was its first president.''

I insert here that I asked Director Mueller: Were you aware that Alamoudi is the one that started this mosque that Tsarnaev attended? And he said: No, he was not. But he sure knew who Alamoudi was. Because the FBI gathered the evidence, whether they wanted to or not, that put him in prison. Actually, I think the British gathered the evidence that was so overwhelming that there wasn't much choice; he had to be prosecuted.

Yes, he had helped the Clinton administration, he had been some help to the Bush administration, according to Alamoudi. Anyway, he gets arrested out at Dulles Airport and is doing I believe 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism.

But the article points out:

''He was convicted on terrorism-related charges in 2004 and has admitted

to being a secret Muslim Brotherhood operative. He wrote from his prison cell, 'I am, I hope, still a member of the Muslim Brotherhood organization in the USA.' He was last paid a speaking fee by the Islamic Society of Boston in 2000, the same year he publicly expressed his support for Hamas and Hezbollah.

''Muslim Brotherhood spiritual leader Yousef al-Qaradawi has been on the ISB board of trustees. Tax filings for 1998–2000 include his name under a list of 'officers, directors, trustees, and key employees.'

''In 2002, Qaradawi helped ISB—the Islamic Society of Boston—fundraise via videotape because the U.S. would not grant him entry. His name also appeared on the Islamic Society of Boston's Web site until March 2001. The Islamic Society of Boston originally denied having any connection to Qaradawi and later claimed that the inclusion of his name on the tax forms was an error.

''The ISB has hosted Islamic speakers like Salah Soltan and Yasir Qadhi. In March 2010, Imam Abdullah Faarooq said that Aafia Siddiqui, a young woman arrested for her al Qaeda ties, was innocent, and 'You must grab on to this rope, grab on to the typewriter, grab on to the shovel, grab on to the gun and the sword, don't be afraid to step out into this world and do your job.'

''ISB has donated 'thousands' of dollars to the Holy Land Foundation, a U.S. Muslim Brotherhood entity later shut down for financing Hamas. It also donated to the Benevolence International Foundation, later identified as al Qaeda front.

''Imam Sheikh Basyouny Nehela, was has served the Islamic Society of Boston for at least 10 years, is also a board member of the Boston chapter of the Muslim American society.

''In 1994, Hamas fundraiser Mohammed El-Mezain addressed the Muslim Arab Youth Association. He spoke after an individual that was introduced as a leader of the 'Hamas mosque military wing.' An FBI report documented the speaker saying: 'I have been told to restrict or restrain what I say . . . I hope no one is recording me or taking any pictures, as none are allowed . . . because I'm going to speak the truth to you. It's simple. Finish off the Israelis. Kill them all. Exterminate them. No peace ever.' ''

These are the Muslim Brothers that the President gets advice from.

It is time to stop this organization. It is time to listen to our friends in Israel and do not, at all costs, facilitate the destruction or the attempted destruction of Israel by our enemies and their enemies.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STEWART (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 8, 2015 at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1699. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization for Colonel Paul J. Rock, Jr., United States Marine Corps, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1700. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Capital Gain Distributions of Regulated Investment Companies [Notice 2015-41] received June 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1701. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2015-33) received June 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1702. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Penalty Relief Program — Late Annual Reporting for Non-Title I Retirement Plans (''One-Participant Plans'' and Certain Foreign Plans) (Rev. Proc. 2015-32) received June 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1703. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Request for Comments Regarding New Financial Accounting Standards Board and International Accounting Standards Board Revenue Recognition Standards [Notice 2015-40] received June 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2131. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the ''J. Waties Waring Judicial Center'' (Rept. 114–137). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2394. A bill to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2645. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent the Thrift Savings Fund from investing in any company that boycotts Israel; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2646. A bill to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 2647. A bill to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act and improve forest management activities in units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 2648. A bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2649. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the application of Medicare secondary payer rules to certain workers' compensation settlement agreements and qualified Medicare set-aside provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2650. A bill to restore equity, save coverage, and undo errors in the case of individuals who lose health insurance subsidies under King v. Burwell, and other individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 2651. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prevent and treat diabetes, to promote and improve the care of individuals with diabetes, and to reduce health disparities, relating to diabetes, within racial and ethnic minority groups, including the African-American, Hispanic American, Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaskan Native communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BLUM, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2652. A bill to provide a 2-year grace period for physicians and other health care providers in transitioning from the use of ICD-9 to ICD-10; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YODER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2653. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and related reconciliation provisions, to promote patient-centered health care, to provide for the creation of a safe harbor for defendants in medical malpractice actions who demonstrate adherence to clinical practice guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, Veterans' Affairs, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2654. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2655. A bill to require all candidates for election for the office of Senator or Member of the House of Representatives to run in an open primary regardless of political party preference or lack thereof, to limit the ensuing general election for such office to the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes in such open primary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KIND, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2656. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the electronic delivery of pension plan information; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2659. A bill to authorize preferential treatment for certain imports from Nepal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FARR, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to increase the age of eligibility for children to receive benefits under the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2661. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2662. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to clarify the situations in which the United States will cover the cost of transportation for next of kin to attend the transfer ceremony of a member of the Armed Forces who dies overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2663. A bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2664. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to protect the right of a claimant in a civil action before a Federal court to retain a structured settlement broker to negotiate the terms of payment of an award, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2665. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 2666. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 2667. A bill to reauthorize the matching grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2668. A bill to establish a National Care Corps through which qualified volunteers provide care, companionship, and other services to seniors and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 2669. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2670. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2671. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the amount of scholarships and duration of obligated service under the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Professional Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2672. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the amount and duration of scholarships under the Department of Veterans Affairs Employee Incentive Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2673. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to participate in the Education Debt Reduction Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2674. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transfer funds among certain scholarship and debt reduction programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2675. A bill to direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to establish a program allowing low volume motor vehicle manufacturers to produce a limited number of vehicles annually within a regulatory system that addresses the unique safety and financial issues associated with limited production, and to direct the Environmental Protection Agency to allow low volume motor vehicle manufacturers to install engines from vehicles that have been issued certificates of conformity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the tax treatment for certain build America bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 2677. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to verify that individuals have made a commitment to serve in the Armed Forces or in public service, or otherwise are a borrower on an eligible loan which has been submitted to a guaranty agency for default aversion or is already in default, before such individuals obtain a consolidation loan; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2678. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the United Nations Population Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2679. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain Tibetans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2680. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase transparency and reporting on campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 2681. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish the STEM Education and Training Account in order to enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by providing funding for STEM education and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 2682. A bill to prohibit business enterprises that lay off a greater percentage of their United States workers than workers in other countries from receiving any Federal assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 2683. A bill to require certain Federal agencies to use iron and steel produced in the United States in carrying out projects for the construction, alteration, or repair of a public building or public work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BARTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COOK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 2684. A bill to restore tribal economic development opportunity for the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas on terms that are equal and fair, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Ms. LEE):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 298. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding steps that Congress should take to restore democracy and change the way we do politics in the United States by reducing the influence of money and corporations and promoting the participation of the people in politics and government; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 299. A resolution on the passing of Joseph Robinette Biden, III; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H. Res. 300. A resolution on the passing of Joseph Robinette Biden, III; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JONES, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. PERRY):

H. Res. 301. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement unless the final legal text of the agreement has been made available to the public for a period of not less than 60 days prior to the date on which the implementing bill is introduced in the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 302. A resolution observing the 100th birthday of the late Les Paul, the ''Wizard of Waukesha'', and honoring his contributions to the American music industry; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to thc following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitent with the original understanding of the Commerce Clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found within Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Consistent with Congress's power to tax, the authority to enact this legislation is also found in Clause 1 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 2652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof (Also known as the ''Necessary and Proper clause)''.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

This legislation puts forth measures relating to the treatment of existing commerce and the exchange of health care products, services, and transactions, while retaining the sovereignty and power of respective states as outlined in Amendment X of the U.S. Constitution. The legislation also makes amendments to the manner in which the United States defines and enacts certain taxes, as implemented through the power to collect taxes and provide for the general Welfare.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution provides for those provisions which serve as a means to secure the ends of Clauses 1 and 3 of Article 1, Section 8, as cited above. Such provisions, include, but are not limited to eligibility standards, reporting measures relating to the practical implementation of tax provisions, and instructions specifying the relationship among existing Departments and programs.

Nothing in this legislation shall be construed to restrict due process of the law as defined in Section 1, Amendment XIV of the U.S. Constitution.

This legislation includes a provision to repeal Public Law 111–148 and title I and subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111–152, which exceeds the scope of power vested in Congress by the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

''The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.''

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 2659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, commonly referred to as the Commerce Clause. The Commerce Clause states that the Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. This bill changes U.S. trade

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 2661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 8

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. (The Property Clause.)

The Property Clause gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and states that nothing in the Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any Particular State.

Currently, the federal government possesses approximately 1.8 billion acres of land. The U.S. Constitution specifically addresses the relationship of the federal government to land. The Property Clause gives Congress plenary power and full-authority over federal property. The U.S. Supreme Court has described Congress's power to legislate under this Clause as ''without limitation.'' This Act falls squarely within the express Constitutional power set forth in the Property Clause.

By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 2664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 2665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States);
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress); and
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).
By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:
H.R. 2666.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 2667.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''
By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:
H.R. 2668.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 2669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2670.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution permits the Congress to, ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with indian tribes''
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2671.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2672.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2673.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 2674.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MULLIN:
H.R. 2675.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. NEAL:
H.R. 2676.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 2677.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 2678.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''
By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 2679.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4
By Ms. SPEIER:
H.R. 2680.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 2681.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. VISCLOSKY:
H.R. 2682.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. VISCLOSKY:
H.R. 2683.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 2684.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 29: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 136: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 169: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 227: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 232: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 276: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 288: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 292: Mr. HANNA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 333: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 348: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 359: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 381: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 419: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 592: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 600: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 702: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 703: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 721: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 731: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 767: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 774: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 775: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 829: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 835: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 842: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 893: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 913: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 921: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 928: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 938: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 969: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 973: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 985: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 997: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 999: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1057: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1096: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1101: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1107: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1133: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1157: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 1188: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1192: Mr. REED, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1197: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1202: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1218: Mr. DOLD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1247: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1258: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1299: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 1300: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1321: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1399: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 1401: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1413: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1434: Mr. KIND, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. MENG, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1435: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1448: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1462: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1475: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1516: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1523: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1552: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1559: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1572: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1599: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1610: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1624: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1670: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1680: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1684: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1688: Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1717: Mr. LANCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FARR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1725: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1736: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1739: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1786: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1817: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1818: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1834: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1846: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1853: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1859: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1877: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1893: Mr. COLE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1942: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1943: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1950: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1961: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1989: Mr. HANNA and Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1992: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1994: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2001: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 2005: Mr. POCAN and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2013: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2016: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2019: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2031: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2043: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2050: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2061: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2063: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2082: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2126: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2132: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2138: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2150: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2152: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2192: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2216: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2221: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. STEWART, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 2248: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2259: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2260: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2290: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2300: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2303: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2309: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2342: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 2360: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2378: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2389: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BARR, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2429: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2430: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2457: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 2470: Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2491: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2510: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2513: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 2513: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 2514: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YODER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2522: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2523: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2530: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2567: Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 2576: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2607: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2630: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. VELA.
H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. KNIGHT.
H. Res. 112: Mr. NUNES.
H. Res. 209: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. STEWART.
H. Res. 230: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 233: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 262: Mrs. TORRES and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 294: Mr. BARLETTA.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to take any actions with respect to the financing of a new passenger rail project that runs from Orlando to Miami through Indian River County, Florida.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to make a loan in an amount that exceeds $600,000,000 under title V of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 821 et seq.).

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to authorize exempt facility bonds to finance passenger rail projects which do not use vehicles that are reasonably expected to be capable of attaining a maximum speed in excess of 150 miles per hour between scheduled stops as defined in section 142 of title 26, United States Code.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may used to carry out any enrichment as defined in Appendix A to part 611 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, for any New Start grant request.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHIFF

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to enforce section 47524 of title 49, United States Code, or part 161 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, with regard to noise or access restrictions or to enforce section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, with regard to access restriction on the operation of aircraft by the operate of Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, California.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GALLEGO

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of these funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to redesign the Phoenix Metroplex regional airspace.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, implement, or enforce section 193 or section 414 of this Act.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 2015 No. 89

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, from whom we come and to whom we go at last, in this quiet moment of prayer, we praise You for Your providence that undergirds our Nation and its leaders. Let Your Kingdom come and Your will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven.

Today, give our lawmakers grace to distinguish between that which is nation-serving and that which is self-serving. Make them committed to serving You by serving others. Give them the wisdom to separate the important from the unimportant, the big concern from the trivial contention. Use our Senators for the betterment of this Nation and the building of Your Kingdom.

And, Lord, we thank You for the wonderful work of our pages.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will continue its work on the National Defense Authorization Act today. Both the Republican and Democratic bill managers have called for Senators on both sides to get their amendments offered so we can get the process moving. I urge all of my colleagues to do so.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, we have heard a lot about the Supreme Court's imminent decision on ObamaCare and its latest problems. No one can say for sure how the Court will rule, but one thing we do know is this: ObamaCare is a mess. It is a law filled with broken promises, one that has been plagued by failure and one that has caused costs to skyrocket for millions after the supporters of this law promised the costs would actually fall.

I speak to you in the wake of a bombshell revelation from the administration that many insurers are now requesting to raise premiums by double digits all across the country. For instance, numbers for Kentucky just came out yesterday, and most of the insurers on the Commonwealth's ObamaCare exchange are looking to raise premiums. Some of the proposed increases are as high as 25 percent, and some Kentuckians may now face double-digit premium increases for the second or even the third year in a row. This is more bad ObamaCare news for the people I represent.

In some States, the proposed increases are even more alarming, if you can believe it. Kentuckians can look next door for proof of that, where some Hoosiers could be hit with a 46-percent jump in their premiums, or if they look south to Tennessee, they will see that premium hikes of 36 percent have been proposed.

These are huge numbers, and they affect real people. We have seen the truth of that statement in the stories we hear from constituents about how ObamaCare's massive cost burdens affect all of them. Take the Kentucky small business owner who wrote to say that his plan is now being canceled thanks to ObamaCare. Here is what he had to say: ''My monthly premium will increase from $610 to [approximately] $1,200,'' he said, ''and this is with very high deductibles.'' Or take the constituent of mine from Floyd County who recently wrote to say she can no longer afford her silver ObamaCare plan after the monthly premium spiked by more than 75 percent. ''I was forced to take the Bronze Plan,'' she said, ''which isn't worth the paper or ink to print it on.''

These are the kinds of stories that have become all too familiar in the age of ObamaCare. They are compounded by a continual drip, drip of bad news about this law, such as the recent report that showed how ObamaCare's multibillion-dollar attack on hospitals in Kentucky is expected to result in a net loss of $1 billion over the next few years—a net loss of $1 billion to Kentucky hospitals.

This is after ObamaCare already compelled taxpayers to shell out billions for Web sites that never worked, along with some pretty sad and desperate but expensive taxpayer-financed marketing campaigns that often just directed users to some technological nightmare, not affordable health care. Take Oregon, for instance. Taxpayers spent over $300 million on that State's exchange, only to have it taken over by the Federal Government and then, along with the ObamaCare exchange in Massachusetts, placed under Federal criminal investigation. Look at Hawaii, which received more than $205 million to establish its exchange. We learned just last month that the Hawaii exchange is planning to shut down operations by September 30 since lawmakers couldn't decide on a path forward to pay for it. And then there is Vermont. This morning, the New York Times reported on the spectacular

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

crash of Vermont's even more ambitious version of ObamaCare. Many on the left thought Vermont's experiment would light the way forward on health care. In the end, it turned out to be a remarkable failure and, as one Vermonter put it, ''an unending money pit.'' The State's top health official now says that ObamaCare's exchanges ''just [weren't] set up for success.'' That is in Vermont.

ObamaCare is hitting small and midsized businesses, too. These are the engines of job growth in our economy, but too many of them are now facing premium hikes of nearly 20 percent because of ObamaCare. One 54-person company in Connecticut is facing up to $100,000 in new costs. Its owner says that ObamaCare ''punishes companies for hiring new, younger workers,'' and, indeed, the uncertainty is causing her company to hire temporary workers rather than create permanent jobs.

So while it is possible that ObamaCare will survive its latest crisis, that is not going to change the grim reality of this law. It won't change the broken promises, it won't change the repeated failures, and it won't change the fact that ObamaCare has led to skyrocketing costs for taxpayers, the small businesses that drive the American dream, and, most importantly, for middle-class Americans who work hard every single day and play by the rules.

It is about time the President and his party worked constructively with us to start over on real health reform that can lower costs and increase choice instead of hurting the middle class the way ObamaCare does. That is what the American people deserve.

BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, several weeks ago, I had the pleasure of meeting with Shwe Mann, speaker of the Burmese Parliament, on his visit to Washington. It was the third time we met. We had a cordial but frank discussion about the challenges and opportunities facing his country in 2015. There are obviously many issues that fall into both categories.

When it comes to challenges, there is the need for the government to do all it can to protect and assume responsibility for members of a long-suffering religious minority group, the Rohingya, thousands of whom have been forced to take to the high seas on dangerous makeshift vessels to escape persecution. There is the longstanding need for the government to continue its work with other ethnic minorities toward a permanent peace agreement that calls for political settlements in order to end a conflict as old as the modern Burmese State itself. Then there is the need for a constitutional reform to enhance civilian control of the military, along with more progress on efforts to protect liberties, such as freedom of the press, freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, and freedom of assembly.

Those are just a few of the challenges facing Burma in 2015. But it is also true that Burma has come a long way from where it was just a few years ago. Reform has been offered, change has occurred, and considering the conditions within Burma when reform began, this is no small achievement. That is why there are opportunities as well.

The parliamentary election that will be held later this year represents a clear opportunity to demonstrate how far Burma has progressed. There are some encouraging signs that the election will be more credible, more inclusive, and more transparent than what we have seen in the past in that country. Unlike recent Burmese elections, international election monitors have been permitted to observe. By and large, the work of the Union Election Commission has been encouraging thus far, especially as it relates to serious efforts to modernize the voter roles and to make it easier to run for office. And our Embassy, under the capable leadership of Ambassador Derek Mitchell, has been engaged in the process as well.

These are all positive signs, but it is going to take a sustained commitment by President Thein Sein's government to ensure that as free and fair an election as possible takes place this fall because for all of the positive change we have seen in recent years, it is obvious that Burma still has much further to go. There are signs that its political reform effort has begun to falter, which is worrying for all of us who care about the Burmese people.

It doesn't mean Burmese officials can't turn things around. I believe they can, which is what I indicated to the speaker when I met with him. I believe there is still time before the next critical test of Burma's slow democratic development this autumn.

There may still be time to amend the Constitution, for instance, to ensure that it promotes rather than inhibits Burma's democratic development. It is hard to claim democratic legitimacy with a Constitution that unreasonably limits who can run for President or that effectively locks in a parliamentary veto for the military.

At the very least, the six-party talks we have seen between President Thein Sein, Shwe Mann, opposition leader Daw Aung Sang Suu Kyi, the military, ethnic groups, and others certainly represent progress. They should continue in a sustained fashion.

I also hope to see further progress on the draft national ceasefire reached between the Burmese Government and representatives from 16 ethnic groups in March.

Those of us who follow Burma want the country to succeed. We want it to succeed in carrying out a transparent, inclusive, and credible election on a broad scale. We know this standard goes far beyond simply holding an election without mass casualties or violence. It needs to be more than just holding an election without mass casualties or violence. It means the lead-up to the election must be transparent, inclusive, and credible, too. It means there should not be political favoritism shown by the state or its media organs. It means freedom of expression of the press and a peaceful assembly must be ensured. It means citizens must be allowed to register and to vote without harassment, and it means they must be granted equal opportunities to organize, to campaign, and to participate fully in the electoral process without fear and violence.

These basic standards of fairness are minimum goals Burmese officials must strive toward. If the Burmese Government gets this right, if it ensures a transparent, inclusive, and credible election, with results accepted by competing parties, that would go a long way toward reassuring Burma's friends around the globe that it remains committed to political reform. But if we end up with an election not accepted by the Burmese people as reflecting their will, it will make further normalization of relations—at least as it concerns the legislative branch of our government—much more difficult.

For example, such an outcome would likely hinder further enhancement of U.S.-Burma economic ties and military-to-military relations. Further, an erosion of congressional confidence in Burma's reform efforts would also make it more difficult for the executive branch to include Burma in the Generalized System of Preferences program or to enhance political military relations.

So these are some of the most pressing challenges and opportunities awaiting Burma in 2015. I noted many of them in my discussion with Burma's parliamentary speaker.

I would close by making it clear that we in the United States will be watching intently to see what happens in Burma in the coming months, and we are prepared to continue doing what we can to encourage more positive change in that country.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

BURMA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have watched over the last decade Senator MCCONNELL focusing attention on Burma. It is remarkable the good he has done for that country. His vigilance in watching literally every move that government has made has been good for that country and I think good for the world, and I admire and appreciate the work he has done. There has not been a watchdog over any country that I am aware of who has been more intense than the senior Senator from Kentucky, keeping an eye on what goes

on in Burma. I appreciate his remarks today in that regard.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader can't see the forest for the trees when it comes to health care. I understand that. He has given many speeches denigrating ObamaCare.

The facts are that more people are getting access to health care today under the Affordable Care Act than ever before. The share without insurance is now at an alltime low.

The cost growth in health care has never been lower than it has been since ObamaCare kicked in. I was telling one of my Senator friends yesterday that when I went home during the Memorial Day recess, I had two people come to me. I know that is not a great sampling, but it shows how impactful the legislation has been. Both of them had children with significant challenges, physical and mental. These young men and women now have the ability to get health care. They cannot be denied insurance because of their preexisting disability. This law that was passed not only applies to people with disabilities about which I have just spoken, but it applies to people with disabilities such as diabetes. Prior to ObamaCare, women could be charged more for their health care. So people are extremely satisfied with health care.

The Supreme Court should understand that about 7 million people who are happy with their health care and who are receiving subsidies for their insurance to take care of themselves would lose that. They would lose those subsidies. It would be a devastating blow to 7 million people, as well as to the economy. Also, those people who don't need subsidies benefit significantly. The people who have had increased premiums—my friend was very selective in whom he chose, because the people having increases are very minimal. I will have more to say about that at some subsequent time in the near future.

ObamaCare is working. Reports out this week show that all the targets have been met as to people who have purchased insurance and they are paying their premiums. So I think we should try to improve the law rather than my Republican friends continually trying to talk about the failures that don't exist.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every Senator wants to keep America safe, and that is why every Senator should be concerned about a particular threat to our national security. This threat to our national security is called sequestration. Sequestration puts in place drastic cuts to all funding, defense and nondefense.

The Defense authorization bill that is before us today doesn't fix that—and that is a gross understatement. We should not start spending until we develop a bipartisan budget that does. That is the only responsible way to protect both our national security and America's middle class.

Sequestration results from what happened 4 years ago with another threat of a government shutdown because the Republicans couldn't get their financial house in order.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 passed. That act included a number of significant spending cuts and established a supercommittee led by Senator MURRAY and Congressman HENSARLING from Texas to produce a balanced, bipartisan agreement for additional deficit reduction. Unfortunately, Republicans could never agree. There was a lot of this: Yes, we are almost there, we are almost there. But they could never pull the trigger and agree. There was a refusal to close a single tax loophole to reduce the deficit; not a single one could they agree on.

So the supercommittee failed to reach an agreement, and the Budget Control Act triggered deep, automatic cuts.

Sequestration was never intended to happen. The point was to threaten cuts so deep and so stupid that Congress would never let them happen. But never put that beyond this Republican group over the last 10 years and who are still here in Congress. They allowed this stupid thing to happen. The cuts affected both defense and nondefense programs so everyone would feel compelled to move it, because the cuts were equal.

Unfortunately, what was stupid in 2011 is now official Republican policy. Congressional Republicans incorporated sequestration into their recent budget resolution. That resolution leaves sequestration cuts in place in parts of the budget that affect the middle class, and it also directly threatens national security. There are many examples of this.

How does it affect the middle class? The list is really endless. It cuts investments in roads, bridges, rail, and transit. That costs jobs—lots and lots of jobs, hundreds of thousands of jobs. It puts travelers at risk, and it weakens our economy.

Sequestration cuts education. That means fewer children with a shot at going to school. If they can't do that, they don't have a shot at success. It means fewer Americans who can afford college. That is the way it is. It means less economic opportunity for millions of Americans.

Sequestration cuts research. That means fewer chances to beat cancer, heart disease, and Alzheimer's. As a result of sequestration, the National Institutes of Health, the premier medical research institution in the world, was whacked by sequestration to the tune of $1.6 billion. They have never, ever gotten that money back. It stopped the finalization work done on the universal flu vaccine. The list is endless as to what they can't do because of that money being lost.

While sequestration is a dagger pointed at the middle class, it also represents a threat to our society in many different ways. It means fewer opportunities for American businesses and consumers to benefit from cutting edge innovations.

Sequestration threatens cuts to the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It means fewer FBI resources devoted to terrorists and hunting them down.

Sequestration threatens cuts for the Transportation Security Administration, which helps protect us from another 9/11.

Sequestration threatens cuts for fusion centers, which have worked so well—these centers help law enforcement officials work together—and for the Coast Guard and border security officials who protect Americans from dangers from abroad.

These are cuts that are in place right now.

The bill before us is designed to provide an end run around sequestration for the Department of Defense by exploiting a provision that exempts from spending caps what is called the overseas contingency operations, or OCO. We all know that OCO was put in the budget many years ago, and it was set there so we would have the money to fight wars. It is always very hard to determine how much wars are going to cost. We know that because we had to borrow almost $2 trillion for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, especially in Iraq.

But the OCO gimmick does not solve the problem of sequestration, and that is true. I am disappointed that even Senators who long have had a reputation for fiscal honesty, such as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my friend, are turning a blind eye to the OCO gimmick. There has not been a word from people who have had a reputation for fiscal honesty—not a word—about this gimmick.

The Department of Defense says it won't work. It is just a 1-year gimmick, and that will make it impossible for military leaders to prepare for threats we face in the future.

The OCO gimmick does nothing for agencies that protect us here at home, such as, as I have indicated, the FBI and even the Department of Homeland Security. That leaves all Americans vulnerable to attacks if they don't get the resources they need.

So until we reach a balanced, bipartisan agreement on the budget—an agreement that protects both national security and the middle class—not a single spending bill will become law. If any bill reaches the President, he will veto it. He has said so publicly many times. He should. It is critical for the middle class, and it is the only way to be fiscally responsible. We ought to budget before we spend.

Days after letting critical national security tools expire on their watch,

Republicans are showing yet another way they can't govern. Now we are wasting time on a bill that has no chance of becoming law—no chance. No troops will be helped by a bill that can't be signed into law by the President. Our military needs all the help they can get. They deserve it.

If Republicans want to join us in supporting our troops, they should start taking their responsibility to govern seriously and work with us on a Defense bill that can actually become law to help those in our Armed Forces.

Let's be straight. At the moment, we don't have a budget.

Without the vote of a single Democrat, Republicans approved a nonbinding resolution with their own wish list. It means nothing. The budget means nothing. There was a lot of back-slapping here: Oh, it is a great budget; we are going to balance the budget. But everyone knows that is just a farce.

Until both parties join together, the government does not have a budget to actually guide decisionmaking. We need one.

This is not rocket science. After all, budgeting for the Federal Government is not all that different than budgeting for a family. If two spouses are trying to resolve differences over their own budget, would it be responsible for one spouse to go out and buy a new car on credit? We all know the answer to that—no. It is the same here in Washington. Shouldn't we agree on a budget first and spend later? That is not asking too much, I don't believe.

We don't need political theater and meaningless votes on bills that are going nowhere. We don't need another manufactured crisis. We just need to sit down, get real, and fix sequestration in a way that protects both national security and the middle class. They go together.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Reed amendment No. 1521 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending relief from the spending limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Portman amendment No. 1522 (to amendment No. 1463), to provide additional amounts for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades, and to provide an offset.

Reed (for Bennet) amendment No. 1540 (to amendment No. 1463), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to brief and submit a report to Congress on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Reed (for Shaheen) amendment No. 1494 (to amendment No. 1463), to revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse.

Tillis amendment No. 1506 (to amendment No. 1463), to provide for the stationing of C–130 H aircraft avionics previously modified by the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) in support of daily training and contingency requirements for Airborne and Special Operations Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be a vote at 10:15 a.m.; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 30 minutes of debate prior to the vote.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I just listened to the words of the Senate minority leader concerning his views on an authorization bill—not an appropriations bill, not a funding bill but an authorization bill. I would hope the minority leader and, frankly, my colleague and friend, Senator REID, would pay attention to what is going on in the world today.

I refer to the Washington Post this morning and an article entitled ''Deadly fighting tests truce in Ukraine.''

As many of us predicted, Vladmir Putin will continue his aggression and dismemberment of the European nation for the first time in 70 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled ''Deadly fighting tests truce in Ukraine'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 2015]

DEADLY FIGHTING TESTS TRUCE IN UKRAINE

(By Karoun Demirjian)

MOSCOW.—Continued skirmishes between pro-Russian rebels and government forces in eastern Ukraine escalated Wednesday into the first major battle in months, leaving at least 18 dead and further threatening a tenuous cease-fire agreement signed in February.

Both sides traded accusations about who had started the fighting in Marinka, a suburb of Donetsk on the government-held side of the cease-fire line. Separatists reported 15 dead, and three Ukrainian soldiers were killed, according to a Facebook post by Yuriy Biryukov, an adviser to Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko.

''They tried to move forward. The Ukrainian military are repelling all attacks, and the situation is under control,'' Col. Andriy Lysenko, a spokesman for Ukraine's National Security and Defense Council, said at a news conference Wednesday in Kiev. ''Marinka and Krasnohorivka are under our control.''

But the head of the separatists' militia said they were only defending themselves against an assault by the pro-Kiev forces.

''Trying to announce that we are storming Marinka—this is a provocation by Kiev,'' said Vladimir Kononov, the militias' top defense official. ''We already are in Marinka.''

Since February, top diplomats from the United States and Europe have participated in several rounds of shuttle diplomacy aimed at settling the conflict and persuading the rebels and the government to fully implement the peace agreement signed in Minsk, Belarus.

Last month, U.S. Secretary of State John F. Kerry and Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland made back-to-back trips to Russia, urging that country's leaders to use their influence over the separatists in eastern Ukraine to push them to parley with Kiev. Groups from both sides were supposed to conclude an opening round of talks in Ukraine this week to address various points of contention.

Ukrainian Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk accused Russia on Wednesday of intentionally undermining the peace process and ordering pro-Russian separatists in Ukraine ''to start a military operation.''

The surge in violence also comes as Western nations are gearing up for this weekend's Group of Seven summit in Germany—an assembly of nations from which Russia was ousted when it annexed Crimea last year.

That annexation happened after the upper house of the Russian parliament met in an emergency session to give President Vladimir Putin the authority to send troops abroad.

On Wednesday, the speaker of the upper house told lawmakers that there may be cause to hold a similar emergency session soon but did not give a specific reason for the warning.

Mr. MCCAIN. Perhaps the minority leader and others have missed this article: ''Syria likely used chlorine gas in recent bombing raids, rights group says.''

A prominent human rights group accused the Syrian government Wednesday of using toxic chemicals during a recent surge in attacks involving barrel bombs on rebel-held areas in northern Syria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 2015]

SYRIA LIKELY USED CHLORINE GAS IN RECENT BOMBING RAIDS, RIGHTS GROUP SAYS

(By Hugh Naylor)

BEIRUT.—A prominent human rights group accused the Syrian government Wednesday of using toxic chemicals during a recent

surge in attacks involving barrel bombs on rebel-held areas in northern Syria.

Human Rights Watch said chlorine gas was probably used in at least three bombing raids that targeted Idlib province in April and last month, after the area fell to a powerful new rebel coalition. That coalition and other insurgent groups have recently inflicted heavy losses on the regime of President Bashar al-Assad in the north and east of Syria.

Assad's government has been accused by Western countries of using chemical weapons over the course of the four-year conflict, including an attack involving sarin gas in 2013 that killed hundreds of people in a suburb of the capital.

Regime opponents and activists allege that Assad's forces have punished residents in rebel-controlled areas with barrages of the crude bombs, which are built from oil barrels or gas cylinders and can be filled with toxic chemicals such as chlorine gas. Barrel bombs have been dropped by regime helicopters and airplanes on residential areas, hospitals and markets, killing thousands of civilians, according to human rights groups.

Another group said two barrel bombings on Wednesday killed at least 24 people, including children, in Idlib and rebel-held areas of Aleppo province. The British-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights said that it expected the death toll to climb from those attacks.

In its Wednesday report, Human Right Watch said evidence indicates that three attacks in April and May on towns in Idlib involved barrel bombs containing toxic chemicals. The group was unable to confirm the exact toxin used in the attacks, which it said killed two people and affected 127. But it cited chlorine as the likely culprit based on interviews with first responders and doctors, as well as an examination of photographs and videos.

The total number of attacks involving chlorine gas during that time is probably much higher, according to the report, which was released to coincide with the U.N. Security Council's regular monthly meeting on chemical weapons in Syria. Citing evidence provided by doctors in Idlib, the group said 24 suspected chlorine gas attacks were carried out between May 16 and May 19, killing at least nine people and affecting over 500.

''While Security Council members deliberate over next steps at a snail's pace, toxic chemicals are raining down on civilians in Syria,'' Philippe Bolopion, Human Rights Watch's U.N. and crisis advocacy director, said in a statement.

He said the Security Council should impose sanctions for the attacks.

In 2013, the Syrian government agreed to a deal brokered by the United States and Russia to eliminate its chemical weapons arsenal, forestalling potential U.S. airstrikes. The Syrian government, which denies using chemical weapons, agreed to join the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) as part of the agreement.

Last month, reports emerged that OPCW inspectors found traces of sarin and VX nerve agent at a military research site in Syria, raising suspicion that the government had not eliminated its chemical weapons stockpiles.

Mr. MCCAIN. On the front page of the New York Times this morning: ''ISIS Making Political Gains, Group Stakes Claim As Protector of Sunnis.''

Ideologically unified, the Islamic State is emerging as a social and political movement in many Sunni areas, filling a void in the absence of solid national identity and security. At the same time, it responds brutally to any other Sunni group, militant or civilian, that poses a challenge to its supremacy.

That dual strategy, purporting to represent Sunni interests and attacking any group that vies to play the same role, has allowed it to grow in the face of withering airstrikes.

In the news yesterday:

ISIS has closed off a dam to the north of Ramadi, cutting water supplies to pro-government towns downstream and making it easier for its fighters to attack government forces. ISIS militants are opening only two or three of the dam's 26 gates on the Euphrates River, denying water to numerous cities and using water as a critical weapon to gain more influence and territory.

''Iraq: ISIS fighters close Ramadi dam gates, cut off water to loyalist towns,'' that was on CNN.

''President Hassan Rouhani stated on Tuesday that,'' according to Reuters, '' 'The Iranian nation and government will remain at the side of the Syrian nation and government until the end of the road.' He also pledged to send reinforcements in backing Bashar al-Assad.''

''U.S.: Shiite Fighters in Iraq Are a Necessary, if Unlikely, Ally''

Retired Marine Gen. John Allen, said the militias have an important role to play in liberating Anbar, so long as they ''take command from the central authority.''

''Embedding U.S. forces can help inject energy into leadership development of new and weaker Iraqi commanders. . . . ''

AFP Beirut: ''Iraq, Iran fighters deployed to defend Damascus.''

Thousands of Iranian and Iraqi forces have been deployed in Syria in past weeks to bolster the defences of Damascus and its surroundings, a Syrian security force told AFP on Wednesday.

Iran's official news agency IRNA quoted elite Revolutionary Guards General Qassem Soleimani as saying ''in the coming days the world will be surprised by what we are preparing, in cooperation with Syrian military leaders.''

I point out to my colleagues, Qassem Soleimani is the guy who sent the copper-tipped IEDs into Iraq that killed hundreds of marines and soldiers and also was seen prominently in Baghdad and other parts of Iraq leading the Shiite militias.

Some of that is complicated. Some of it is impossible to make up.

Finally, the New York Times article on June 2: ''Assad's Forces May Be Aiding New ISIS Surge.''

Building on recent gains in Iraq and Syria, Islamic State militants are marching across northern Syria toward Aleppo, Syria's largest city, helped along, their opponents say, by the forces of President Bashar al-Assad.

Finally, ''Exclusive: Syrian Rebels Backing Out of U.S. Fight Vs. ISIS.''

Syrian rebels are backing out because they are not being protected by the United States of America and being barrel-bombed.

So I will not even go into the crisis in the Far East, where China is now militarizing islands in international waters.

So here we are arguing about the way the authorization for America's defense is funded, and the minority leader just announced they would take a stand because they don't like the way it is funded. I don't like the way it is funded. But don't those who are in opposition to this have some sense of reality as to what is going on in the world; that if we don't authorize the ability to defend this Nation and its national security interests—which in the words of Henry Kissinger before the Armed Services Committee, ''The world has not seen more crises since the end of World War II.''

I say, with respect to my good friend Senator REID, haven't you got your priorities skewed? Don't you understand this is an authorization bill? Don't you understand that if you want to fight, fight it on appropriations? Don't you understand—I am sure you do—that this is about the welfare and benefit of the men and women who are serving?

I am as opposed to sequestration as anybody. I have watched the hearings on the Senate Armed Services Committee, where the military leaders have said sequestration is putting the lives of the men and women serving in uniform in greater danger. That should be enough alone, but we are playing the hand we are dealt. That fight should not take place on an authorization bill.

This authorizes reforms of the Pentagon. This authorizes reforms of the retirement system, which is long overdue. It authorizes our ability to acquire the weapons and training which are necessary to defend this Nation. It doesn't fund them. It doesn't fund them; it authorizes them.

After intense hearings, months and months of hearings, debate, work in the Senate Armed Services Committee, we have come up with a product that I am extremely proud of.

I understand my friend from Rhode Island will be proposing an amendment later on to nullify the funding of OCO, which would then, by the way, have the effect of reducing the funding and authorization rather dramatically and cancel many vitally needed programs, equipment, and training for the men and women who are serving in the military. That is fine, but that will be defeated.

Once it is defeated, I hope and pray we will then move forward with the amendment process, which has been absent for the last 2 years—totally absent for the last 2 years—and not—for the first time in 53 years—not pass a Defense authorization bill through the Congress of the United States. For 53 years, through Democratic and Republican majorities, through liberal and conservative, we have authorized. We have authorized because our highest responsibility is the security of this Nation.

I urge all of my colleagues, if we want to have this fight, have it on the appropriations bill, the money bill. This is authorization. For you to distort it in some way and to equate it with a funding mechanism, in my view, is intellectual sophistry.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is correct, every uniformed Chief of service came before us and said the greatest crisis facing the military process was sequestration, the Budget Control Act, and they asked us to change it, and we didn't change it.

If we are going to change it, then we have to make every effort and take every step to make those changes, and that is the point I have tried to raise in this committee—not by eliminating the funds available to the military but by making these funds subject to responsible action with following the request of the defense officials to eliminate sequestration. I think we should do it as soon as possible. If we don't take every opportunity to make that case and every action possible to make that case, then we will be essentially rejecting the advice of our senior military leaders.

Suggesting that this bill is somehow so totally disconnected to the appropriations process is belied by the title of the bill. This is an act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2016 for the military activities for the Department of Defense, for military construction, the defense activities in the Department of Energy. We are directly linked to the appropriations process. In the ideal world, the one that we authorize and would like to see, nothing can be appropriated, no dime can be spent, unless we have authorized it.

What we have done, effectively, in the bill—and I think it is not because it is the chairman's first choice but because it was the only available option given the budget resolution—is that we have taken the overseas contingency account, bolstered it up dramatically, and set a new sort of pathway, which next year, unless we resolve this issue of the Budget Control Act, we will come back again with more money—and the following year.

Also, as has been pointed out, we will have situations where we will find some very strange things happening in our OCO account, because we can't fund legitimate concerns of the government in other areas because of caps. That is essentially what happened in the eighties. That is why we have a significant amount of medical research money in the Department of Defense—not because the Department of Defense does it but because that was the only available option in the eighties and nineties to get money to where we thought we would need it.

I think the other issue here, too, is very implicit in our activity, which is that this bill is aimed at the Department of Defense and the military activities of the Department of Energy. Our national security is much more than that. The chairman read quite accurately reports about activity in the world, but up my way, in Roslindale, MA, there was an alleged terrorist who was confronted by an FBI agent and a Massachusetts police officer. That is the kind of terrorism a lot of people are concerned about, and if we sequester and cut off funding for the Department of Justice and the FBI and the Customs Service, et cetera, we will see this threat growing. So this is about a broader view, a wider view, and the overall mass security of the United States.

I know we have some votes pending, and I would like to go ahead and allow for my colleague to speak.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes—the vote was scheduled at a quarter after—an additional 5 minutes in order to allow 3 minutes for the Senator from Colorado and 3 minutes for the other Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the Senator from Arizona for that additional time and for his commitment and the ranking member's commitment to our national security. I deeply appreciate it.

AMENDMENT NO. 1540

Mr. President, I would like to talk briefly about amendment 1540, which the Senate will consider shortly. I am here with my colleague Senator GARDNER from Colorado. We are here on this bipartisan amendment to require the Government Accounting Office to audit the way the Veterans' Administration constructs major medical facilities and help identify exactly where the money went on some of these projects.

The Veterans' Administration is building several major medical facilities across the country, including one in Aurora, CO.

The project in Colorado has been grossly mismanaged leading to excessive cost overruns. Other projects across the country have had similar problems for years. For years, our delegation and practically anyone who has been involved with the Aurora project—almost anybody who has driven by the Aurora project has pushed the VA to acknowledge that there is actually a problem and to come up with a plan to fix it. Unfortunately, the VA has so far failed to do this, and veterans across the Rocky Mountain region have continued to wait for this new medical center.

We should ensure and must ensure that the mistakes on the Aurora project never happen again, but we all concluded that with greater accountability and transparency the right thing to do is to move forward and complete this critical facility.

As many of us have experienced up here, imposing accountability and transparency on an enormous Federal bureaucracy is elusive and complicated. The GAO has the necessary expertise to identify realistic, hard reforms and to make them stick.

We have to hold the VA accountable to our taxpayers so we can move forward to give the Rocky Mountain region's veterans the care they need. The VA and Congress are going to have to work together to get this project back on track. Finding the money to do this will be painful. It will be difficult, which is why we need to ensure that we account for every dollar that has been spent. But failing to complete this hospital is not an option. It would be a broken promise. Having a half-finished hospital in Colorado would be a national disgrace, and on behalf of our veterans, we cannot allow it to happen. It would be a disservice—worse than a disservice—a broken promise of the worst kind to the hundreds of thousands of veterans across the Rocky Mountain region and throughout the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague from Colorado, Senator GARDNER, for joining me on this important amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I, too, echo the thanks to my colleague from Colorado, Senator BENNET, for his leadership on this effort. It is time that we take the VA hospital from the thorn of the VA system to the crown of the VA system, which we know it will be once it is completed. But in the meantime, there is a tremendous amount of work we have to do. I would like to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for allowing this time today on the floor.

I would note that there are four Members of this body who have actually visited the facility in Denver in recent months. The Presiding Officer has witnessed this hole in the ground right now that has already spent hundreds of millions of dollars, projected to be $1.73 billion at this point.

We have talked about the need to complete it and have committed to that need to finish this project, along with the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, who has joined us on the floor today, Senator ISAKSON, who is here today with us, who is in support of this amendment to bring more accountability to the VA system so that we can understand what went wrong when they were building not only the Aurora facility but what went wrong around the country as project after project has seen cost overruns and delays.

Veterans gathered this past week in Colorado to rally to finish the darn thing. We have a Veterans' Administration that time and time again has failed to take into account the necessary measures and policies to fix it and to prevent it from ever happening again. With this amendment, we can start to find out where they went wrong and to hold them accountable. When the only person who has been fired is the person who said we were going to have a problem, there is something wrong with that.

I commend Senator BENNET for his leadership on fixing this problem,

building the hospital, and giving our veterans what they were promised.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his time today. I thank the chairman of the committee for enduring this conversation this morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

FLOOR PRIVILEGES

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have a list of staff members of the Committee on Armed Services and I ask unanimous consent that those staffers on the list be granted the privilege of the floor at all times during the Senate's consideration of and votes relating to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

The list is as follows:

Barker, Adam; Barney, Steven; Bennett, Jody; Borawski, June; Brewer, Leah; Brose, Christian; Chuhta, Carolyn; Clark, Jon; Clark, Samantha; Davis, Lauren; Donovan, Matt; Edelman, Kathryn; Edwards, Allen; Epstein, Jonathan; Everett, Elizabeth; Goel, Anish; Goffus, Tom; Greene, Creighton; Greenwalt, Bill; Guzelsu, Ozge; Hayes, Jeremy; Hickey, James; Howard, Gary; Kerber, Jackie; King, Elizabeth; Kuiken, Mike.

Leeling, Gary; Lehman, John; Lerner, Daniel; Lilly, Greg; McConnell, Kirk; McNamara, Maggie; Monahan, Bill; Nicolas, Natalie; Noblet, Mike; Patout, Brad; Potter, Jason; Quirk, John; Salmon, Diem; Sawyer, Brendan; Sayers, Eric; Scheunemann, Leah; Seraphin, Arun; Soofer, Rob; Sterling, Cord; Waisanen, Robert; Walker, Barry; Walker, Dustin; Wheelbarger, Katie; White, Jennifer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1522

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the amendment pending before us now is the Portman amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio. We spoke about it yesterday.

First, let me recognize that he is trying to assist the Army in modernizing the Stryker, which is a very critical piece of equipment. But I want to reiterate some of the concerns I have about the amendment. I know Senator PORTMAN will be here shortly to make a final comment on the amendment. The amendment would add $371 million of funding for procurement, research, and development of the lethality upgrade to the Stryker program.

I do not have to tell anyone around here that we are in a very tough budget situation. We have to look very closely at every request. The traditional way it is done is that there will be in the President's budget the request by the service department, including the Department of Army, and then the Army will submit an unfunded requirements list—those priority elements that have not made the cut, if you will, in the President's budget. That was done in March. I understand that this whole requirement for the Stryker lethality upgrade came in in April. There is an issue of unfortunate timing. But, nevertheless, because we did not have the opportunity to look at this as part of the overall unfunded requirements list—nor the Army, for that matter—we really do not have a sense of the priority. Is this the most important program that we can invest $371 million in at this moment for the benefit of the Army? Therefore, I am very concerned that we are sort of moving forward without full and careful analysis both by the Department of the Army and by the committee, and we need, at this particular moment, this difficult time, to have that type of analysis.

The other issue here, too, is that this is the first step in a multiyear process. We are not quite sure how much additional funding will be needed over the next several years. It is clear from the Army that additional funding will be needed.

So we are at this time, without the usual review by the Army and by the committee, committing ourselves, perhaps, to significant funding going forward. The present estimate is that it will cost $3.8 million per vehicle. The plan is to upgrade about 81 vehicles. But it is something that, again, could be more expensive and will commit us over several years.

The funding—the vast majority of it—is going to be dedicated to one plant in a single State. Indeed, I think, generally and appropriately, it is a concern of the Senator from Ohio because most of the work will be done in Ohio. I think, again, he should be commended for being interested in what is happening in his home State.

So I appreciate the demand, but I just do not think this has gone through the process sufficiently enough for us to make that type of commitment today on the floor, and I will be opposing it right now.

I would also point out two other factors. First, the Army has the capability going forward, if this program becomes so critical and they raise it to the highest priority, to request a reprograming of funds, to move money from one less significant priority to this program. That is an option they have, and that is an option they may well choose to use, but it will only be after their careful consideration of the other priorities that are facing the Army. I think that is a better way to do it.

The other factor I would point out is that the pay-for for this program is the foreign currency account. Basically, that is a hedge within the Department of Defense for their international transactions and the value of the U.S. dollar versus other currency. Well, the dollar is strong, and so there appears to be additional excess funds in that account, but currency over the next year could change dramatically. We have already put significant pressure on this supposed excess funding. We have reduced by about $550 million the request that the Department of Defense has made for this hedge fund, if you will, against currency changes in the world going forward in their acquisition process. I know the House has used more. But I think we have been careful not to try to put too much weight on this account.

So for all of these reasons, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. Later, there will be an opportunity for the Department of the Army to reprogram funds if it is necessary.

I think this should have been done in the context of a careful review of all their priorities so we know exactly where it stands. Again, I think we are putting too much pressure on this currency account. It might turn out to evaporate these supposed savings.

I yield the floor since I see the Senator from Ohio has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I talked about an amendment that is absolutely crucial that we include in this legislation. Again, I commend the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, for their work on this underlying bill. But there is something missing, and it is very clear to everybody who is looking at this issue objectively, particularly what is going on right now on the eastern border of Ukraine. We do not have the ability in Europe, because we have pulled our armored units out, to say with credibility that we have the capacity to address the very real challenge now, unfortunately, that is emerging in Europe.

Last night, as some of you know, Russian and separatist forces launched an offensive again. I am told it is the largest attack since the February Minsk agreement. So this is just what so many people predicted, including President Poroshenko and others in Ukraine, which is that things are heating up again on the eastern border of Ukraine. The NATO forces—the United States of American in particular—need to be sure they have in Europe the ability to at least have some credibility to say they can respond to this.

We have moved our armored units out, meaning there are not Abrams tanks there, except for a few units that were up in the Baltics on a temporary basis this spring. I visited them a couple of months ago. They are doing a terrific job, but they are leaving.

What the Army has said is, we want to allow our troops who are there to be able to up-armor, particularly with a weapon—a 30-millimeter cannon rather than a .50-caliber machine gun—on our Stryker vehicles to be able to have some credibility there, to be able to say that we have armored units in Europe that can respond to these new challenges. The Army has asked for this. The Army wants this. They are pleading for it because the soldiers who are there know they will not be able to perform their mission without this enhanced capability.

We had this debate yesterday on the floor. I do not think Senator REED and other Democrats necessarily disagree with the substance of this amendment. What they have said is they are concerned about the pay-for. Well, let's talk about the pay-for. The pay-for is

taking this out of an account that is already being used for other purposes. It is already being used by the House Armed Services Committee. In fact, the House Armed Services Committee has already taken more funds out of this account than all of the funds in the SASC committee, the Senate committee, plus this amount that I believe ought to be taken out of this account. This is called the foreign currency fluctuation account at the Department of Defense.

GAO, which is the body that looks at these issues from our perspective, from a legislative branch perspective—they are the auditors—GAO has estimated that the Pentagon will have $1.86 billion in surplus from these fluctuations by the end of fiscal year 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. So GAO has looked at this. They have said there will be $1.86 billion in surplus in these fluctuation accounts at the end of fiscal year 2016. They have actually updated their figures now with even more recent data, and they have just adjusted the 2016 surplus even higher to $2.02 billion. No one has produced a currency projection to counter this GAO estimate. So we are talking about over $2 billion in this account that is available.

By the way, the money we are talking about here is not going to be taken and used for other readiness priorities because the SASC bill has already swept up that money for readiness. This money will be sitting in a reserve fund. The Pentagon does not need to be sitting on this size of a reserve fund—essentially a slush fund—when we do have these needs that have been identified. The Army has made a formal request for these. They have asked for assistance here. These deployed units need this assistance. They said they need it. We ought to put this to good use—namely, for an urgent requirement like this one.

Again, if you look at the House bill versus the Senate bill, the House has used more of this funding in this reserve fund, this slush fund, than we have used even when you include this additional requirement I am talking about today.

So this notion that somehow we cannot do this because the offset is not good—it just does not make any sense. It does not fit with what GAO has said, and it does not fit with what the House has done. So I do not know what the objection is, but I tell you what—if you vote against this, then you are saying that our troops in Europe ought not to have the capability that they have asked for, that they need.

Admittedly, this came late. I am sorry about that. It should have come with it sooner. This was a requirement they had identified, but they had identified needing it later by 2020. Now, they need it now, and they need it now because the situation has changed in Europe.

We have to be flexible to be able to respond to that change. If we wait another 12 months, another year to do this, who knows what is going to happen. But I know one thing, having been in Eastern Europe recently, I know those countries of Eastern Europe and, in fact, those countries on the European Continent—our NATO partners, in particular, but also Ukraine—are looking to the United States of America to show that the commitment we have made on paper, to ensure we have that commitment in terms of our capability on the ground in Europe.

Again, this is an issue where I think we should come together as Democrats and Republicans. It is a bipartisan amendment. I commend Senator PETERS for identifying this need with the Army.

I understand Senator REED's concern that this came late in the process, but it is here. The request has been made. I would sure hope we would be able to come together today, given what is happening right now on the eastern border of Ukraine, to ensure that we send a strong message that, at a minimum, we are going to meet these requirements that the Army has insisted they need to be able to give our troops what they need to be able to keep the peace in this important part of the world.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the time. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, again, I recognize the way that the Senator from Ohio is articulating a need of the military. The question is how high the priority is.

Just one point I wish to make is that we do understand acutely the crisis in the Crimea, et cetera. The availability of this equipment would not be instantaneous. It would take many months to do the upgrade, to do the evaluations, et cetera.

Again, I think the best approach would be to allow the Department of the Army to make a judgment, to reprogram, if necessary, and to get this moving.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1522, offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Alexander	Enzi	Murray
Ayotte	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Flake	Peters
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Cantwell	Heinrich	Rounds
Capito	Hirono	Sasse
Casey	Hoeven	Scott
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Stabenow
Collins	King	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	
Donnelly	Murkowski	

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Kaine	Reid
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Sanders
Booker	Leahy	Schatz
Brown	Manchin	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Shaheen
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	
Heitkamp	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Boxer	Heller	Warner
Graham	Rubio	

The amendment (No. 1522) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1540

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on amendment No. 1540, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, for Mr. BENNET.

If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1473.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1473 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the retirement of Army combat units)

On page 38, line 12, insert after ''**FIGHTER AIRCRAFT**'' the following: ''**AND ARMY COMBAT UNITS**''.

On page 43, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(e) MINIMUM NUMBER OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—Section 3062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall maintain a total number of brigade combat teams for the regular and reserve components of the Army of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

''(2) In this subsection, the term ' brigade combat team' means any unit that consists of—

''(A) an arms branch maneuver brigade;

''(B) its assigned support units; and

''(C) its assigned fire teams''.

(f) LIMITATION ON ELIMINATION OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—

(1) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not proceed with any decision to reduce the number of brigade combat teams for the regular Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT.—The Secretary may not eliminate any brigade combat team from the brigade combat teams of the regular Army as of the date of the enactment of this Act until the later of the following:

(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required under paragraph (3).

(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(i) the elimination of Army brigade combat teams will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy; and

(ii) the reduction of such combat teams does not reduce the total number of brigade combat teams of the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

(3) REPORT ON ELIMINATION OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) The rationale for any proposed reduction of the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), and an operational analysis of the total strength of the Army that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the personnel of the Army so reduced.

(B) An assessment of the implications for the Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve of the force mix ratio of Army troop strengths and combat units after such reduction.

(C) Such other matters relating to the reduction of the total strength of the Army as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days before the date on which the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, is reduced below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with (where applicable) the Director of the Army National Guard or Chief of the Army Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the reduction.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each major combat unit of the Army that will remain after the reduction, organized by division and enumerated down to the brigade combat team-level or its equivalent, including for each such brigade combat team—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(B) A list of each brigade combat team proposed for disestablishment, including for each such unit—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B)(ii), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed disestablishment.

(E) A description of any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B).

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I will return to the floor soon to lay out more fully what this amendment does. Fundamentally, it tries to protect our force structure, our personnel and, in particular, the core component of brigade combat teams as the Pentagon—the Defense Department—deals with curtailed resources.

I am very concerned, as are so many of us, that as defense budgets are cut, personnel and core resources in terms of end strength, including brigade combat teams, will suffer cuts that go well beyond fat and into meat and bone. We need to limit that. We need to avoid that. This amendment would do that with regard to brigade combat teams.

It does not increase spending. It retains as much flexibility as possible for the Department of Defense. I think it meets an important goal in a balanced and reasonable way. I look forward to continuing this discussion toward a vote in favor of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, for the benefit of Members, and in agreement with Senator REED, we will be having the Shaheen amendment, followed by side-by-side Markey and Cornyn amendments. And those votes, we are planning on, but haven't confirmed, will probably be at around 1:45 p.m., and that would complete our activities. That is not totally agreed to, but that is the plan.

Mr. REED. Madam President, also I believe we anticipate taking up by voice vote the Tillis amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. We will voice vote the Tillis amendment, and we will be looking, hopefully, at a manager's package, as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 1494

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise to discuss amendment No. 1494, which I believe would move our Nation one step closer toward finally securing equal protection under the law for veterans in the United States. I thank the other cosponsors of this amendment, Senators LEAHY, DURBIN, BROWN, HIRONO, BLUMENTHAL, BALDWIN, SCHATZ, PETERS, GILLIBRAND, MARKEY, WHITEHOUSE, COONS, WYDEN, FRANKEN, MURPHY, MURRAY, and BOXER.

This amendment would end the current prohibition on benefits for gay and lesbian veterans and their families who live in States that do not recognize same-sex marriage. My amendment is based on the Charlie Morgan Military Spouses Equal Treatment Act, which I was proud to reintroduce earlier this year.

The bill is named for Charlie Morgan, a former soldier and chief warrant officer in the New Hampshire National Guard and the Kentucky National Guard. Charlie was a military veteran with a career spanning more than 30 years. I first met Charlie in 2011. She was on her way home from deployment in Kuwait, and she had just been diagnosed for a second time with breast cancer. Concerned for her wife Karen and their young daughter's well-being, Charlie became an outspoken critic of the Defense of Marriage Act, which at the time prohibited her spouse and child from receiving the benefits that she had earned during her service.

Sadly, Charlie did not live to see the Supreme Court overturn the Defense of Marriage Act in 2013. However, because of her example, her leadership, and her courageous advocacy, our Nation took another historic step toward ensuring equal treatment and civil rights for all.

Despite the Supreme Court's overturning the Defense of Marriage Act, there are still provisions remaining in the U.S. Code that deny equal treatment to LGBT families. One of those provisions is in title 38, which deals with veterans benefits.

Today, if you are a gay veteran living in a State such as New Hampshire that recognizes same-sex marriage, your family is entitled to all the benefits you have earned through your military service. However, a veteran with the exact same status, the same service record, the same injuries, the same family obligations, but living in a State that does not recognize same-sex marriage will receive less.

The impact of this discrimination is very real. Monthly benefits are less, spouses and children are not eligible for medical care at the VA, and families are not eligible for the same death benefits.

There are even reports that the VA has required gay veterans to pay back benefits because their State will not recognize their marriage. In one case, a young woman—a 50-percent disabled combat veteran—was initially approved for benefits for her wife and child but later told by the VA that because of where she lived and whom she

loved, she was not only going to lose a portion of her benefits but the VA was also going to withhold her future payments until she paid the VA back. This is just disgraceful—to cut the benefits earned by a combat veteran and then also require that she pay back the VA, all because of whom she married and where she lives. Perhaps the most frustrating part of this story is knowing that if this woman moved across the border to another State, she would have no problems with the VA.

My amendment would fix this issue for these men and women who have volunteered to serve in our Armed Forces. They have volunteered to put themselves in harm's way, to leave their families and their homes, and to travel around the world to protect America and our way of life. Yet they are being deprived of the very rights they have risked their lives to protect.

So again, let's be clear what we are talking about. The Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional to deny Federal benefits to legally married, same-sex couples and their children. Yet, due to unrelated provisions of the Federal Code, State legislatures have the ability to indirectly deny Federal benefits to certain disabled veterans and their families solely because they are in a same-sex marriage. It is unjust and, according to the Supreme Court, it is unconstitutional.

Now, my amendment is not new to the Senate. Last Congress the Veterans' Affairs Committee approved it by a voice vote, and earlier this year, 57 Senators voted in favor of a budget resolution amendment on this issue. Now, when we vote—hopefully very soon on this amendment—Senators will have the opportunity to end an unjust and unconstitutional provision of law that discriminates against veterans.

Many of us talk about the need to honor the service of our veterans and to make sure they have access to the care they deserve, and we should all do that. But if you believe that all veterans, regardless of their sexual orientation, deserve equal access to the benefits they have risked their lives for, regardless of where they live, then you will vote in favor of this amendment.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of this amendment when it comes up for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to commend the Senator from New Hampshire. I think one of the best indications of the appropriate direction of this policy is that the Department of Defense extends benefits regardless of State law to all military personnel. Consistent with the Department of Defense, this should be done by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

So I commend the Senator. I think it is the right thing to do and the consistent thing to do and the logical thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I thank Senator REED, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, who has a distinguished military career of his own, for his support of this effort and his understanding of how important this is to so many veterans who have served.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 1645 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up the following amendment: Markey No. 1645.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] proposes an amendment numbered 1645 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EXPORTS OF CRUDE OIL.

It is the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to allies and partners of the United States should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest and the purposes of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, what we are about to do is have a discussion about whether the United States of America should start exporting our oil—exporting our oil.

The United States right now, along with China, is the largest importer of oil in the world. We are not exactly at but very near to the level of imports of oil in our country that we were back in 1975 when we put a ban on the exportation of oil in our country.

Why is that important? It is important for a lot of reasons. No. 1, if we begin to export our oil in the United States, a new Barclays report found that the U.S. consumer last year saved $11.4 billion at the pump because of the lowest U.S. crude prices in a long time, and we would potentially save upwards of $10 billion in prices for consumers at the pump in the United States of America.

We understand the oil industry. Here is what happens. The world price is set. It is called the Brent price. The Brent price is the world price of oil. That price is traditionally higher, much higher than the price of crude oil in the United States that is produced in the United States. That is West Texas intermediate. That is a price set in Cushing, OK.

If you are an oil company, you want to get our U.S. crude out on the world market because they will then be able to sell it for a much higher price. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with that is that the American consumers will not get that oil at the lower price, and we will still have to import oil into our country because we are still short by millions of barrels of oil per day.

The consumer in America is the one who will be paying this tax on their price at the pump. That is the essence of what this whole strategy is about. It is to get the oil companies the highest price for the oil which is on the world market. But who is going to pay? Who is going to have their pockets tipped upside down at the pump and have money shaken out of them so they have to pay a higher price? It will be the consumers.

If we want to give more money to the defense budget, let's just do it. Let's have a big debate about increasing the defense budget. Let's have that debate. But let's not have the American consumer at the pump be a special tax that is imposed in order to help our allies overseas. Ultimately, of course, there is a beautiful access there where the oil industry is saying: Yes, sir, we are willing to put our crude oil on ships and send it overseas.

It is just a bad, bad economic policy for our country. We are already paying a high price at home. This exportation of our oil would also defy what our own Department of Energy is saying. Our Department of Energy is saying that in 2020, our oil production in America is going to peak, and then we are going to begin to go down once again in our oil production.

Who is saying this? Our Government. Who is saying this? The Energy Information Administration of the United States of America. What we are engaging in here is a premature attempt to export oil with the likelihood that by 2019 and 2020 our oil production is going to start to go down again.

It also hurts our domestic oil refining industry. The Energy Information Administration has found that lifting this ban on the exportation of our own domestic crude could lead to a fundamental reduction in the amount of investment made by the American refining industry here on our own soil. Some $9 billion less would be invested because the oil would be sent overseas. The crude oil would get refined overseas. It would not be refined here in our own country with American workers and American companies doing it here on our own soil, helping our economy here.

This decision, by the way, that Members are going to be asked to make

today is opposed by the AFL–CIO, it is opposed by the steel workers, it is opposed by the League of Conservation Voters, by the Sierra Club, by Public Citizen, and by an entire group of American refiners.

This is no radical coalition that has been put together. It is a broad base of interest in our own country that wants to make America stronger. How in the world can we be strong if we are exporting oil while we are still importing oil? We will have to import the same amount that we are now exporting under this amendment that is being made by the Senator from Texas, and we will wind up with, ultimately, the price being paid by the American consumer at the pump.

From my perspective, this is about as desperate an attempt as the oil industry can have to get out from underneath the 1975 law. They have been looking for an opportunity. But, obviously, the instability in the Middle East should make us very cautious at this time. The oil fields of Saudi Arabia are now very vulnerable. They are right on the border. The Houthis being supported by Iran, right at the bottom of the Red Sea, makes that juncture very vulnerable to a cutoff of oil coming into the world economy. This Shiite-Sunni war is something that we have to be very conscious of because ISIS is targeting those areas in Syria, in Iraq, and in Yemen that have oil resources.

We need a big debate in our country about oil and war in the Middle East. We are at a pivotal point here where the Ottoman Empire and all of the lines that were drawn 100 years ago are being erased and with that the protection of oil resources in the Middle East.

We should not just have a debate on the Senate floor about cavalierly lifting the ban on the exportation of oil. We should have a debate about what this war in country after country and oil area after oil area means for our country.

I would say to you that we should err in a way that is going to protect our own economy. That is what makes us strong. That is what makes it possible for us to project the power around the world. It is that we are the strongest economy in the world, and the indispensable life's blood of economic growth is low-energy cost for every single industry and every single consumer. It puts more money in their pockets.

This decision that the amendment of the Senator from Texas asks us to make will send us in the wrong direction. This is a disaster for consumers in our country. It is a disaster for the refiners in our country, and it is a disaster for the national security of our country. We should keep our resources here at home for American families, American businesses, to enhance our national security using America and our economy as the basis for how we project power around the world. For every barrel of oil that we export, we are going to have to import another barrel of oil from some other place.

We should have the debate here on the Senate floor about where that oil will be coming back into our country because we still need 3 million, 4 million extra barrels of oil a day. That is a national security consideration that we have to deal with. Which country are we going to call up? Which country are we going to ask to send us their oil? What are the implications for our national security of having phone calls go to country after country—probably not just the oil companies but our government beginning new negotiations to get even more oil to come here as we export the oil that we should be keeping here.

The Saudis have been our friends, historically. We have no guarantee that the Saudis are going to even be running that country. Let's be honest about it. Let's talk about that. Let's debate it. ISIS has taken over oil fields in Syria. ISIS has taken over areas of oil production in Iraq. Let's have a debate about that. That is what we should be debating. How is that oil now funding ISIS? How is that oil now being used by Iran, potentially, in Yemen and in other parts of the world to undermine American interests?

In one part of the world, Yemen, we want to back the Sunnis against the Shiites. In Iran, we are backing moderate Sunnis against Shiites. In Iraq we are backing the Shiites against radical Sunnis, trying to get moderate Sunnis to help us. All of it, by the way, is with oil as—if not the central issue, then one of—the central issues in each one of these countries. To have a resolution here today and to be saying that we should be exporting oil—no, ladies and gentlemen, that is not how we should be discussing this issue.

How did we get into the Middle East? We got into the Middle East, yes, protecting Israel, but we got in because of our addiction to oil—not my words, President Bush's words. We have to break our dependence upon imported oil. Increasing fuel economy standards is a big part of it. Having this fracking revolution continue to produce more oil here domestically is a big part of it. Investing in renewables and energy efficiency is a big part of it. But we are still at the earliest stages of this strategy. When we have completed it, when we know we are successful, then let's talk about the generosity that we are going to expect from American consumers at the pump to pay higher prices for gasoline.

Again, this is an issue that the American people overwhelmingly want to see resolved in a way that keeps American oil in America. If we are going to continue to export young men and women from America over to the Middle East, then we should not be exporting our oil at the same time. That makes no sense—no sense. It is disrespectful to the sacrifice young men and women are making in the Middle East in order to protect our interests to start an economic policy of exporting imported oil while we still need to import it.

This issue, to me, is central to our overall long-term national security and economic interests, and I urge an aye vote on the amendment.

I ask for a rollcall on the amendment, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, this morning, Majority Leader MCCONNELL spoke about the skyrocketing costs, the broken promises, and the repeated failures of the President's health care law. He pointed out specifically how so many Americans are facing double-digit premium increases because of ObamaCare. In his home State of Kentucky, some people face proposed increases as high as 25 percent. He noted that some people in Indiana could be hit with a 46-percent jump in their premiums.

So how did Democratic Leader REID respond to the news of double-digit premium increases? He said people are extremely satisfied with health care. He said the people Majority Leader MCCONNELL spoke about are having increases that are ''very, very minimal.'' I wish to repeat that. The Democratic leader, on the floor of the Senate today, called premium increases of 25 and 46 percent very, very minimal. What world is he living in? How on Earth can Senate Democrats believe Americans are satisfied with their health care when they are facing double-digit premium increases? How on Earth can the Senate Democratic leader believe these increases are very, very minimal? They are shocking.

The Democrats have their head in the sand about the health care law. We can pick up Investor's Business Daily, Monday, June 1: ''ObamaCare Deductibles Soaring to $6,500 for Silver-Level Plan.''

Pick up the Wall Street Journal, Friday, May 22: ''Health Insurers Seek Big Increases.''

Investor's Business Daily today: ''ObamaCare Enrollment Mystery: 2 Million Young Adults Missing.'' They are not signing up, and there are plenty of good reasons why. It is not because it is a good deal for them.

No matter how bad it gets, no matter how unaffordable it is, President Obama and the Democrats in Congress absolutely refuse to face the reality. They refuse to help Americans who continue to be hurt by this law.

I wish to speak a little bit about the reality of the law and why Republicans are committed to helping all Americans finally have access to affordable care.

We all remember when President Obama promised that his health care law would cause insurance premiums to go down—down—by an average of $2,500 per year, per family. So where do we stand now? A couple of weeks ago was the deadline for insurance companies to say what they intended to charge people for health care next year. This is the first time companies have been able to set their prices based on a full year of information about how much ObamaCare actually costs. From what we have seen so far, the cost is enormous. A lot of Americans are going to be shocked by how much more their health insurance will be.

These higher premiums are just the latest evidence that ObamaCare is an expensive failure. We have seen reports about the largest insurance company in New Mexico saying it wants to raise rates by almost 52 percent next year. The biggest insurer in Tennessee wants to raise its rates 36 percent. In Maryland, the largest insurer is planning to increase premiums by more than 30 percent. Yet, we hear Senator REID on the floor of the Senate this morning saying these things don't matter.

People who are in the President's home State of Illinois right now are facing an average premium increase of 30 percent. It seems as though there is another headline every day about how expensive health care insurance is becoming.

The Wall Street Journal Tuesday: ''Insurers Seek Big Premium Increases.''

I know there are some supporters of the law who like to say lots of people have insurance under ObamaCare. How many of them are actually going to be paying these double-digit rate increases next year because of ObamaCare? That is what Americans want to know.

On Monday, the Obama administration released information on rate hikes for people living in about 41 States. It turns out that 676 different insurance plans—different ObamaCare insurance plans—offered for sale in these 41 States plan to raise their rates by double digits—by at least double digits. The average increase is 21 percent. About 6 million people getting their insurance from these plans will face double-digit rate increases next year. Do Democrats who voted for ObamaCare think a 21-percent rate increase is affordable? Do they think a double-digit premium increase will help these 6 million hard-working Americans?

These numbers are so large, it is hard to even understand what they mean for a typical person. What does it mean that health insurance policies in Maryland might have an average rate increase of 30 percent? How does that impact someone's life, their quality of life?

Let's say there is a 40-year-old nonsmoker living in Annapolis, MD. He buys a silver plan from CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield, which is the biggest insurer in Maryland and the most popular kind of plan. According to the Wall Street Journal study, those rates would go from about $2,900 for the year to nearly $3,700 next year. That is an $800-a-year increase. The President promised it would go down $2,500, and now it has gone up $800. That is how expensive ObamaCare has become. It is far more costly than people thought it was going to be, than the insurers thought it was going to cost, and far more costly than the American people were told it was going to be.

I have heard some Democrats who support this law say these are just the requested rates. They say we shouldn't worry because State insurance agencies won't allow these huge rate increases to take effect. Well, CareFirst, the company in Maryland that wants a 30-percent rate increase next year, raised its rates 16 percent last year. Hard-working people across the country are going to have to pay these enormous premiums because the President mandates they buy it. And many of them still won't be able to actually use their insurance because the deductibles and the copays are so high. This year, the average deductible for an ObamaCare silver plan is almost $3,000 per person and more than $6,000 per family.

One has to ask, why are costs going up so much so fast? That is what a radio station in Kansas City, MO, KCUR-FM, asked. They reported last week, on May 27, that premiums for some plans in Kansas are going to go up 38 percent. According to the radio station, the increases ''appear to be driven by requirements in the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare.'' That is what they report.

The Kansas State Insurance Department said it was because of things like all of the coverage mandates in the law. Families are now paying for coverage that is more than they need, more than they want, and more than they can afford. A spokesman for the State insurance agency in the State of Kansas told the radio station, ''These things cost money.''

What do people think about these enormous increases in their premiums? Are people happy because of all the extra money they have to pay because of Obamacare?

Let's look at Connecticut. In Connecticut, they have been writing to the State insurance department, and they are angry and frustrated about the Obamacare price hikes.

One person wrote, ''I find it outrageous that the rates for 2016 are going to increase by 6.7 percent,'' which was the request in Connecticut. The person goes on:

> Where do you think that I am going to get that money? I do not get a raise every year based on your ''every year'' rate increases.

So this is somebody who is having a hard time with a rate increase of only 6.7 percent. Imagine how tough it is going to be for families all around the country who will have to pay 20 or 30 or 40 percent more next year for their Obamacare-mandated insurance. Thousands of families across the country are facing these shocking rate increases, and it might be just the beginning.

Sometime this month, the Supreme Court is expected to decide an important case called King v. Burwell. This case is about the subsidies some people get to pay Obamacare's alarmingly high costs. The health care law said that Washington could subsidize the premiums of people who buy insurance through its exchanges established by the States. President Obama knew that wouldn't be enough because he knew his law was going to make insurance premiums skyrocket, so he told his administration to use taxpayer dollars to subsidize insurance in the Federal exchange as well. Democrats in Congress wrote the law to allow subsidies for one group, and then the President then decided to pay them out for another group. So if the Supreme Court decides that the President overstepped his authority, there are going to be a lot of people who could be facing paying the full cost of their Obamacare plans without the subsidy. They are going to see just how expensive this Obamacare insurance is and just how destructive the Democrats' health care law has been.

Let's face it. In spite of what the minority leader says on the floor of the Senate, Obamacare has been a disaster. It is bad for patients. It is bad for providers. It has been terrible for the American taxpayers, hard-working Americans who work every day to try to put food on the table and pay their taxes.

Republicans are offering better solutions, real solutions that will end these outrageous and expensive Obamacare side effects. That means giving Americans freedom, choice, and control over their health care decisions. Republicans understand that hard-working American families can't afford Obamacare any longer.

Democrats need to admit that their health care law has been and continues to be an expensive failure. If they are ready to do that, then Republicans will work with them to help give people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise today to speak on my amendment No. 1578, the Military Justice Improvement Act, to ensure that survivors of military sexual assault have access to an unbiased and professionalized military justice system.

Last year, despite earning the support of 55 Senators—a coalition spanning the entire ideological spectrum,

including both the majority and minority leader—our bill to create an independent military justice system, free of the inherent bias and conflicts of interest within the chain of command, fell short of overcoming the 60-vote filibuster threshold. But, as we said then, we will not walk away. We will continue to fight to strengthen our military because that is our duty.

It is our oversight role in Congress to act as if the brave survivors are our sons and daughters, our spouses who are being betrayed by the greatest military on Earth. We owe them at least that.

Over the last few years, Congress has forced the military to make many incremental changes to address this crisis. After two decades of complete failure and lipservice to ''zero tolerance,'' the military now says essentially: Trust us. We have got this.

They spin the data, hoping nobody will dig below the top line because when you do, the clear conclusion is that survivors still have little faith in the system and that the military has not actually made a dent in the problem. Even after much-lauded reforms, the estimate for 2014 is 20,000 cases of sexual assault and unwanted sexual contact—the same level as 2010—an average of 52 a day. A much-touted reform made retaliation a crime. That made a lot of sense, but a sky-high 62-percent retaliation rate remains unchanged from 2 years ago.

The system remains plagued with distrust and does not provide the fair and just process the survivors deserve. Simply put, the military has not held up to the standards posed by General Dempsey 1 year ago when he said, ''We are on the clock if you will . . . the President said to us in December, you've got about a year to review this thing . . . and if we haven't been able to demonstrate we are making a difference, you know, then we deserve to be held to the scrutiny and standard.''

So I am urging my colleagues to hold the military to that standard. Enough is enough with the spin, the excuses, and the promises, because throughout the last year, we have continued to see new evidence of how much further we actually have to go to solve this problem.

We have a very simple choice. We can keep waiting, hoping that the reforms we put in place—that we actually forced the military to put in place—will somehow restore trust in the system, while an average of 52 new lives are shattered every day, three-quarters of whom will never come forward because they see what happens around them and they don't trust the system and don't see how justice is possible because commanders hold all the cards, or we can do the right thing and act.

We can accept a system where, according to the DOD themselves, three out of four servicewomen and nearly half of servicemen say sexual harassment is common or very common or we can do the right thing and act.

We can accept a system where women who were sexually harassed were 1,400 percent more likely to be sexually assaulted that same year or we can act.

We can accept a climate where supervisors and unit leaders were responsible for sexual harassment and gender discrimination in nearly 60 percent of all cases or we can act.

My friends, I believe it is time that we provide our servicemembers with an unbiased justice system, one that is professionalized, where the decision-maker is trained in military justice. It is time to finally listen to the survivors who have told us over and over again that this reform is required to instill long-lost confidence in the system.

It is very much time to do the right thing and act because every time we look at this problem, it seems to get worse. My office just reviewed 107 sexual assault case files from the largest base in each of the services. We requested these files, and that was for 1 year of sexual assaults. We requested the data to understand what actually happens once the reports are filed, how they are investigated, and how they move forward within the military justice system to see if there is any other challenges we have to address. It took the Pentagon a year to respond to my document request. These 107 files are just a snapshot of the thousands of estimated cases that occur annually.

What we found, which was unexpected, was an alarming rate of assaults among two survivor groups who are not represented in the DOD survey. The DOD survey is all servicemembers. But what we found is that civilian women and military spouses are not counted in that survey, and of these 107 cases, in 53 percent of them, the survivor was either a military spouse or a civilian. These two categories of survivors are hidden in the shadows.

According to the DOD themselves, the real scope of this problem, unfortunately, is much larger than the 20,000 that were estimated for last year alone. These obviously aren't just numbers; these are real lives being broken, and they deserve a fair shot at justice.

It should disturb everyone in this Chamber that instead of hope for justice at these four military bases, nearly half of the survivors who initially filed a complaint—some of them going through the medical exam, going through testimony, going through evidence—nearly half who filed withdrew their complaint during the process before trial. What does that tell us? Is there a form of retaliation taking place? Is it just a lack of faith in the system? To have about half of these cases not move forward is very troubling.

Even when a case did move forward, just over 20 percent of them went to trial, and only 10 percent of these cases resulted in sexual assault convictions with penalties of confinement and dishonorable discharge. Ten percent. Only 10 percent ended in conviction. The cases that did proceed to trial but failed to obtain a sexual assault conviction typically resulted in a more lenient penalty, such as reduction in rank or docked pay.

There was a new report published by the Human Rights Watch. They issued a report which told us that servicemembers who reported a sexual assault were 12 times more likely to suffer retaliation than to see their offender get convicted of the sexual offense. Let me repeat that. A survivor who reports a sexual assault is 12 times more likely to see retaliation than to see justice. How can anyone say this is a system our survivors can actually have faith in?

Despite the DOD's reported 62 percent retaliation rate—and this is so troubling—there was not evidence of a single serious disciplinary action against anyone for retaliation. Not one. There was not one disciplinary action for 62 percent of survivors who were retaliated against. That borders on the impossible. But the reality is, without independent review, we are actually relying on commanders to charge themselves with retaliation. It doesn't make any sense.

According to the DOD's own SAPRO report, retaliation remains at 62 percent for women. Over one-third experienced administrative action, and 40 percent faced other forms of professional retaliation. That means your job changes in some meaningful way.

DOD admits they have made zero progress since 2012.

The carefully crafted and widely bipartisan Military Justice Improvement Act is designed to reduce the systemic failure that survivors of military sexual assault describe, in deciding whether to report the crimes committed against them, due to the bias and inherent conflicts of interest posed by the military chain of command's current sole decisionmaking power over whether a case moves forward. This reform actually protects both the victim and the accused. We do not want to see an innocent person convicted any more than we want to see a guilty person go free.

Due process, professionalism, training, equal opportunity to justice is how we restore a broken system. It is time to move the sole decisionmaking power over whether serious crimes akin to a felony go to trial from the chain of command into the hands of nonbiased, professionally trained military prosecutors, where it belongs. And we do this while leaving military crime in the chain of command. So we completely carve-out anything that is military-related, such as missing in action or not honoring a command. In fact, the decision whether to prosecute the vast majority of crimes, including 37 serious crimes uniquely military in nature, plus all punishable crimes that have less than a year of confinement as a penalty, remain in the chain of command.

The brave men and women we sent to war to keep us safe deserve nothing

less than a justice system that is actually equal to their sacrifice. We owe that at least to them.

Thank you, Madam President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise in support of the NDAA that is on the floor now but also in strong support of an amendment that has been offered by Senator REED of Rhode Island to the NDAA. Actually, I have a deja vu feeling in the speech, because the speech is largely about what I gave as my maiden speech in February of 2013; that is, the BCA budget caps and sequester.

To begin, before I focus on the amendment from my colleague from Rhode Island, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, I do think there is a lot of good policy in the NDAA. We worked on it together. That committee process is a productive one. I think we always find a great degree of bipartisanship as we are trying to tackle the programmatic description of our Nation's military budget and support. There is much good policy, acquisition reform, and other key reforms that are part of this budget. There are some items that I feel very strongly about dealing with shipbuilding and ship repair.

I think it is great that we are having the debate on the floor. We have had NDAAs passed, but we have not had a lot of floor time on them in 2013 and 2014. So the fact that we have are having this debate about the critical nature of our Nation's defense and the authorizing bill on the floor is very positive.

There are some aspects of the NDAA that I do not like. There are some items that I wish were in there but that are not. That is part of the process. I think we could all say that, but I am glad we are having the debate on the floor. However, the item that is in the NDAA that I have the greatest concern about is the use of what I consider a flagrant budget gimmick to sneak by defense spending caps that were imposed by the 2011 Budget Control Act.

I think the gimmick is a serious one and a challenging one. The gimmick is dishonest. It is bad for the Nation's defense. It is also bad for America's nondefense priorities.

The good news is that the budget can be fixed. My colleague from Rhode Island, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, has a proposal to fix it. The proposal was offered in committee and rejected, and it has been offered again on the floor. I want to describe it and explain why I strongly support it.

First, there is the gimmick itself. Just for the public on this, in August of 2011, before either I or the Presiding officer were in the body, Congress passed the Budget Control Act that imposed a set of draconian budget caps on defense and nondefense spending as a punishment, in case Congress did not find a grand budget deal. So the wisdom of this body at the time was that we will sort of punish ourselves unless we can find a budget deal. I describe that colloquially as if we don't do something smart, we will do something stupid.

Well, Congress did not do something smart. There wasn't the grand budget deal that many hoped there would be. So on March 1, 2013, budget caps went into effect that put a significant crimp in both the defense and nondefense items in the Nation's budget. The first speech I gave on the floor was in February 2013. After my first State recess week, I traveled around and I heard my constituents talk about how bad these caps would be, especially for the Nation's defense. I stood up and just shared what my constituents had described to me. But, nevertheless, the caps went into effect and we agreed, through the early 2020s, to limit in a very significant and tough way both defense and nondefense spending.

So what is the gimmick that is in this NDAA that is on the floor today?

A decision was made that the world has changed since August 2011. ISIL has grown up and is gobbling up acres and square miles of territory. We are battling against Ebola, as we were earlier in the year. North Korea is cyberattacking major American corporations. Vladimir Putin has moved into Ukraine and is threatening other nations.

There are a lot of challenges. So it was the wisdom first of the President, in submitting the fiscal year 2016 budget, and then of the Armed Services Committee that living under the sequester defense caps was a bad idea. It would be a bad idea for the Nation. But instead of just saying: OK, the caps are a bad idea; let's adjust the cap—which we can do with 60 votes in this body and the concurrence of the House—a decision was made: Let's not adjust the cap, let's end-run the cap.

So we want to exceed the cap. We want to exceed it by $38 billion in fiscal year 2016. But rather than adjust the cap, let's do this: Let's just take $38 billion that the Nation needs to be safe, and we will put it in what is called the OCO account, Overseas Contingency Operations. It is something that is not subject to the cap. It is supposed to be used for core warfighting activity. But the $38 billion does not represent core warfighting.

We spent $2 billion in the last year, for example, in the war on ISIL. We are not going to spend $38 billion in the next year. No, instead, we are going to fund all kinds of nonemergency, noncontingency, nonwarfighting expenditures that would require an adjustment of the cap, and we are just going to put them into the OCO account, kind of a slush fund. By doing that, we end-run the law of Congress, the Budget Control Act.

I asserted, and I strongly believe, that this is dishonest, it is bad for defense, and it is bad for the nondefense accounts. It is dishonest. It is dishonest because, if we need this money for defense, we should fix the budget control caps. That is what we should do. We should not call expenditures for daily operations that are not core warfighting part of the OCO account. That violates the way the OCO account has been treated.

Once we go down that path, we are going to see everything going into the OCO account, and we will really end-run. So we are not being honest with ourselves, but especially, since we all know what the game is, we are not being honest with the public.

Second, putting this money, the $38 billion, in the OCO account is bad for defense. Defense needs the ability to plan. If we put the money in the OCO account, is it going to be here next year? Is it not going to be here? There is sort of a wink and a nod that it will probably be here. We ought to be acknowledging that these funds are needed in the base defense budget so that our DOD personnel can plan that it will be there in the future, because that is probably our intent. It is bad for defense to put this in this OCO account.

Third, it is bad for the nondefense accounts. If we are going to say that the BCA caps are bad, we should adjust them. Instead of using an end run, let's adjust them. Let's adjust them not just for the defense accounts but also for the nondefense accounts, because, as the Presiding Officer and my colleagues here know, the nondefense accounts are critical to the Nation's defense.

The FBI is nondefense. It is critical to the Nation's defense. Homeland Security is critical to the Nation's defense. In the Department of Energy, much of the research we do is for the reactors on nuclear carriers and nuclear subs. Those get cut by budget cups. They are critical to defense. We ought to be lifting the caps on the nondefense accounts, as well.

So the gimmick that is used is a gimmick. It is dishonest. It hurts defense. It hurts nondefense accounts that are important to the Nation. Good news—there is a solution. We are doing this because we do not like the budget caps. That is why we are doing this. That is why we are using the OCO gimmick. If we don't like the budget caps, we should fix them. We should find the 2015 version of the Murray-Ryan budget deal that was reached in December of 2013, where we agreed to adjust the budget caps. That deal accepted part of sequester. It absorbed sequester cuts. But it also found targeted ways to provide relief, both to defense and nondefense accounts. That is what we should be doing. We should be showing the same leadership that was shown in 2013.

I rise to say that the amendment that my colleague from Rhode Island, our ranking member, proposes does exactly that. It does exactly that. It takes the $38 billion that is in our budget, which I believe should be spent on defense, and it says that this money should be spent on defense, but it should be spent the right way, as part of a base budget, not as part of OCO.

It puts a fence around those dollars and says that the money is there, and it is there for defense because the Nation needs it. But the fence will keep the money from being utilized until we fix the BCA caps on both the defense and nondefense accounts.

If we do fix the BCA caps, that money will be available. Because of language included by the chair of the committee in the markup, fixing the budget caps would move the money from the OCO account into the defense base budget where it should be. I think we all know what the right answer is here, which is for this $38 billion to be used to protect the Nation but to be part of the base budget, not the OCO account. To get there we need to fix the BCA caps across the board for defense and nondefense. The Reed amendment would accomplish that. That is the reason that I am on the floor today, to praise the debate on the NDAA but to say this is the right way to keep our Nation safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. today, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments: Shaheen No. 1494, spouse definition; Tillis No. 1506, C–130 aircraft; further, that there be no second-degree amendments in order to any of those amendments prior to the votes, and that the Shaheen amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, on behalf of Senator PAUL of Kentucky, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1543.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I rise with my friend from Arizona, Senator FLAKE, to speak about an amendment that he and I and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut have as part of this pending legislation.

Along with sports fans across America, I was appalled to learn last month that many of the ceremonies honoring members of our armed services at NFL games are not actually being conducted out of a sense of patriotism but for profit in the form of millions of dollars in taxpayers' money going from the Department of Defense to wealthy NFL franchises.

In fact, NFL teams have received nearly $7 million in taxpayer dollars over the last 3 years from contracts with the Army National Guard, which include public tributes to American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. Our amendment would put an end to this shameful practice and ask the NFL to return those profits to charities supporting our troops, veterans, and their families.

All Americans can agree that sports unite us, especially football. For generations, football has brought together people from every walk of life—from the first organized American football game between Rutgers and Princeton in 1869 to Super Bowl XLIX played in the great State of Arizona this February, which attracted more than 100 million television viewers, the most watched TV program in history.

Football has been a uniting force for our Nation. Every weekend, from peewee to high school, college, and the NFL, for good seasons and bad, in common cause and bitter rivalry, millions of passionate fans have bonded together. For many Americans, football is deeply patriotic and woven into the very fabric of our country's unique history and heritage. For several weeks every fall, this patriotic spirit grows when the NFL takes time to honor the service and sacrifice of the brave young Americans serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Teams wear special camouflage uniforms, hold special game-day programming under the theme ''Salute to Service.'' We have all been heartened by these patriotic displays, from the giant oversized flags and color guard pregame performances to half time tributes to our hometown heroes. Every fan, whether united by team or divided by rivalry, comes together to thank those who have served and sacrificed on our Nation's behalf.

That is why I and so many other Americans were shocked and disappointed to learn that several NFL teams were not sponsoring these activities out of the goodness of their own hearts but were doing so to make an extra buck, taking money from American taxpayers in exchange for honoring American troops. That means many of the color guard performances and troop recognition ceremonies were actually funded with American tax dollars and pocketed by wealthy NFL teams.

For example, the Army National Guard spent $675,000 under contracts with the New England Patriots—hardly a deprived franchise—that included a program called ''True Patriot,'' in which the team honored Guard soldiers at half-time shows during home games.

Other contracts funded color guard performances, flag ceremonies, and appearance fees to players for honoring local high school coaches and visiting students.

According to the information my office has received from the Army National Guard, the NFL received nearly $7 million in taxpayer dollars over the last 3 years from Guard contracts for activities including: pregame color guard ceremonies, pregame reenlistment ceremonies, pregame onfield American flag rollouts, ingame flag runners, half-time soldier recognition ceremonies, Guard-sponsored high school Player of the Week and Coach of the Week awards, and Guard-sponsored player appearances at local high schools.

The following teams had contracts in the past 3 years, according to the Army National Guard: Atlanta Falcons, $579,500; Baltimore Ravens, $350,000; Buffalo Bills, $550,000; Chicago Bears, $443,000; Cincinnati Bengals, $117,000; Dallas Cowboys, $262,500; Denver Broncos, $460,000; Detroit Lions, $193,000; Green Bay Packers, $300,000; Indianapolis Colts, $400,000; Miami Dolphins, Tampa Bay Buccaneers, and Jacksonville Jaguars, $160,000; Minnesota Vikings, $410,000; New Orleans Saints, $307,000; New York Jets, $212,500; Oakland Raiders, $275,000; Pittsburgh Steelers, $217,000; St. Louis Rams and Kansas City Chiefs, $60,000; San Diego Chargers, $453,500; San Francisco 49ers, $125,000; and Seattle Seahawks, $393,500.

What makes these expenditures all the more troubling is at the same time the Guard was spending millions on pro-sports advertising, it was also running out of money for critical training for our troops. In fact, at the end of fiscal year 2014, the National Guard Bureau and Army National Guard announced they were facing a $101 million shortfall in the account used to pay National Guardsmen and could face a delay in critical training and drills because they couldn't afford to pay soldiers. Despite the fact that the Guard was facing serious threats to meeting its primary mission and paying its current soldiers, it was spending millions of taxpayer dollars on speakership and advertising deals with professional sports leagues, such as the NFL.

This is obviously unacceptable. Providing for our common defense is the highest duty of the Federal Government. At a time of crippling budget cuts under sequestration, the Defense Department cannot afford to waste its limited resources for the benefit of sports leagues that rake in billions of dollars a year. Each of the four service Chiefs have warned before the Senate Armed Services Committee this year that sequestration is damaging our military readiness and putting American lives in danger. We must conserve every precious defense dollar we have at our disposal—which the NDAA does through important reforms to acquisition, military retirement, personnel, headquarters and management, and which our amendment would support by ending taxpayer-funded soldier tributes at professional sporting events.

In addition to ending this shameful practice, this amendment calls upon professional sports leagues like the NFL to donate—to donate—these ill-gotten profits to charities supporting American troops, veterans, and their families.

The NFL raked in revenues totaling some $9.5 billion. The absolute least they can do to begin to make up for this terrible misjudgment is to return those taxpayer dollars to charities supporting our troops, veterans, and military families.

I thank my fellow Senator from the State of Arizona, JEFF FLAKE, who has done terrific oversight of this issue. He was the first to expose it and similar cases of wasteful and excessive government spending.

I also commend Senator BLUMENTHAL for his longstanding commitment to our troops and veterans, as well as the other Members of this body who have supported our amendment.

Again, I thank JEFF FLAKE, who was first to blow the whistle on this egregious use of American tax dollars, and also Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I also thank the senior Senator from Arizona for helping me bring this amendment forward. I am proud to cosponsor it with him and Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I wish to make a couple of points. We have asked the Pentagon for a full accounting, not just NFL teams but other teams that have received such money. We want to make sure this practice stops.

Part of the reason it needs to stop is these teams that were mentioned before by the senior Senator from Arizona and other teams that have received this kind of money do a lot for the military out of the goodness of their heart. They do a lot for the military and for veterans who return, and we shouldn't discount that and don't want to discount that.

The problem is, when some teams are accepting money to do what has been termed ''paid-for patriotism,'' then it cheapens all the other good work that has been done by these sports teams and others. So it is important we stop this practice and make sure that when fans are there and they see this outpouring of support for the military, they know it is genuine—because there is a great deal of patriotism by those who attend these games. We want to make sure people recognize it is done for the right reason, and that is the reason for bringing this amendment forward.

I, again, thank the senior Senator from Arizona for his work on this amendment and other efforts to fight wasteful spending, making sure that the funding that goes to our military and that we appropriate for the Department of Defense—authorize for the Department of Defense—is used for military purposes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I withdraw my request with respect to amendment No. 1543. It is my understanding we will call up this amendment after the votes this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's request is withdrawn.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1506

Mr. REED. Madam President, I wish to comment briefly on the amendment proposed by my colleague from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, with respect to the stationing of the C–130 aircraft at Pope Army Airfield in North Carolina.

The amendment states that these aircraft shall be positioned in Pope Army Airfield. They are C–130 Avionics Modernization Program aircraft, the AMP program. Basically, they are C–130H models that were upgraded. In addition, the Air Force has C–130J models, the newest model. In the give-and-take of the budget deliberations over the last few years, this AMP modernization program is essentially curtailed dramatically because the choice was buying new J models or fixing the old H models.

So, in effect, what we have is a group of C–130 modified aircraft that are at Little Rock Air Force Base. They are only being minimally maintained because these AMP-modified aircraft are not standard. They are different from the traditional hotel model, and they are not as new or as modern as the J model, and they are not being supported with AMP-trained crews or AMP-unique logistics. Logistically, they are at Little Rock Air Force Base and sort of caught up in this funding and programmatic dilemma.

They are not fully deployable because of these conditions. They are just sort of additive to the force structure of the C–130J. There are only three that are modified, with five more to be modified. That would be at $8 million per aircraft for about an additional multimillion dollar pricetag. Therefore, they are not as functional as a unit since there are only three aircraft and not a full complement. To operate these aircraft would require additional resources.

The thrust of the gentleman's amendment is that these aircraft be transferred to Pope Air Force Base in North Carolina, but they would not really be effectively utilized by the forces there and would not, in my view at least, contribute to the training and the real-time operations of the 82nd Airborne Division, the XVIII Airborne Corps, and the special operations forces that are there.

So rather than doing that, what we did in the underlying legislation at section 136 is to go through and quite clearly have a careful review of the adequacy of aircraft to support operations of the paratroop forces at Fort Bragg so that the Air Force is fully supportive of this very important issue. The 82nd is America's most ready Army force, and of course we know special forces operators are all across the globe constantly.

So my comments are that this amendment would not essentially help what I think is the underlying goal, which is to ensure that our airborne forces have the platforms necessary. It would, in fact, restrict the flexibility of the Air Force in terms of using C–130 aircraft. It would practically have the effect of simply taking aircraft that because of their modification and their nonstandardization are being parked at Little Rock and moving them without effect, I think, on the operational capacity and capabilities of our airborne forces.

So as a result, I believe our best approach is to stay with the language in the underlying bill, section 136, which—to the credit of Senator TILLIS, he was very adamant about including—would have a careful review of the operational capacity of the Air Force to support the airborne operations.

It would include the ability of commanders from the corps level, XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd, Special Operations Command, to comment effectively on whether the Air Force was doing this. After such a review and analysis, we could make better decisions about the allocation of the Air Force aircraft.

Again, ironically—and again it strikes me that simply moving these aircraft—which are sort of one-of-a-kind aircraft—to Pope would not help the airborne operations of our military forces. They would simply involve additional cost, and they would not be part of the ability of our Air Force and our mobility command to support a wide range of missions. They would complicate, rather than simplify, our ability to respond.

So for that, when this vote, which is scheduled later today, comes up for a vote, I will oppose it, and I will do so because I believe—in the underlying legislation, through the work of Senator TILLIS particularly—we have an appropriate response to the issue of flexibility, mobility, and operational capacity of our airborne forces at Fort Bragg.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GRIEVING FOR THE BIDEN FAMILY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, when a child predeceases the parent, it is a grievous occasion, and we have been grieving for the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, for what he has been going through—his whole family.

It is my belief JOE BIDEN has known for some period of time the progression of his son, Beau's, cancer and, as a result, he has continued to carry on his public duties while at the same time carrying this huge burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech JOE BIDEN made to the Yale graduating class about 2 weeks ago on Class Day.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT YALE UNIVERSITY CLASS DAY, YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Hello, Yale! (Applause.) Great to see you all. (Applause.) Thank you very, very much.

Jeremy and Kiki, the entire Class of 2015, congratulations and thank you for inviting me to be part of this special day. You're talented. You've worked hard, and you've earned this day.

Mr. President, faculty, staff, it's an honor to be here with all of you.

My wife teaches full-time. I want you to know that—at a community college, and has attended 8,640 commencements and/or the similar versions of Class Day, and I know they can hardly wait for the speaker to finish. (Laughter.) But I'll do my best as quickly as I can.

To the parents, grandparents, siblings, family members, the Class of 2015—congratulations. I know how proud you must be. But, the Class of 2015, before I speak to you—please stand and applaud the ones who loved you no matter what you're wearing on your head and who really made this day happen. (Laughter and applause.) I promise you all this is a bigger day for them than it is for you. (Laughter.)

When President Obama asked me to be his Vice President, I said I only had two conditions: One, I wouldn't wear any funny hats, even on Class Day. (Laughter.) And two, I wouldn't change my brand. (Applause.)

Now, look, I realize no one ever doubts I mean what I say, the problem occasionally is I say all that I mean. (Laughter.) I have a bad reputation for being straight. Sometimes an inappropriate times. (Laughter.) So here it goes. Let's get a couple things straight right off the bat: Corvettes are better than Porsches; they're quicker and they corner as well. (Laughter and applause.) And sorry, guys, a cappella is not better than rock and roll. (Laughter and applause.) And your pundits are better than Washington pundits, although I've noticed neither has any shame at all. (Laughter and applause.) And all roads lead to Toads? Give me a break. (Laughter and applause.) You ever tried it on Monday night? (Laughter.) Look, it's tough to end a great men's basketball and football season. One touchdown away from beating Harvard this year for the first time since 2006—so close to something you've wanted for eight years. I can only imagine how you feel. (Laughter.) I can only imagine. (Applause.) So close. So close.

But I got to be honest with you, when the invitation came, I was flattered, but it caused a little bit of a problem in my extended family. It forced me to face some hard truths. My son, Beau, the attorney general of Delaware, my daughter, Ashley Biden, runs a nonprofit for criminal justice in the state, they both went to Penn. My two nieces graduated from Harvard, one an all-American. All of them think my being here was a very bad idea. (Laughter.)

On the other hand, my other son, Hunter, who heads the World Food Program USA, graduated from Yale Law School. (Applause.) Now, he thought it's a great idea. But then again, law graduates always think all of their ideas are great ideas. (Laughter.)

By the way, I've had a lot of law graduates from Yale work for me. That's not too far from the truth. But anyway, look, the truth of the matter is that I have a lot of staff that are Yale graduates, several are with me today. They thought it was a great idea that I speak here.

As a matter of fact, my former national security advisor, Jake Sullivan, who is teaching here at Yale Law School, trained in international relations at Yale College, edited the Yale Daily News, and graduated from Harvard—excuse me, Freudian slip—Yale Law School. (Laughter.) You're lucky to have him. He's a brilliant and decent and honorable man. And I miss him. And we miss him as my national security advisor.

But he's not the only one. My deputy national security advisor, Jeff Prescott, started and ran the China Law Center at Yale Law School. My Middle East policy advisor and foreign policy speechwriter, Dan Benaim, who is with me, took Daily Themes—got a B. (Laughter.) Now you know why I go off script so much. (Laughter and applause.)

Look, at a Gridiron Dinner not long ago, the President said, I—the President—''I am learning to speak without a teleprompter, Joe is learning to speak with one.'' (Laughter.) But if you looked at my speechwriters, you know why.

And the granddaughter of one of my dearest friends in life—a former Holocaust survivor, a former foreign policy advisor, a former Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Tom Lantos—is graduating today. Mercina, congratulations, kiddo. (Applause.) Where are you? You are the sixth—she's the sixth sibling in her immediate family to graduate from Yale. Six out of 11, that's not a bad batting average. (Laughter.) I believe it's a modern day record for the number of kids who went to Yale from a single family.

And, Mercina, I know that your mom, Little Annette is here. I don't know where you are, Annette. But Annette was part of the first class of freshman women admitted to Yale University. (Applause.)

And her grandmother, Annette, is also a Holocaust survivor, an amazing woman; and both I'm sure wherever they are, beaming today. And I know one more thing, Mercina, your father and grandfather are looking down, cheering you on.

I'm so happy to be here on your day and all of your day. It's good to know there's one Yalie who is happy I'm being here—be here, at least one. (Laughter.) On ''Overheard at Yale,'' on the Facebook page, one student reported another student saying: I had a dream that I was Vice President and was with the President, and we did the disco funk dance to convince the Congress to restart the government. (Laughter.)

Another student commented, Y'all know Biden would be hilarious, get funky. (Laughter.)

Well, my granddaughter, Finnegan Biden, whose dad went here, is with me today. When she saw that on the speech, I was on the plane, Air Force Two coming up, she said, Pop, it would take a lot more than you and the President doing the disco funk dance. The Tea Party doesn't even know what it is. (Laughter.)

Look, I don't know about that. But I'm just glad there's someone—just someone—who dreams of being Vice President. (Laughter and applause.) Just somebody. I never had that dream. (Laughter.) For the press out there, that's a joke.

Actually, being Vice President to Barack Obama has been truly a great honor. We both enjoy getting out of the White House to talk to folks in the real America—the kind who know what it means to struggle, to work hard, to shop at Kiko Milano. (Laughter and applause.) Great choice. (Laughter.)

I just hope to hell the same people responsible for Kiko's aren't in charge of naming the two new residential colleges. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, look, folks, I spent a lot of time thinking about what I should day to you today, but the more I thought about it, I thought that any Class Day speech is likely to be redundant. You already heard from Jessie J at Spring Fling. (Laughter.) So what in the hell could I possibly say. (Laughter.)

Look, I'm deeply honored that Jeremy and Kiki selected me. I don't know how the hell you trusted them to do that. (Laughter.) I hope you agree with their choice. Actually I hope by the end of this speech, they agree with their choice. (Laughter.)

In their flattering invitation letter, they asked me to bring along a sense of humor, speak about my commitment to public service and family, talk about resiliency, compassion, and leadership in a changing world. Petty tall order. (Laughter.) I probably already flunked the first part of the test.

But with the rest let me say upfront, and I mean this sincerely, there's nothing particularly unique about me. With regard to resilience and compassion, there are countless thousands of people, maybe some in the audience, who've suffered through personal losses similar to mine or much worse with much less support to help them get through it and much less reason to want to get through it.

It's not that all that difficult, folks, to be compassionate when you've been the beneficiary of compassion in your lowest moments not only from your family, but from your friends and total strangers. Because when you know how much it meant to you, you know how much it mattered. It's not hard to be compassionate.

I was raised by a tough, compassionate Irish lady named Catherine Eugenia Finnegan Biden. And she taught all of her children that, but for the grace of God, there go you—but for the grace of God, there go you.

And a father who lived his motto that, family was the beginning, the middle, and the end. And like many of you and your parents, I was fortunate. I learned early on what I wanted to do, what fulfilled me the most, what made me happy—my family, my faith, and being engaged in the public affairs that gripped my generation and being inspired by a young President named Kennedy—civil rights, the environment, trying to end an incredibly useless and divisive war, Vietnam.

The truth is, though, that neither I, nor anyone else, can tell you what will make you happy, help you find success.

You each have different comfort levels. Everyone has different goals and aspirations. But one thing I've observed, one thing I know, an expression my dad would use often, is real. He used to say, it's a lucky man or woman gets up in the morning—and I mean this sincerely. It was one of his expressions. It's a lucky man or woman gets up in the morning, puts both feet on the floor, knows what they're about to do, and thinks it still matters.

I've been lucky. And my wish for all of you is that not only tomorrow, but 20 and 40 and 50 years from now, you've found that sweet spot, that thing that allows you to get up in the morning, put both feet on the floor, go out and pursue what you love, and think it still matters.

Some of you will go to Silicon Valley and make great contributions to empower individuals and societies and maybe even design

a life-changing app, like how to unsubscribe to Obama for America email list—(laughter)—the biggest ''pan-list'' of all times.

Some of you will go to Wall Street and big Wall Street law firms, government and activism, Peace Corps, Teach for America. You'll become doctors, researchers, journalists, artists, actors, musicians. Two of you—one of whom was one of my former interns in the White House, Sam Cohen, and Andrew Heymann—will be commissioned in the United States Navy. Congratulations, gentlemen. We're proud of you. (Applause.)

But all of you have one thing in common you will all seek to find that sweet spot that satisfies your ambition and success and happiness.

I've met an awful lot of people in my career. And I've noticed one thing, those who are the most successful and the happiest—whether they're working on Wall Street or Main Street, as a doctor or nurse, or as a lawyer, or a social worker, I've made certain basic observation about the ones who from my observation wherever they were in the world were able to find that sweet spot between success and happiness. Those who balance life and career, who find purpose and fulfillment, and where ambition leads them.

There's no silver bullet, no single formula, no reductive list. But they all seem to understand that happiness and success result from an accumulation of thousands of little things built on character, all of which have certain common features in my observation.

First, the most successful and happiest people I've known understand that a good life at its core is about being personal. It's about being engaged. It's about being there for a friend or a colleague when they're injured or in an accident, remembering the birthdays, congratulating them on their marriage, celebrating the birth of their child. It's about being available to them when they're going through personal loss. It's about loving someone more than yourself, as one of your speakers have already mentioned. It all seems to get down to being personal.

That's the stuff that fosters relationships. It's the only way to breed trust in everything you do in your life.

Let me give you an example. After only four months in the United States Senate, as a 30-year-old kid, I was walking through the Senate floor to go to a meeting with Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. And I witnessed another newly elected senator, the extremely conservative Jesse Helms, excoriating Ted Kennedy and Bob Dole for promoting the precursor of the Americans with Disabilities Act. But I had to see the Leader, so I kept walking.

When I walked into Mansfield's office, I must have looked as angry as I was. He was in his late '70s, lived to be 100. And he looked at me, he said, what's bothering you, Joe?

I said, that guy, Helms, he has no social redeeming value. He doesn't care—I really mean it—I was angry. He doesn't care about people in need. He has a disregard for the disabled.

Majority Leader Mansfield then proceeded to tell me that three years earlier, Jesse and Dot Helms, sitting in their living room in early December before Christmas, reading an ad in the Raleigh Observer, the picture of a young man, 14-years-old with braces on his legs up to both hips, saying, all I want is someone to love me and adopt me. He looked at me and he said, and they adopted him, Joe.

I felt like a fool. He then went on to say, Joe, it's always appropriate to question another man's judgment, but never appropriate to question his motives because you simply don't know his motives.

It happened early in my career fortunately. From that moment on, I tried to look past the caricatures of my colleagues and try to see the whole person. Never once have I questioned another man's or woman's motive. And something started to change. If you notice, every time there's a crisis in the Congress the last eight years, I get sent to the Hill to deal with it. It's because every one of those men and women up there—whether they like me or not—know that I don't judge them for what I think they're thinking.

Because when you question a man's motive, when you say they're acting out of greed, they're in the pocket of an interest group, et cetera, it's awful hard to reach consensus. It's awful hard having to reach across the table and shake hands. No matter how bitterly you disagree, though, it is always possible if you question judgment and not motive.

Senator Helms and I continued to have profound political differences, but early on we both became the most powerful members of the Senate running the Foreign Relations Committee, as Chairmen and Ranking Members. But something happened, the mutual defensiveness began to dissipate. And as a result, we began to be able to work together in the interests of the country. And as Chairman and Ranking Member, we passed some of the most significant legislation passed in the last 40 years.

All of which he opposed—from paying tens of millions of dollars in arrearages to an institution, he despised, the United Nations—he was part of the so-called ''black helicopter'' crowd; to passing the chemical weapons treaty, constantly referring to, ''we've never lost a war, and we've never won a treaty,'' which he vehemently opposed. But we were able to do these things not because he changed his mind, but because in this new relationship to maintain it is required to play fair, to be straight. The cheap shots ended. And the chicanery to keep from having to being able to vote ended—even though he knew I had the votes.

After that, we went on as he began to look at the other side of things and do some great things together that he supported like PEPFAR—which by the way, George W. Bush deserves an overwhelming amount of credit for, by the way, which provided treatment and prevention HIV/AIDS in Africa and around the world, literally saving millions of lives.

So one piece of advice is try to look beyond the caricature of the person with whom you have to work. Resist the temptation to ascribe motive, because you really don't know—and it gets in the way of being able to reach a consensus on things that matter to you and to many other people.

Resist the temptation of your generation to let ''network'' become a verb that saps the personal away, that blinds you to the person right in front of you, blinds you to their hopes, their fears, and their burdens.

Build real relationships—even with people with whom you vehemently disagree. You'll not only be happier. You will be more successful.

The second thing I've noticed is that although you know no one is better than you, every other persons is equal to you and deserves to be treated with dignity and respect.

I've worked with eight Presidents, hundreds of Senators. I've met every major world leader literally in the last 40 years. And I've had scores of talented people work for me. And here's what I've observed: Regardless of their academic or social backgrounds, those who had the most success and who were most respected and therefore able to get the most done were the ones who never confused academic credentials and societal sophistication with gravitas and judgment.

Don't forget about what doesn't come from this prestigious diploma—the heart to know what's meaningful and what's ephemeral; and the head to know the difference between knowledge and judgment.

But even if you get these things right, I've observed that most people who are successful and happy remembered a third thing: Reality has a way of intruding.

I got elected in a very improbable year. Richard Nixon won my state overwhelmingly. George McGovern was at the top of the ticket. I got elected as the second-youngest man in the history of the United States to be elected, the stuff that provides and fuels raw ambition. And if you're not careful, it fuels a sense of inevitability that seeps in. But be careful. Things can change in a heartbeat. I know. And so do many of your parents.

Six weeks after my election, my whole world was altered forever. While I was in Washington hiring staff, I got a phone call. My wife and three children were Christmas shopping, a tractor trailer broadsided them and killed my wife and killed my daughter. And they weren't sure that my sons would live.

Many people have gone through things like that. But because I had the incredible good fortune of an extended family, grounded in love and loyalty, imbued with a sense of obligation imparted to each of us, I not only got help. But by focusing on my sons, I found my redemption.

I can remember my mother—a sweet lady—looking at me, after we left the hospital, and saying, Joey, out of everything terrible that happens to you, something good will come if you look hard enough for it. She was right.

The incredible bond I have with my children is the gift I'm not sure I would have had, had I not been through what I went through. Who knows whether I would have been able to appreciate at that moment in my life, the heady moment in my life, what my first obligation was.

So I began to commute—never intending to stay in Washington. And that's the God's truth. I was supposed to be sworn in with everyone else that year in '73, but I wouldn't go down. So Mansfield thought I'd change my mind and not come, and he sent up the secretary of the Senate to swear me in, in the hospital room with my children.

And I began to commute thinking I was only going to stay a little while—four hours a day, every day—from Washington to Wilmington, which I've done for over 37 years. I did it because I wanted to be able to kiss them goodnight and kiss them in the morning the next day. No, ''Ozzie and Harriet'' breakfast or great familial thing, just climb in bed with them. Because I came to realize that a child can hold an important thought, something they want to say to their mom and dad, maybe for 12 or 24 hours, and then it's gone. And when it's gone, it's gone. And it all adds up.

But looking back on it, the truth be told, the real reason I went home every night was that I needed my children more than they needed me. Some at the time wrote and suggested that Biden can't be a serious national figure. If he was, he'd stay in Washington more, attend to more important events. It's obvious he's not serious. He goes home after the last vote.

But I realized I didn't miss a thing. Ambition is really important. You need it. And I certainly have never lacked in having ambition. But ambition without perspective can be a killer. I know a lot of you already understand this. Some of you really had to struggle to get here. And some of you have had to struggle to stay here. And some of your families made enormous sacrifices for this great privilege. And many of you faced your own crises, some unimaginable.

But the truth is all of you will go through something like this. You'll wrestle with these kinds of choices every day. But I'm here to tell you, you can find the balance between ambition and happiness, what will make you really feel fulfilled. And along the way, it helps a great deal if you can resist the temptation to rationalize.

My chief of staff for over 25 years, one of the finest men I've ever known, even though he graduated from Penn, and subsequently became a senator from the state of Delaware, Senator Ted Kaufman, every new hire, that we'd hire, the last thing he'd tell them was, and remember never underestimate the ability of the human mind to rationalize. Never underestimate the ability of the human mind to rationalize—her birthday really doesn't matter that much to her, and this business trip is just a great opportunity; this won't be his last game, and besides, I'd have to take the redeye to get back. We can always take this family vacation another time. There's plenty of time.

For your generation, there's an incredible amount of pressure on all of you to succeed, particularly now that you have accomplished so much. Your whole generation faces this pressure. I see it in my grandchildren who are honors students at other Ivy universities right now. You race to do what others think is right in high school. You raced through the bloodsport of college admissions. You raced through Yale for the next big thing. And all along, some of you compare yourself to the success of your peers on Facebook, Instagram, Linked-In, Twitter.

Today, some of you may have found that you slipped into the self-referential bubble that validates certain choices. And the bubble expands once you leave this campus, the pressures and anxiousness, as well—take this job, make that much money, live in this place, hang out with people like you, take no real risks and have no real impact, while getting paid for the false sense of both.

But resist that temptation to rationalize what others view is the right choice for you—instead of what you feel in your gut is the right choice—that's your North Star. Trust it. Follow it. You're an incredible group of young women and men. And that's not hyperbole. You're an incredible group.

Let me conclude with this. I'm not going to moralize about to whom much is given, much is expected, because most of you have made of yourself much more than what you've been given. But now you are in a privileged position. You're part of an exceptional generation and doors will open to you that will not open to others. My Yale Law School grad son graduated very well from Yale Law School. My other son out of loyalty to his deceased mother decided to go to Syracuse Law School from Penn. They're a year and a day apart in their age. The one who graduated from Yale had doors open to him, the lowest salary offered back in the early '90s was $50,000 more than a federal judge made. My other son, it was a struggle—equally as bright, went on to be elected one of the youngest attorney generals in the history of the state of Delaware, the most popular public official in my state. Big headline after the 2012 election, ''Biden Most Popular Man in Delaware—Beau.'' (Laughter.)

And as your parents will understand, my dad's definition of success is when you look at your son and daughter and realize they turned out better than you, and they did. But you'll have opportunities. Make the most of them and follow your heart. You have the intellectual horsepower to make things better in the world around you.

You're also part of the most tolerant generation in history. I got roundly criticized because I could not remain quiet anymore about gay marriage. The one thing I was certain of is all of your generation was way beyond that point. (Applause.)

Here's something else I observed—intellectual horsepower and tolerance alone does not make a generation great: unless you can break out of the bubble of your own making—technologically, geographically, racially, and socioeconomically—to truly connect with the world around you. Because it matters.

No matter what your material success or personal circumstance, it matters. You can't breathe fresh air or protect your children from a changing climate no matter what you make. If your sister is the victim of domestic violence, you are violated. If your brother can't marry the man he loves, you are lessened. And if your best friend has to worry about being racially profiled, you live in a circumstance not worthy of us. (Applause.) It matters.

So be successful. I sincerely hope some of you become millionaires and billionaires. I mean that. But engage the world around you because you will be more successful and happier. And you can absolutely succeed in life without sacrificing your ideals or your commitments to others and family. I'm confident that you can do that, and I'm confident that this generation will do it more than any other.

Look to your left, as they say, and look to your right. And remember how foolish the people next to you look—(laughter)—in those ridiculous hats. (Laughter.) That's what I want you to remember. I mean this. Because it means you've learned something from a great tradition.

It means you're willing to look foolish, you're willing to run the risk of looking foolish in the service of what matters to you. And if you remember that, because some of the things your heart will tell you to do, will make you among your peers look foolish, or not smart, or not sophisticated. But we'll all be better for people of your consequence to do it.

That's what I want you to most remember. Not who spoke at the day you all assembled on this mall. You're a remarkable class. I sure don't remember who the hell was my commencement speaker. (Laughter.) I know this is not officially commencement. But ask your parents when you leave here, who spoke at your commencement? It's a commencement speaker aversion of a commencement speaker's fate to be forgotten. The question is only how quickly. But you're the best in your generation. And that is not hyperbole. And you're part of a remarkable generation.

And, you—you're on the cusp of some of the most astonishing breakthroughs in the history of mankind—scientific, technological, socially—that's going to change the way you live and the whole world works. But it will be up to you in this changing world to translate those unprecedented capabilities into a greater measure of happiness and meaning—not just for yourself, but for the world around you.

And I feel more confident for my children and grandchildren knowing that the men and women who graduate here today, here and across the country, will be in their midst. That's the honest truth. That's the God's truth. That's my word as a Biden.

Congratulations, Class of 2015. And may God bless you and may God protect our troops. Thank you.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is noteworthy that the Vice President discussed very frankly the tragedy he has had in his life, all while knowing of this impending tragedy that was unfolding with his son, Beau. The speech was vintage Biden, with a lot of humor and Irish tales, but the essence of the speech came down to this, as he was talking to the graduates:

> Build real relationships—even with people with whom you vehemently disagree. You'll not only be happier. You will be more successful.

And he continued:

> The second thing I've noticed is that although you know no one is better than you, every other person is equal to you and deserves to be treated with dignity and respect.

That is the essence of how in a democracy we have to get along. It is known as the Golden Rule. JOE BIDEN talked about the Golden Rule without saying it was the Golden Rule—treat others as you want to be treated. Put into old English: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

The Vice President talks in his speech about his time as a young Senator, when he heard Senator Jesse Helms talking about an issue that Senator BIDEN was opposed to. He felt it was violative of his basic concept in the treatment of other people. In this case, I think it was a question of disability. As he walked in to see the majority leader—probably in that same office, in this case, Mike Mansfield—Senator Mansfield, the leader, noticed that JOE was visibly upset and he said: What is wrong? And JOE told him about this encounter with Senator Helms.

Senator Mansfield then went on to say to Senator BIDEN: Don't ever judge until you really know the person, because Senator Helms and his wife had run into a situation where they found a severely disabled child and, as a result, they adopted that child.

As a result, Senator BIDEN and Senator Helms became the best of friends. Even though their politics were different, when they served as the leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—sometimes Helms as chairman and sometimes BIDEN as chairman—they could disagree on the issues, but they could get a lot done because they could work together. That is because they built a relationship.

How different is that today, where each of us are racing out of here on Thursday afternoons and evenings to go back to our States and we hardly ever have time for each other, to understand the core of us as humans and what makes us, drives us as we are. If we knew that about each other, maybe we would find more common ground.

What I have found is that every one of these Senators is an extraordinary person, extremely accomplished, and well motivated. They try, we all try to do the right thing, but then we let the politics and the ideology get in the way and it drives us apart. As a result, is it any wonder that we have a dysfunctional Senate that has difficulty getting along, particularly when you consider the arcane rules of the Senate, which were designed to slow down the process.

When you don't have the relationship that can be built, when the two leaders can't get along, when the Senate cannot be run by unanimous consent, is

there any wonder that it is dysfunctional? Yet, we have the capacity, just as Senator BIDEN and Senator Helms did, to overcome significant differences and get things done.

At this time of grieving for the Biden family, as I read his Yale speech, I was reminded that there is a lot about what was expressed there in a grieving father who could not show his grief because it was still very private. There is a lot of wisdom there. That is why I entered it into the RECORD.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise today to discuss two important issues—first, the Export-Import Bank.

There is a lot about this place that puzzles me, but one of the things that this year has puzzled me the most is the movement to somehow defund or end the Export-Import Bank. I just don't get it. This is an agency of the Federal Government that has been extraordinarily effective. It creates jobs in the United States. It supports jobs. It supports American businesses. It supports small American businesses. It returns money to the Treasury. It fills a market niche that the private sector has been unwilling or unable to fill. This isn't competition with the private sector. This isn't the government doing something the private sector should do. This is the government filling a niche that has been identified for over 80 years. And it makes a difference.

I have visited several small companies in Maine—I think there may be eight or so—that benefit directly from this program, which supports 2 percent of the financing of U.S. exports.

We are engaged in intense global competition for the export of goods and services, and to unilaterally disarm by taking away one of the tools our businesses use just doesn't make any sense. I don't understand what the impetus is for this move to undermine this very valuable program that is important to our companies.

I toured a little company in Maine that resells computer and networking equipment all over the world, particularly to third-world countries that need this equipment desperately for various needs but particularly for coping with emergencies. It is a small business in Maine, has 35 employees, and is owned by a woman, Connie Justice. I visited with her, and she told me this story. I don't like to read, but I think this quote is so powerful from a real live business owner in Maine as to how important this program is.

> Ex-Im's Working Capital Loan Guarantee program helped us expand our export sales during a period of rapid growth, when private banks were unwilling to lend to us without a guarantee.

This is important to understand, that one of the most important programs the Export-Import Bank sponsors is a guarantee of receivables from foreign countries, which American banks—quite logically in many cases because they don't have the history, they can't collect—are very reluctant to factor or to finance.

She said:

> After 2 years of solid exports, our financial position strengthened so that the Ex-Im guarantee was no longer needed. Private banks now meet all our credit needs. Our expansion and increased sales would have been impossible without Ex-Im's involvement. We continue to use Ex-Im Bank to insure our receivables to Ex-Im approved customers in developing countries. We pay reasonable premiums for this insurance.

This program makes money for the Federal government. This isn't a handout. This isn't corporate welfare. They are paying insurance premiums, which, over the past 20 years or so, have returned $7 billion to the U.S. Treasury. This makes money. She pays her premiums, and that is a positive for U.S. taxpayers.

> Being able to offer open payment terms for U.S.-made goods opens previously inaccessible markets for us. Our major manufacturers—including HP, Dell and Lenovo—have committed to making more systems domestically to comply with Ex-Im's ''Made in USA'' requirement for eligibility. This has a huge multiplier effect on US employment. . . . Since 2004, Planson's annual export sales have grown from $5 million to $35 million. Our staff has grown from 5 to 35, and our payroll has increased to almost $2 million. We use local suppliers for a broad range of goods and services.

She goes on to conclude:

> We achieve all this entirely through export sales. The U.S. Export-Import Bank is a key partner in our success.

Why would we want to let this very valuable program expire for some theoretical reason that, frankly, I just find inexplicable? It makes money for the American taxpayers. It is projected to continue to make money. But my passion here is about its support for small businesses in Maine that otherwise could not make these sales into the international market.

As I mentioned, allowing the Export-Import Bank charter to expire is a kind of unilateral disarmament in an era of intense global competition. It makes no sense. Sixty other countries have similar kinds of programs, and if we take ours away, what we are doing is handcuffing our businesses while the rest of the world is moving forward with their programs to support exports.

I used to start speeches in Maine by saying, simply, ''Five percent.'' People would look at me and say: What is he talking about, 5 percent? Well, 5 percent is the percentage of the world's population that lives in North America. That means that if our businesses are going to ultimately be successful, we have to sell into the rest of the world. We have to be able to export, and the Export-Import Bank is a very valuable tool in order to facilitate the export of goods from the United States.

There is bipartisan support. I believe the votes are there in the House. Senator MCCONNELL has committed to a vote here in the Senate. I commend Senator CANTWELL and Senator GRAHAM for their work on behalf of this.

I hope we can bring this matter to a vote promptly and avoid the deadline of June 30. I do not know why we cannot do things around here before the night before. Let's get this done and move on to more important topics. We should not even be having this debate. This ought to be automatic, as, indeed, it has effectively been for some 80 years.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this program. We should not be playing games with this important agency at a time of such intense global competition.

Madam President, I also wish to talk about the national defense authorization bill, which is also coming to the floor today and is on the floor today.

Sixty-five years ago this week a freshman Senator from Maine rose on this floor, in this place, and made one of the most important speeches in American history. It certainly was one of the most important speeches of the 20th century. It was June 1, 1950. That freshman Senator was Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. I got to know Margaret Chase Smith after she left the Senate, in the 1980s and 1990s in Maine, before we lost her in 1995.

She told me about that speech. The speech was about the dangers to the country and, particularly, to this institution of the practices of Joseph McCarthy, of the smear campaigns, of the innuendo, of the threats. Her speech took enormous courage. She told me two stories about the speech that I think are interesting that I want to note before I go on to the implications of that speech for what we are considering today.

One was that, as she had the speech in her hand and got on the little trolley to come from the Russell Building over here—at that time the Russell Building was the only Senate office building—who should be sitting in the trolley in the seat next to her but Joe McCarthy. Senator Smith sat down and McCarthy turned to her and said: What are you up to today, Margaret?

She told me that she responded: I am about to make a speech, Joe, and you are not going to like it.

She went on to the Senate floor. She had written that speech with her close aide Bill Lewis at her kitchen table in Skowhegan, ME, over Memorial Day weekend of 1950. She had the speech in her hand, and Bill Lewis was in the press gallery right up here. But she told him not to hand out a copy of the speech until she was well into giving it on the Senate floor because she was afraid that she would lose her nerve and not deliver the speech.

That speech took enormous courage. It took enormous courage because she was telling her colleagues an uncomfortable truth—an uncomfortable truth. I believe that today it is also important that we face uncomfortable truths.

I am a strong supporter of the National Defense Authorization Act that is on the floor. I am a strong supporter of the need and the importance and how crucial that bill is to the defense and the security of this country. The most solid responsibility we have in this place is set forth in the preamble to the Constitution itself: to ''provide for the common defense'' and ''insure domestic Tranquility.'' That is what governments are established to do. That is the basic fundamental responsibility—to ''provide for the common defense'' and ''insure domestic Tranquility.''

That is national security. That is what this bill that is on the floor today is all about. I worked in subcommittee on it. I have been to numerous, repeated hearings, as the Presiding Officer has, all through the winter and early spring, where we learned about the strategic challenges facing this country. I commend the chair of the committee for putting this in a strategic context. We talked about big issues with people such as Henry Kissinger and Brzezinski and Madeleine Albright before we started talking about the specifics that are in this bill. And then we had lengthy subcommittee meetings and subcommittee markups.

For me, one of the most satisfying parts of my legislative experience here has been the markup of this bill, where we met as a committee, where we argued and debated and voted and had a lot of amendments and tried to deal with it for 2 solid days and came to a conclusion, where, as I recall, the vote out of the committee was something like 22 to 4. It was a very powerful vote.

I am in total support of this piece of legislation. However, my problem with the legislation is that it attempts to avoid the impact of the sequester through the use of the overseas contingency account money, which is not paid for.

We have had hearings. Every hearing we have had this year has been talking about the danger of the sequester to national security. Indeed, I have been working with a number of my colleagues to try to find a solution for the sequester, but the solution for the sequester is not simply to borrow the money from our grandchildren. What bothers me about this legislation is that it is part of a pattern. When the chips are down around here, we borrow the money from our grandchildren. If 5-year-olds could vote and knew what we were doing to them, we would all be dead ducks because we are passing the bill on to them. I think we should fully fund the Department of Defense and the request at the level that is in this bill. I just do not think we should borrow the money to do it.

Make no mistake, that is what we are doing. We are saying it is very important, these are important expenditures, and it is critical for national defense that we make these expenditures but not critical enough to pay for them. That is the pattern.

Earlier this year we passed the so-called tax extenders. They ought to be called tax-cut extenders because that is what they are. Everybody said they were important to economic development and they were important for the country and important for certainty for businesses. All that was true, but it was not enough to pay for them. We borrowed the money.

Last year we passed a major rewrite of the Veterans' Administration program, where everybody talked about how important this was, how important the Veterans Affairs Department was to our veterans, how much we owed our veterans, and how we had to take care of this. But then we turned around and borrowed the money from our grandchildren in order to fund it. We did not fund it.

Recently, just in the last month or so, we fixed the so-called doc fix, which has been plaguing this place for a dozen years. But we did not really fix it. We fixed it as far as the docs are concerned, but we fixed it by borrowing the money. We did not pay for it.

Many of my colleagues talk a lot around here about the deficit and the danger to the country. I think they are right. I think the deficit is a serious danger to this country. But it seems that the deficit is only a problem when we think it is a problem, and then the next day, it is not a problem anymore because we are going to borrow $38 billion more to put into this bill.

I think we need to stand up and pay for things. I am no angel. I voted for all those things that I listed. But I think it is time to start saying: Wait a minute; we cannot do this. By the way, by fixing the sequester in the Department of Defense, of course, we are not fixing it anywhere else in the Federal Government. Some people say: Well, that is OK because defense is important, and we are not so worried about these other programs. Well, I am sorry, but some of those other programs are little items such as the FBI. There has never been a time in the history of this country when the FBI was more important.

We are facing serious, dangerous imminent threats. To not fund the FBI or the Border Patrol or the TSA and to have the sequester affect those agencies and kid ourselves that we are dealing with our national security responsibilities is just not responsible. It is just not right. And to borrow the money to fix some of these things is not responsible or fair to our grandchildren.

We are saying: We are just going to fix defense with this funny-money deal, a gimmick wrapped up in a trick, but we are not going to fix anything else. I talked about the FBI, the TSA, Border Patrol, and national security issues, but what about NIH and what about scientific research that can save lives? And we are having the sequester and saying: It is OK; we can do that. What about education? What about, yes, Head Start, which gives young people a chance to make a serious contribution to this country?

I think the OCO trick that is in this bill is wrong on two counts. It is wrong on three counts, actually. No. 1, it is not paid for. No. 2 it is not really what the Defense Department needs. They need base budget authority so they can plan, so they can look to the future, and so they can make decisions on an ongoing basis that are necessary to commit to programs, plans, and projects that will defend this country. The short-term OCO solution does not do that. That is No. 2.

No. 3, by ignoring the needs of the rest of the Federal Government, by ignoring the needs of other parts of the national security apparatus, we are not serving the public we were sent here to look after.

I support this bill, but I think we really ought to be thinking about alternative ways to fund the needs we have identified. It is too easy to say this is an important national priority but not important enough to pay for it. We are continually—even today, after all of the talk about deficits and budget control and everything else—finding ways to shift the burden to our kids and to our grandchildren. I do not think that is right.

Senator REED of Rhode Island has an amendment to this bill that I think is an important one. All it simply says is that we are not going to spend that OCO money in defense until we solve the problem more generally throughout the rest of the Federal Government.

I realize it is not the responsibility of the Defense Department or of the Armed Services Committee to solve the overall budget problem within the Defense bill. But I think we have a responsibility to look at the larger problem, and we can contribute to its solution by saying to our colleagues throughout this body and in the House that there has to be a comprehensive solution before we say we are going to fix only defense and we are only going to fix defense with borrowed money.

There are three ways to solve this budget problem—three ways. One is by cuts, and there have already been substantial cuts. From the projected budgets back in 2010, there is something like three-quarters of a trillion dollars that has already been cut from defense and other areas of the Federal budget. We have to continue to look at that, and we have to look at all aspects of the Federal budget.

The second way is revenues. Nobody is supposed to talk about revenues around here, but the reality is that we are not paying our bills. To pat ourselves on the back for tax cuts when in

reality we are passing the expenses on to our children is just not honest.

When we pass tax cuts here in a deficit situation and borrow the money to fill the hole, we are not cutting taxes. We are shifting the tax to our children. I do not think that is honest. I do not think that is responsible. I do not think that is what we were sent here to do.

The third way, of course, to solve this budget problem is by economic growth. Some people say that the only way to grow the economy is to cut taxes. I have seen no economic study that says that works. Maybe it works if you are reducing taxes, as they did in 1960, from a 90-percent top marginal rate to now about 35 percent. Ok, I think that is significant. But to reduce that marginal rate by two or three points and say that it will stimulate a huge amount of economic activity—there is no economic justification for that.

The two single biggest economic development projects in the recent history of the United States were the GI bill after World War II and the interstate highway system. Both of them were investments, both of them cost money, and, by the way, our predecessors paid for them. They didn't pass the bill on to us. They paid for them.

So, yes, we need to control taxes. Yes, we need to think about strategic tax reductions in ways and areas that will actually help stimulate the economy. I don't understand how having some guy who is managing money in New York pay half the tax rate that his secretary makes is a stimulus to the economy. Yet that is what we are doing.

We have to look at this problem in a comprehensive way. We have to look at health care costs, we have to look at the effects of demographics on Federal expenditures over the next 20 to 30 years, and we have to look at investments that will help our economy grow.

The Presiding Officer and I work hard on this bill. I think it is an important bill for the future of this country. I think it is an important bill to protect the national security and to provide for the common defense, but I think we need to do it in an honest and open way and not try to fill a short-term budget gap with money our children and our grandchildren are going to have to repay. I believe we can do this. I believe we can face this responsibility because that is why we are here.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, someone already asked unanimous consent that U.S. Army MAJ Justin Gorkowski, who is a fellow in my Senate office, be granted floor privileges for this debate.

I just wanted to explain how pleased and lucky we have been to have the major with us to help with these issues. He is a graduate of West Point. He currently serves as an information operations officer. He served as an adviser to the Iraq Army during the surge in 2006 and 2007 and returned from Afghanistan in January of last year, where he had been responsible for psychological operations, electronic warfare and military deception for Kandahar Province. He has been a great addition to our office during this debate, and in my view this debate is the most important debate we have.

The No. 1 priority for the Federal Government is to defend the country. We can spend all the time we want talking about all the other priorities and all the things we should be doing and whether there is some sudden mystical balance between all of those priorities and defending the country, but in most of our States, and certainly in the State of Missouri, the one thing you can get the least argument on as to what the Federal Government should do that we can't do for ourselves is defend the country. That is why for 54 years straight the Senate has passed a defense authorizing bill every year. There are very few things that get authorized every year, very few things that get debated every year, very few things that get looked at every year, but our national defense is one of those, and it is one of those for a reason.

We hear all kinds of reasons not to move forward with this bill, and then you hear: But I am for the bill. Well, that is because people understand that this is one of the things the Federal Government is supposed to do and in my view the top thing we can't in any way do for ourselves. Local government can't do this, State governments can't do this, individually we cannot do this, and that is why this debate is always so important and why the Armed Services Committee voted this out 22 to 4 after all kinds of discussions, such as, well, maybe the minority would not vote for this for the reasons we just heard. But at the end of the day, the vote was 22 to 4 out of the committee.

Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED have done a good job of bringing this bill to the floor with bipartisan support and looking for ways to reform defense so we really focus our defense where the defenders are rather than where the defenders are not.

This bill is focused on eliminating wasteful spending. It focuses on finding ways to reduce bureaucracy and streamline the critical military functions we have. It puts a focus on the fighting forces, not the bureaucratic forces in the defense structure.

The bill identifies $10 billion in excessive and unnecessary spending and reallocates those funds to our true military capabilities. It also modernizes the military retirement system so that many more who served have a retirement benefit from serving. The current retirement system benefits less than 20 percent of those who served in the Armed Forces because the people who benefit from the retirement program are people who serve 20 years and retire at that point. This bill would create a system where servicemembers and taxpayers join together to create a retirement benefit which estimates that 75 percent of the people who served in the military would leave with a retirement benefit rather than only 17, 18, 20 percent of the people who leave the military. It is a reform that really honors all of those who served in a good way and doesn't penalize anyone who served. It still allows people who have been serving under the old system to stay under the old system. Obviously, the longer you stay in that system, the better you are going to do. But the options now are basically no retirement benefit or a retirement benefit that comes with substantial service and only with that kind of service.

This bill creates retention bonuses to keep people in the military longer than 20 years. We have men and women retiring at the height of their capacity with technical skills that are not easily replaced. This bill recognizes that and looks for ways to encourage them to continue to serve.

Our State, the State of Missouri, has a real commitment to the military. More than 17,000 Active-Duty servicemembers serve in Missouri. We have important bases in our State. We have 8,000 civilian Department of Defense employees and more than 20,000 members of the Reserve and the National Guard.

This bill authorizes funding to build a Consolidated Stealth Operations and Nuclear Alert Facility at Whiteman Air Force Base. It preserves and prevents the retirement of the A–10 plane that has wide support in the Congress, but more importantly the A–10 has wide support from the ground forces it supports from the air. When you talk to people who serve on the ground, General Odierno and others, will say that in their view there is no plane that does what this plane does. Of course, those who fly it and support it are very important. Whiteman Air Force Base, again, has the 442nd Fighter Wing. It is an A–10 fighter wing which just returned from a deployment.

This bill also authorizes upgrades in our cargo aircraft, such as the C–130 aircraft, which will help the main force as well as the National Guard and Reserves.

In fact, Rosecrans Air National Guard Base in St. Joseph is a great training facility not only for our forces, but that base also serves as a training facility for our allies. At least 16 of our allies trained at this facility last year so they could figure out how to get supplies, how to get troops, and how to move things with those cargo planes in ways that they would not otherwise be able to do.

This bill also takes an important step in moving forward with the new bomber. There is money here that would continue to fund the new plan

for the idea out there for a long-range bomber. We have to have that. We have to have a precision bombing capability that is better than anybody else's. The planes we are using now have been the best planes in the world for a long time, but they will not be the best planes in the world forever, and it is time to begin to move forward, as we have been, toward that new plane. Those are all important projects. There are key initiatives here, such as promoting accountability and promoting the standards we need to have for performance in the military and how we reward those standards.

This bill maintains critical quality-of-life programs for men and women who serve and their families. This bill addresses the needs of our wounded, ill, and injured servicemembers.

This bill continues to provide critical assistance to our allies, particularly our ally Israel, where we have significant common research efforts. As we have all seen in recent years, the David's Sling and Iron Dome weapon systems are critical not only for Israel's security, but they have been a critical proving ground for the kind of response that was once looked at as some kind of unachievable ''Star Wars'' capacity. Both David's Sling and the Iron Dome have proved that capacity is, in fact, truly achievable, and we continue to move forward with that kind of defense system in this bill.

This also goes a long way toward combating threats of cyber space and cyber security by evaluating what those vulnerabilities are and dealing with those vulnerabilities.

I want to mention a few amendments I filed and intend to offer before we move on with this bill. I believe my amendments will strengthen the bill. First, I believe the military's mental health screening process can be improved. We learned a lot about mental health and behavioral health over the past 15 years. I believe we can continue to adapt and, frankly, last year's Defense authorization bill had important steps in this direction. I was able to get on the bill when I was a member of the committee last year—not just the defense appropriating committee I serve on now but the defense authorizing committee I served on then.

The amendments I will offer will improve the predeployment health assessment and postdeployment health reassessment by requiring that all servicemembers be screened and that they don't have to meet some criteria that every member of the service may not meet. While people are serving, it is important to establish the things that have happened to them, so if they need help years later, perhaps, and come back and ask for assistance in what truly was a post-traumatic event which was caused by their service but didn't show up for a number of years, having the incidents and things that might have affected their mental health is important.

The National Institutes of Health says that one in four adult Americans has a diagnosable and almost always treatable behavioral health issue.

I asked the Surgeon Generals of the Armed Forces if that number applies to the Armed Forces, and without hesitation they said yes. They said: We recruit from the general population and there is no reason that number wouldn't apply to people serving us in uniform.

The key is diagnosable and treatable—diagnosable and treatable in a way that people aren't held back by their behavior health issues any more than they are held back by their physical health issues. They just need to be dealt with.

We will look at mild traumatic stress injury potential, post-traumatic stress injury potential, and look at the things that might affect somebody as they move forward from their time in the service. What happens in the service and what can happen years after really matters.

I think those amendments on mental health meet the evolving needs of servicemembers and hopefully the evolving needs of how we understand behavioral health as it relates to all other health.

I have another amendment that would not allow the Army to go below the currently authorized end strength level of 475,000 soldiers. There are threats around the world, and we need to increase our national security.

We heard General Odierno, Chief of Staff of the Army, testify earlier this year before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee about the risk associated with going below 490,000 soldiers. This amendment would say you can't go below the 475,000 soldiers until the Secretary of Defense tells the Congress how he plans to reduce excess headquarters elements and excess administrative overhead.

Just this morning, I read an article from military.com discussing Navy Secretary Ray Mabus's recent comments about excessive bloat—his term—in the DOD headquarters functions.

The article states:

> Secretary Mabus said Pentagon and Congressional budget cutters should look at eliminating extra bureaucracy before slashing funds for sailors and ships.
>
> Mabus said 20 percent of the Pentagon budget is spent on what he called ''pure overhead''—items not directory linked to readiness or ongoing operations.
>
> He [Mabus] referred to this ''overhead'' as the fourth estate, specifying entities such as the office of the Secretary of Defense, defense agencies and organizations funded by the Under Secretaries of Defense.

Here is a direct quote from Secretary Mabus:

> There are other places to look rather than taking tools from the warfighter. To the extent you can, protect the stuff that actually gets to the warfighter.

I think my amendment would ensure that the Secretary of Defense has to take that quote to heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has an order for a vote at this hour.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. I wish to make one other comment on one other amendment I have that I will speak more about later in this debate. It involves a concern I have for Iran's growing influence in Iraq and the failure we have had in maintaining the commitment we made to those Camp Liberty residents whom we promised to protect. More than 100 residents have been killed at Camp Liberty.

I recognize the State Department's ongoing efforts, but they are not good enough. I believe the Secretary of Defense needs to certify to the defense committees that the central government of Iraq is taking appropriate and sufficient steps to ensure the safety and security of Iranian dissidents housed in Camp Liberty in Iraq.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 1494

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on the pending amendment No. 1494.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, the Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional to deny Federal benefits to legally married, same-sex couples and their children. Yet due to unrelated provisions of the Federal Code, State legislatures have the ability to indirectly deny Federal benefits to certain disabled veterans and their families solely because they are in a same-sex marriage. This is unjust and, according to the Supreme Court, it is unconstitutional.

This amendment we are about to vote on would end the current prohibition on benefits for gay and lesbian veterans and their families living in States that do not recognize same-sex marriage.

I wish to quote from testimony we heard from the VFW at a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee hearing last month. The VFW said this, and I hope all of my colleagues will keep this in mind as we vote. ''Simply put, if a veteran is legally married in a State that recognizes same-sex marriage, we''—the VFW—''believe the VA should provide benefits to his or her spouse or surviving spouse the same way it does for every other legally married veteran.''

Many of us speak all the time about the need to honor the service of our veterans and to make sure they have access to the care they deserve. This amendment will right a wrong that so many of our veterans who have fought and volunteered deserve to have.

I hope our colleagues will support this amendment so we can ensure that those veterans are treated equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on

agreeing to amendment No. 1494, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Portman
Booker	Johnson	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Reid
Cantwell	King	Sanders
Capito	Kirk	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden
Franken	Murphy	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Enzi	Perdue
Barrasso	Ernst	Risch
Blunt	Fischer	Roberts
Boozman	Gardner	Rounds
Burr	Grassley	Sasse
Cassidy	Hatch	Scott
Coats	Hoeven	Sessions
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Boxer	Heller	Rubio
Graham	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1506

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on amendment No. 1506, offered by the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. TILLIS.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I want to thank Matt Donovan and Stephen Barney of Senator MCCAIN's staff for their patience and assistance in drafting this amendment.

I also want to thank COL Anthony Lazarski of Senator INHOFE's staff and, of course my senior colleague from Oklahoma.

I say to the chairman and Senator REED, I have the privilege of representing America's Global Response Force, the XVIII ABN Corps and the 82nd ABN Division.

As Senator REED knows from his long service in the division, the 82nd is the most decorated combat unit in the Armed Forces—it is America's Guard of Honor.

GEN Colin Powell famously said, ''There is nothing that gets a bad guy's attention quicker than knowing the 82nd ABN is flying straight for his nose.''

But to put it bluntly, the Air Force wants to take the ''air'' out of ''airborne''.

In 2012 the Air Force decided to deactivate the Reserve Air Wing at Pope Army Airfield at Fort Bragg and eliminate onsite daily support for training for XVIII ABN Corps, 82nd ABN and USASOC.

The wing consists of 8–12 C–130Hs.

Last year this committee required the Air Force to produce a report on the C–130 fleet during which time the Air Force was required to maintain its wings at Pope and Little Rock for 1 year—the report came out in April, the committee expected it last December. The Congress was to be given time to respond.

Unfortunately, the Air Force began dismantling the Wing at Pope long before the report was produced and in direct opposition to this committee's instructions. When asked about this, the Air Force said, ''Congress said nothing about us taking away pilots and maintainers, we are leaving the Aircraft''.

The chairman's mark is full of behaviors like this: including Air Force refusal to heed the recommendations of the National Commission on the Air Force and the SECAF's refusal to cut the size of AF headquarters.

In my brief time in this body I have repeatedly asked the Air Force for documentation as to the impact on Airborne and Special Operations training the departure of dedicated Air Force Wings will have. I have been rebuffed by Pentagon leadership.

The Deputy Commander of the USAF Reserve said that planes at Pope were a ''luxury''. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force said that the Air Force needed to maintain C–130s at Minneapolis, Youngstown, and Pittsburgh for important missions. With all due respect is there any mission at Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and Minneapolis that is as important as supporting Airborne and Special Operations units.

In the last 3 months, the commanders of the XVIII ABN Corps and 82nd ABN have taken the extraordinary step of delivering public speeches noting that Airborne and Special Operations leadership were not consulted about the Air Force decision and that the loss of onsite planes will severely hamper their ability to train and meet requirements of emergency contingencies.

The Pope planes provide between 25 to 40 percent of all Airborne and SOF daily training missions. Last year they dropped 50 percent of the 82nd ABN's chutes; 440 AW provides 100 percent of 18 ASOG, Air Force, training—Air Force Special Operations Group.

Even as a cost savings device, the transfer of 8 to 12 planes out of Pope makes no sense, as planes will have to be flown in—often on a voluntarily basis if they are Reserve units—from around the country and those units will have to go on TDY orders, etcetera. This also does not provide for the moving to the left effects of weather grounding planes that would have to fly into Pope from the rest of the country. As the XVIII ABN Corps Commander said, the downstream effects will be problematic.

This amendment is simple and it supports the C–130 Avionic Modernization Program that the Air Land Subcommittee validated yesterday by accepting the chairman's $75 million mark and the Manchin amendment.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall, by September 30, 2017, station aircraft previously modified by the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program, AMP, in direct support of the daily training and contingency requirements of the Army Airborne and Special Operations units. The Secretary shall provide such personnel as required to maintain and operate such aircraft.

There are roughly 260 C–130Hs left—I believe the AF will try and retire up to 100, and it will hopefully replace 50 more with C–130J models—this leaves 100 C–130Hs that need AMP.

The AF spent $2.3 billion on C–130H AMP, the program was on schedule and cost when the AF cancelled it, the design was validated by the JROC, Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and the program had begun Low Rate Initial Production, LRIP.

We currently have five C–130H AMP aircraft at Little Rock that will be flown to the bone yard at a loss of approx $300 million, as well as four AMP kits that can be modified to fit any C–130H, three simulators and all software that will be thrown away

We can have nine AMP C–130Hs plus simulators and software for $75 million—this also adheres to the law Congress passed last year and was validated by the Manchin amendment yesterday.

The bottom line is, if the AF does not take this course, it will send the five C–130H AMP aircraft to the boneyard, wasting $300 million, not to mention the simulators and software. Total amount spent for AMP was $2.3 billion. Program was approved by JROC and was on schedule and cost when AF tried to cancel it. There are roughly 260 C–130Hs left—I believe the AF will try and retire up to 100, and it will hopefully replace 50 more with C–130J models—this leaves 100 C–130Hs that need AMP. Total cost to get nine aircraft, all simulators and software running again is approximately $75M which was funded this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, very quickly, the Senator from North Carolina worked very hard to get legislative language in the bill which has a study of the sufficiency of the airlift requirements for the units stationed at Fort Bragg, NC. This legislation would take several aircraft that are at Little Rock and move them up to North Carolina. It would not effectively help the mobility of our forces. It would micromanage the use of military aircraft. As such, I would ask that there be a ''no'' vote.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Cassidy	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rounds
Cochran	Isakson	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Kirk	Sessions
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	McCain	Thune
Daines	McCaskill	Tillis
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Menendez	Vitter
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Capito	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Manchin	Udall
Casey	Markey	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Cotton	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—8

Alexander	Graham	Rubio
Boxer	Heller	Sanders
Durbin	Moran	

The amendment (No. 1506) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 204 I voted yes. It was my intention to vote no. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 204, I voted yes. It was my intention to vote no. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for vote No. 204 on Tillis amendment No. 1506. Had I been in the Chamber I would have opposed this amendment. Section 136 of the underlying bill requires the Secretary of the Air Force in consultation with the Secretary of the Army to examine the daily training and contingency requirements of the C–130 fleet on this issue.•

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1618, 1539, 1551, 1571, 1484, AND 1511 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up, reported by number, and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 1618; McCain, Blumenthal, and Flake No. 1539; Shaheen No. 1551; Warner No. 1571; Hoeven No. 1484; and Heller No. 1511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for others, proposes en bloc amendments numbered 1618, 1539, 1551, 1571, 1484, and 1511 to amendment No. 1463.

The amendments en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1618

In the appropriate place please insert the following:

SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the accidental transfer of live Bacillus anthracis, also known as anthrax, from an Army laboratory to more than 28 laboratories located in at least 12 states and three countries discovered in May 2015 represents a serious safety lapse;

(2) the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should continue to investigate the cause of this lapse and determine if protective protocols should be strengthened;

(3) the Department of Defense should reassess standards on a regular basis to ensure they are current and effective to prevent a reoccurrence; and

(4) the Department of Defense should keep Congress apprised of the investigation, any potential public health or safety risk, remedial actions taken and plans to regularly reassess standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 1539

(Purpose: To prohibit the Department of Defense from entering into contracts to facilitate payments for honoring members of the Armed Forces at sporting events)

Insert after section 342 the following:

SEC. 342A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS TO FACILITATE PAYMENTS FOR HONORING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT SPORTING EVENTS.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Army National Guard has paid professional sports organizations to honor members of the Armed Forces;

(2) any organization wishing to honor members of the Armed Forces should do so on a voluntary basis, and the Department of Defense should take action to ensure that no payments be made for such activities in the future; and

(3) any organization, including the National Football League, that has accepted taxpayer funds to honor members of the Armed Forces should consider directing an equivalent amount of funding in the form of a donation to a charitable organization that supports members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2241a the following new section:

''§ 2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces

''(a) PROHIBITION.—The Department of Defense may not enter into any contract or other agreement under which payments are to be made in exchange for activities by the contractor intended to honor, or giving the appearance of honoring, members of the armed forces (whether members of the regular components or the reserve components) at any form of sporting event.

''(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Department from taking actions to facilitate activities intended to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events that are provided on a pro bono basis or otherwise funded with non-Federal funds if such activities are provided and received in accordance with applicable rules and regulations regarding the acceptance of gifts by the military departments, the armed forces, and members of the armed forces.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2241a the following new item:

''2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1551

(Purpose: To require a study and report on the changes to the Joint Travel Regulations related to flat rate per diem for long term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. STUDY AND REPORT ON POLICY CHANGES TO THE JOINT TRAVEL REGULATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on

the impact of the policy changes to the Joint Travel Regulations for the Uniformed Service Members and Department of Defense Civilian Employees related to flat rate per diem for long term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014. The study shall assess the following:

(1) The impact of such changes on shipyard workers who travel on long-term temporary duty assignments.

(2) Whether such changes have discouraged employees of the Department of Defense, including civilian employees at shipyards and depots, from volunteering for important temporary duty travel assignments.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the study required by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1571

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on diversity among members of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States military includes individuals with a variety of national, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds that have roots all over the world.

(2) In addition to diverse backgrounds, members of the Armed Forces come from numerous religious traditions, including Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, non-denominational, nonpracticing, and many more.

(3) Members of the Armed Forces from diverse backgrounds and religious traditions have lost their lives or been injured defending the national security of the United States.

(4) Diversity contributes to the strength of the Armed Forces, and service members from different backgrounds and religious traditions share the same goal of defending the United States.

(5) The unity of the Armed Forces reflects the strength in diversity that makes the United States a great Nation.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to recognize and promote diversity in the Armed Forces; and

(2) honor those from all diverse backgrounds and religious traditions who have made sacrifices in serving the United States through the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 1484

(Purpose: To require a report on Air National Guard contributions to the RQ–4 Global Hawk mission)

In title XVI, after subtitle A, insert the following:

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-related Activities

SEC. 1621. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RQ–4 GLOBAL HAWK MISSION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of using the Air National Guard in association with the active duty Air Force to operate and maintain the RQ–4 Global Hawk.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission consisting of members of the Air Force serving on active duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(2) The capacity of the Air National Guard to support an association described in paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 1511

(Purpose: To require additional elements in the report on the plan on the privatization of the defense commissary system)

On page 265, strike line 15 and insert the following:

result of the implementation of the plan;

(C) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the current savings to patrons of the defense commissary system;

(D) an assessment of the impact that privatization of the defense commissary system under the plan would have on all eligible beneficiaries;

(E) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the continued operation of existing commissaries; and

(F) an assessment whether privatization of the defense commissary system is feasible for overseas commissaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendments Nos. 1618, 1539, 1551, 1571, 1484, and 1511 are agreed to en bloc.

AMENDMENT NO. 1543 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator PAUL, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mr. PAUL, proposes an amendment numbered 1543 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government)

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1116. COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority'' after ''mismanagement'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(C) in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee.

''(d)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

''(2) Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) shall not apply to transfers under paragraph (1).

''(3) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

''(e)(1) The head of an agency may retain not more than 10 percent of amounts to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury under subsection (d).

''(2) Amounts retained by the head of an agency under paragraph (1) may be—

''(A) used for the purpose of paying a cash award under subsection (a) to 1 or more employees who identified the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority; and

''(B) to the extent amounts remain after paying cash awards under subsection (a), transferred or reprogrammed for use by the agency, in accordance with any limitation on such a transfer or reprogramming under any other provision of law.

''(f)(1) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management an annual report regarding—

''(A) each disclosure of possible fraud, waste, or mismanagement or identification of potentially surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority by an employee of the agency determined by the agency to have merit;

''(B) the total savings achieved through disclosures and identifications described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the number and amount of cash awards by the agency under subsection (a).

''(2)(A) The head of each agency shall include the information described in paragraph (1) in each budget request of the agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Government Accountability Office an annual report on Federal cost saving and awards based on the reports submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(g) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

''(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

''(h) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.''.

(b) OFFICERS ELIGIBLE FOR CASH AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4509 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term 'agency'—

''(1) has the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

''(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(1).

''(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the officer—

''(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

''(2) is the head of an agency; or

''(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

''4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and on behalf of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, I call up amendment No. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. REED], for Mr. BLUMENTHAL, proposes an amendment numbered 1564 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INCREASE IN CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 801(b)(3) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 597(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$55,000'' and inserting ''$110,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$110,000'' and inserting ''$220,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) that occur on or after such date.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered as if it were offered before Senator PAUL's amendment to maintain an alternation between Democratic amendments and Republican amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1559 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and on behalf of Senator DURBIN I call up amendment No. 1559.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1559 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations)

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

''(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

''(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

''(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

''(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

''(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

''(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

''(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

''(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

''(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any

Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

''(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'expanded affiliated group', 'foreign incorporated entity', 'person', 'domestic', and 'foreign' have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

''2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.''

(b) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall, for purposes of section 2338(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask that Senators wait to speak—which I will be asking to be in morning business in about 2 or 3 minutes—while we finish seeing if the modification that may be at the desk is approved. I ask for their patience for 2 or 3 minutes until we get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1543, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendment, No. 1543, be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1116. COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority'' after ''mismanagement'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(C) in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee.

''(d)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

''(2) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

''(e)(1) The head of an agency may retain not more than 10 percent of amounts to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury under subsection (d).

''(2) Amounts retained by the head of an agency under paragraph (1) may be—

''(A) used for the purpose of paying a cash award under subsection (a) to 1 or more employees who identified the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority; and

''(B) to the extent amounts remain after paying cash awards under subsection (a), transferred or reprogrammed for use by the agency, in accordance with any limitation on such a transfer or reprogramming under any other provision of law.

''(f)(1) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management an annual report regarding—

''(A) each disclosure of possible fraud, waste, or mismanagement or identification of potentially surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority by an employee of the agency determined by the agency to have merit;

''(B) the total savings achieved through disclosures and identifications described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the number and amount of cash awards by the agency under subsection (a).

''(2)(A) The head of each agency shall include the information described in paragraph (1) in each budget request of the agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Government Accountability Office an annual report on Federal cost saving and awards based on the reports submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(g) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

''(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

''(h) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.''.

(b) OFFICERS ELIGIBLE FOR CASH AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4509 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term 'agency'—

''(1) has the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

''(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(1).

''(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the officer—

''(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

''(2) is the head of an agency; or

''(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

''4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.''.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

CLEAN WATER ACT RULE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to share my concerns regarding the administration's recently finalized Clean Water Act rule issued by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to define waters of the United States.

The Clean Water Act clearly states it is the ''policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution.'' Despite this partnership and the limits to Federal authority, the President and his administration, along with some lawmakers, have sought in recent years to clarify and extend the scope of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act in a manner that would expand the Federal Government's ability to regulate waters of the United States—in short, a Federal power grab. Changing the scope of the law, including the Clean Water Act, is solely the responsibility of Congress. Yet, the President's administration has again elected to bypass the legislative process by finalizing this rule.

When I am in Louisiana, I consistently hear from my constituents about the impacts this rule could have on private property development, timberland, farmland, and other bodies of water that would be subject to Federal control. They tell me this rule will create more uncertainty and impact infrastructure projects and jobs despite the EPA and the Corps' assurances to the contrary.

Louisiana is experiencing significant economic growth—growth that is bringing jobs to those Americans who have had the hardest time finding jobs with this recent poorly performing economy. This progress will be negatively affected as a result of this rule.

In addition to the increased costs and regulations, the rule invites costly litigation, and it can significantly restrict the ability of landowners to make decisions about their property and make it harder for State and local governments to plan for their own development.

Let me note that this is not the only rule the EPA has been working on that will negatively impact the economy and the job growth in my State. Their proposed rule to lower the standard for ground-level ozone will hurt job development in Louisiana, carrying with it health impacts to workers and families that are not fully considered by the EPA. It is clearly established that the higher the standard of living, the healthier the family. These rules will lower the standard of living for those who lose their jobs.

In Calcasieu Parish, more than $60 billion in various manufacturing projects are underway and are in the process of being approved—that is $60 billion with a ''b.'' These will require construction workers—again creating the kinds of jobs our economy needs more of. These projects can be severely impacted as a consequence of this rule.

We see in this graphic display the navigable waters prior to the release of the rule this past week in Calcasieu Parish. Now we will see the bodies that will fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government under the finalized rule. Again, this here is under current law. And that is what it will be. This will impact the ability of local government to plan their development.

Instead of people in Louisiana deciding how best to use their property, the Federal Government will be able to dictate many land use decisions, which have always been local. Again, this rule is a major takeover effort by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers. The administration has stated that this rule is narrowly defined. However, under the new definitions for tributaries, adjacent waters, and waters that are neighboring a traditional navigable water, virtually any water body could fall under the Agency's regulatory authority. And if certain bodies of water don't fit these definitions, the Agency can make a case-by-case determinations of significant nexus.

Assistant Secretary Jo-Ellen Darcy from the Army Corps said last week that this rule is a huge win for public health and the economy and reflects that clean water matters to the American people.

First, let me point back to this map that community leaders in Calcasieu Parish provided for me, highlighting that this is not a win for the economy and could significantly impact economic and private land development moving forward.

Secondly, as a physician—I am a doctor—I understand the importance of human health, and I also understand the impacts on human health as a consequence of overregulation by the Federal Government. If people are poor, their health suffers. There is a strong statistical relationship when, because of regulations and regulatory uncertainty, jobs are lost overseas. Again, I believe this revised rule is a power grab by the administration and not based upon any congressional action.

We took a vote on this issue back in March, during the budget debate, to limit the expansion of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, which I supported. Last fall, we took a similar vote while I was in the House of Representatives to repeal this harmful regulation. My colleague from Wyoming, Senator JOHN BARRASSO, has a bill, the Federal Water Quality Protection Act. It is a good bill that provides clarity for how EPA should and should not define the waters of the United States. I know the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma, intends to move this bill through his committee soon, and I wish to offer my support for that legislation.

Again, we have seen time and again that this administration will attempt to overreach the limits of what the executive branch should do. When it comes to the EPA's overreach, the waters of the United States rule isn't the exception; it is the norm.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the bill that is before us and reauthorizing funding priorities for the Department of Defense.

I wish first to congratulate Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member JACK REED for working together on a very important bill. There are a lot of important issues and a lot of important priorities in this legislation for our home State in Michigan.

The fact that we are supporting the A–10s so our troops have the close air support they need is very important. It is important that we are continuing to invest in research and development and new kinds of technologies. We are very proud in Michigan to be the ones that are on the frontlines providing research and development for the Army. If the Army drives it, we design it, fix it, and build it in Warren, MI, and in the surrounding area of Macomb County that we call the Defense Corridor, and we are very proud of that. We have vital military equipment manufactured here in the United States, and in Michigan, specifically, that is supported in this legislation.

It provides very important pay increase and support for our troops that are actually critical.

My concern is not with the contents of what we are doing in this particular bill in terms of supporting the defense of our country and supporting our troops. It is the fact that we have budget gimmicks being used to fund the Department of Defense.

Our troops deserve more than budget gimmicks. Those on the frontlines deserve more than basically funding essential services or pay raises or essential equipment through funds that we know are sort of made-up funds—another name for deficit spending. This has been done over the years, as we

went to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, when there was a fund set up—the overseas contingency account—not including any money in it, but it was a way to mask the fact that we were not funding the wars and we were in fact abusing deficit spending to do it.

So to continue that with the critical items in this bill is a mistake and, frankly, not worthy of the men and women who are on the frontlines, putting their lives—putting themselves—in harm's way every single day. So it is critical that we do better in terms of this budget and the structure of this budget.

Our families also deserve better, because we need to fully fund the full defense of our country—both here at home and overseas—without budget gimmicks, without adding to the deficit. All those things that create a strong country and security for our families need to be done in a way that does not include budget gimmicks. And that, frankly, is not what is being proposed.

That is why I am very proud to be a cosponsor of Senator REED's amendment, which would cap the spending on what has been called this overseas contingency account. Others of us at various points have called it the fake money account because there is no money in it. It is a fancy way of covering up the fact that we are spending and adding to the deficit. Senator REED would basically indicate that this would be capped. We would try to begin to rein that in, to cap that amount. We would also say very clearly that we are going to address the issues that affect the United States in terms of our strength, the defense, broadly, of our country—whether it is in the Department of Defense or whether it is in other parts of our overall budget as a Nation—by basically lifting the caps—for those watching, we talk about the Budget Control Act, but there are caps—in a way so we can fully fund both the Department of Defense but also the other things that need to be done to create security and to fully make sure our families are safe, our economy is safe, and that we are aggressively moving forward as an economy.

That is what Senator REED's amendment would do. It brings some balance. It begins to rein in what is a policy that does not make sense in terms of using budget gimmicks. As I said before, our troops certainly deserve better than that, and our families deserve better than that.

Using gimmicks is a convenient way to avoid dealing with what the real problem is. There is this thing called sequestration. People wonder: What in the world is that? We put in a policy a number of years ago to limit spending. The good news is that we have brought the annual budget deficit down by two thirds. This is good news for our country. Two thirds of the annual deficit is gone. But now, as we go forward and look at what is going to grow the economy and what is going to keep us safe, we look at the threats around the world that are coming at us—not just through the Department of Defense but through every area of the budget. When we look at what we need in terms of jobs and the economy and so on, we know we need to revisit that policy and stop the gimmicks. Don't use gimmicks going forward to pretend that we are still meeting sequestration but to look honestly at the needs of our country today and move forward.

Frankly, on the security front alone, security is more than just what happens at the Department of Defense, as important as that is. It is all of the programs that we rely on day in and day out to keep our country safe. Certainly, we care about border security all the time. That is not predominantly funded in the Department of Defense. We look at cyber security. It is one of the No. 1 issues we have, and we are hearing now from a consumer standpoint, from a security threat or terrorist standpoint, and from a business security standpoint. Cyber security is absolutely critical, and it is not given the same priority of importance as the Department of Defense is as we look at the overall defense of our country.

Counterterrorism—who answers the call, no matter what it is? In Boston, a terrorist attack—who was on the frontlines there? It was local police, local fire, which are under the broad budget parameters that are being discussed now by the majority. The Republican majority would provide less funding—less funding—for the frontline defense in our neighborhoods and in our communities.

Stopping weapons of mass destruction, airport security is something we all know about as we get on airplanes all the time, every week. There is Ebola protection, when we look at the Centers for Disease Control and all of the issues that relate to diseases—whether it is threats at home or whether it is those that can be used in some way as a terrorist attack. Many of the Federal agencies fighting terrorism at home and protecting us from deadly diseases such as Ebola will not receive critical funding under the budget that has been proposed.

Now, there is a willingness to use budget gimmicks in the Department of Defense. Again, our troops are certainly worthy of much more than budget gimmicks. But when we look more broadly at the whole budget, we don't even see enough to use budget gimmicks of these things. I don't think we should be using budget gimmicks, but the point is there is not an acknowledgement that there is more to defense and safety for our country than just in one department.

To be strong abroad we need to be strong at home, as well, and in so many other areas, as we know. If we want to talk about competing around the globe, if we want to talk about what we need to be doing to be secure, to have a robust economy, to outcompete the competition, we have also to talk about educating our young people—which, by the way, is cut in the overall scheme of things in this budget. We have to talk about lowering the costs of college. If there is one thing we are hearing over and over from young people or from those going back to job training programs who lost their job in the economy, going back to get new skills to get a new job, it is about the huge debts they are incurring to do the right thing. People coming out of college are now in a situation where they can't qualify even to buy that first home. They are telling me: Do something about college loan debt. We can't help young people coming out of college to buy a house. They don't qualify because of the amount of debt, and the amount of debt they have will equal a house. That is a security issue for us—education, the ability to have a college education, job training.

Investing in cures for diseases—how exciting it is for us to hear about all the opportunities now through the National Institutes of Health. We have so many promising opportunities and treatments and cures, such as on Alzheimer's—which, by the way, takes one out of every five Medicare dollars—and in other areas, such as cancers, Parkinson's disease, mental health disorders. That is part of our strength and being secure and strong and robust for the future.

Of course, if we are going to be strong, we have to fix our roads and our bridges, and we don't have dollars in this budget. In fact, the whole highway trust fund is going to run out in less than 60 days now if no action is taken by the majority, if there is no sense of urgency from our Republican colleagues.

So we look overall at securing those things at home and abroad, whether it is making sure—beyond the Department of Defense—that we are funding our border security, cyber security, counterterrorism, police and fire departments, airport security, and Ebola protection or whether it is investing in our own people in all of this to create the opportunity for strong businesses, entrepreneurs, and an educated workforce or for infrastructure, making sure that we have those airports and we have those roads.

As I conclude, let me say that all of this leads to the fact that we need to next week vote yes on Senator REED's amendment because that is what it is all about: real safety, real security, growing the economy of our country. Our people deserve better than budget gimmicks that are in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

OBAMACARE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, it has been 5 years since Americans were forced into a broken and unhappy relationship with ObamaCare. Ever since

the implementation of this failed law, Americans have received one broken promise after another. For Montana families, reflecting on the consequences of this law is not a happy trip down memory lane. Too many Montanans have seen their work hours cut, they have been forced off the plans they liked, and they were told they could not see the doctors whom they trusted.

The reviews have been in for quite some time, and ObamaCare is not anything close to what Montanans were promised. Five years later, insurance companies are still unable to find stable rates that do not force more uncertainty and hardship upon Montanans. It has been widely reported across the country that rates for millions of Americans are set to skyrocket again. Look no further than Montana, where it is evident that health care premiums are not as affordable as President Obama promised they would be. Policies sold through ObamaCare exchanges are becoming even more expensive. In fact, in Montana, according to filings with the Montana Commissioner of Securities and Insurance, insurers across the board are asking for double-digit increases for 2016 policies on top of more increases that occurred just last year.

Blue Cross Blue Shield, which is Montana's largest insurer that boasts 255,000 consumers in the State, is asking for an average increase of 23 percent for Montanans enrolled in individual plans. That is the start.

PacificSource filed papers with the commissioner requesting an average of a 31-percent increase for individual plans. What about Montana Health CO-OP? They have requested a 38-percent increase for individual plans. And Montanans who were insured under Time Insurance are facing a staggering 47-percent increase in 2016.

Increased premiums make it harder for Montanans to have access to affordable health care. It is money that no longer is in the pockets of Montanans, and those rate increases are not just in Montana. Across the Nation, Americans are seeing massive and debilitating rate increases. These hikes are a far cry from what Montanans—from what the American people were promised.

In 2007, President Obama said himself that by the end of his first term, ObamaCare would ''cover every American and cut the cost of a typical family's premium by up to $2,500 a year.''

Montanans have not seen their premiums decreased by $2,500 a year. It is not even close. Unfortunately, this is the predictable result of forcing a partisan piece of legislation through Congress without transparent consideration or bipartisan input. We need to ensure health care is affordable, and it needs to be accessible for all Montanans. That starts with repealing ObamaCare, repealing its costly mandates, repealing its burdensome taxes, and repealing the senseless regulations. ObamaCare is not working and it is not popular. This law is a bureaucratic nightmare that hurts small businesses.

I just came out of a meeting with some homebuilders and small business owners from Montana. I showed them this chart before I came down to the floor. One of the builders said: This likely means I no longer will be able to provide health care insurance for my employees.

Growing up in Montana, I grew up hunting, camping, backpacking, fishing. In fact, I was fly fishing in Montana before Brad Pitt made it cool in the movie ''A River Runs Through It.'' I know that when your fishing line gets tangled up, you have two options. I have been there many times on one of the banks of Montana's rivers. Sometimes you take a minute, sometimes you take several minutes, and you work to untangle the line. But other times the line gets so badly knotted up that the best option, instead of spending a long time untangling the line, is to simply cut the line.

After 5 failed years, the American people know ObamaCare is too badly tangled to fix. It is time to cut the line and tie on a new fly.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to begin my comments on this year's National Defense Authorization Act, S. 1376, by thanking all of the members of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. I would especially like to thank the subcommittee's chairman, Senator SESSIONS, for the close working relationship we share.

I want my colleagues to note that Senator SESSIONS and his staff worked closely with me and my staff in developing the elements of the bill pertaining to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. This bipartisan effort has proved fruitful as all of our provisions were adopted unanimously by the full committee during the markup of this bill.

The annual National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress passes every year, and this year will mark what I hope will be the passing of a defense authorization act for the 54th year in a row.

I would like to give my colleagues a brief overview of the provisions in what we will call the NDAA, which we are considering today, as they relate to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee includes missile defense, strategic forces, space programs, the defense-funded portions of the Department of Energy, nonproliferation, and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

In preparing the provisions in the bill that relate to the areas of our jurisdiction, the subcommittee held six hearings and three briefings on defense programs at the Department of Energy, strategic nuclear forces, missile defense, and space programs at the Department of Defense.

As I mentioned before, our committee oversees the strategic nuclear forces based on a triad of air, sea, and land-based delivery platforms. This triad is, as Secretary Carter has called it, ''the bedrock'' of our national defense posture. In the wake of the Department of Defense's 2014 nuclear enterprise review, this is a significant year for reforms and investments to ensure the safety, security, and the effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent.

Among the key priorities going forward, I look forward to working with our leaders at the Department of Energy, at DOD, and my colleagues on the committee to take advantage of smart opportunities to enhance commonality across nuclear systems, sharing expertise and resources across the services—particularly the Navy and Air Force—to enhance the capabilities and cost-effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent in the future.

Critically, the bill creates a position in the Air Force responsible for nuclear command, control, and communications acquisition and policy. The Air Force is responsible for over 70 percent of this mission, which essentially connects the President to the nuclear weapon and the delivery platform. We have found that since the communications layers involve space, air, and ground systems, there is fragmentation in an overall strategy as we begin the modernization of the overall system, which must be fail-safe.

Through hearings and briefings concerning the state of other nations' nuclear programs, it was clear that we face an increasingly complex global nuclear environment. We are well past the days of the Cold War. Today, our deterrent strategy must now account for a wide range of nuclear-armed nations beyond simply Russia to now include Pakistan, India, North Korea, and even China's modernization of its strategic arsenal. Our bill contains a provision that directs the Office of Net Assessment to begin a study on what effect, if any, this multipolar nuclear environment will have on our deterrent strategy. This is an important area which will only grow as time goes on.

In the area of missile defense, this bill fully authorizes the President's budget request for the Missile Defense Agency and maintains our commitments to key allies. It includes several provisions that advance MDA's efforts to deploy additional sensors and to improve the reliability and effectiveness

of the ground-based interceptors. The bill also contains the GAO's annual review of MDA's acquisition programs.

Moving on to space programs, the bill addresses several key aspects of space system acquisition. It includes important provisions aimed at maintaining fair competition among space launch providers through fiscal year 2017. It does not, however, solve a potential 2- to 3-year gap after that, as launch providers work to develop and certify a new American-made rocket engine to replace the Russian RD–180. I hope that gap does not occur, but if it does, I am sure this committee will revisit and correct the issue so we can maintain a competitive and healthy launch industrial base that both ensures DOD's access to space and saves taxpayer dollars. The bill also makes important contributions to ensuring that we address the threats we may face in space by requiring an interagency policy and a principal DOD position to address these threats.

We have authorized the President's requested level of funding for the nuclear modernization programs at the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA. We also create a program that enables the scientists and engineers at the NNSA to work on new concepts and methods that shorten the time and the cost for future life extensions of our warheads.

Let me close noting that we fully fund the President's request for nonproliferation at both the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Defense. At the NNSA, these programs collect loose nuclear material around the world, which could be used as terrorist devices against us. The NNSA also maintains a network of radiation detectors at borders across the world to detect the illegal transfer of nuclear material before it can cross our borders here in America.

Finally, the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program at the Department of Defense will continue to secure weapons of mass destruction all around the world, as it did with Syria's chemical weapons and dangerous pathogens at Ebola clinics in West Africa. The relatively small sum of money in this program has made a noticeable difference in reducing dangerous threats to our country.

I take particular pride in this program as the enduring legacy of my fellow Hoosier, Senator Richard Lugar, who has done our Nation and the world a great service as a champion for nuclear nonproliferation. He and Senator Sam Nunn were extraordinary leaders, and we are proud to try to follow in their tradition.

I again thank Senator SESSIONS for the productive and bipartisan relationship we have had on the subcommittee and also all members on the subcommittee for taking part in our hearings and in crafting the provisions under this subcommittee's jurisdiction.

I look forward to working with our colleagues to pass this important legislation.

I yield back any remaining time that has been allotted.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have had a number of our colleagues come to the floor to talk about the importance of the Export-Import Bank, and I want to see if I can put in context the exceptionally important work done by our colleagues Senator CANTWELL and Senator HEITKAMP on this issue.

We have been talking in this body for weeks now about the importance of trade and particularly tapping global markets, given the fact that there are going to be 1 billion middle-class people in the developing world in 2025. This is an exceptional opportunity for us to be able to sell the products we make here, whether they are computers or wine or helicopters or planes, you name it.

We had a big debate about trade promotion authority. What I want to spend just a few minutes talking about is whether a Senator was for trade promotion authority or not, they ought to support the Export-Import Bank because the Export-Import Bank provides key financing tools to promote products that are made in my home State, in the States of our colleagues, and all across the land. It has supported tens of thousands of American jobs—even hundreds of thousands—for decades. It doesn't cost American taxpayers a single dime. In fact, the Export-Import Bank covers its own costs and then some. It actually generates revenue for taxpayers—$7 billion over the last two decades and $675 million in fiscal year 2014 alone.

So what I would submit is the Export-Import Bank is a way to ensure that in this country we get trade done right. I happen to believe it makes sense to support the trade promotion act because that is going to ensure that we are going to have a chance to drive down some of those tariffs that are barriers to American products. Whether you are for it or not, you ought to support the Export-Import Bank because it provides key tools so we can reduce barriers to our exports, take on modern challenges that threaten American workers, and fight to create more high-wage jobs in the United States because it provides the financing you need in order to actually secure one of these deals. The Export-Import Bank is a core part of getting trade done right.

Countries, including Germany, Japan, Mexico, and Canada, all have agencies that are up and running and do it in a fashion that make their exports more competitive. How are they doing it? They are using financing tools, including supporting their manufacturers and pushing their products into the global marketplace.

As Senators CANTWELL and HEITKAMP have said, we need this tool to make sure our country doesn't fall behind. We shouldn't let the Export-Import Bank become some kind of ideological pinata that you keep bashing on, not recognizing it will hurt our competitiveness. I think it would be legislative malpractice to let the Bank expire because it would needlessly endanger the thousands of businesses and tens of thousands of jobs supported by Ex-Im, including many in my home State.

In particular, in Oregon, one can see that Ex-Im is a very substantial help to small- and medium-sized companies. In fact, 86 percent of the funds disbursed in fiscal year 2014 went to small businesses. Thanks to the Export-Import Bank, companies in Albany could find markets abroad and hire new workers. They manufacture important things such as titanium casting.

Selmet is a perfect example, a company that got its start in my home State years ago. Today, it employs hundreds of people in Oregon and across the United States, and 40 percent of its revenue comes from overseas. They got off the ground with help from Ex-Im Bank, and it has customers in France, Germany, and Asia, and it is looking to expand further.

These kinds of success stories are ones you see in every single State because these startups got help when it was essential to have that added boost to be able to seize the opportunities around the world and create high-skilled, high-wage jobs.

To me, when we debate the future of the Export-Import Bank, colleagues, this is about red, white, and blue jobs. Keeping the Export-Import Bank up and running with the important financing tools it offers is part of getting trade done right.

I commend our colleagues Senators CANTWELL, HEITKAMP, MURRAY, and GRAHAM, who have come together in a bipartisan way to work to extend the Bank as quickly as possible, and they have my support.

NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I asked for an extra few minutes. I want to spend another few minutes just talking about another part of our economy that I think can grow in the days ahead, and I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to bring a basket of Oregon products onto the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this week is National Hemp History Week, and to help celebrate I thought I would show a few Oregon-made hemp products to highlight the many uses and opportunities for industrial hemp in my State and across the country.

In the basket I brought, I have food, soap, clothes, and even deck sealant, all made in Oregon, bought and sold in American stores and used by Americans. Oregon companies such as Bob's Red Mill, Fiddlebumps, and Hemp Shield contribute to our economy in unique ways. Industrial hemp supports a $620 million industry in America, and our companies have found innovative ways of incorporating it into everyday products.

However, the full growth potential of this industry is being cut down before it can fully bloom because a single ingredient that links all of these products—the hemp itself—cannot be grown in America. The unfortunate reality is that current Federal rules prohibit our farmers from growing industrial hemp on American soil. This means 100 percent of the hemp used in these products is imported from other nations. The Federal ban on hemp amounts, in my view, to a restriction on free enterprise, and it doesn't accomplish anything but stifles job creation and economic growth.

We are the world's largest consumers of hemp products, but we are the only major industrialized nation to ban hemp farming. This hasn't always been the case, and it doesn't have to continue to be the case. It was once a booming crop in America and it can and should be again.

American farmers were growing this product as early as the 1600s, before our Nation was even founded. The Declaration of Independence, colleagues, was written on paper made from hemp. In the 1800s and early 1900s, it was used to make rope, heating oil, and textiles. During World War II we used it as part of the Hemp for Victory Program to support our soldiers. But everything got changed when hemp got wrapped up with marijuana in Federal regulations, and it has been banned ever since. Are they related? Maybe industrial hemp and marijuana are related species, but one should not be confused with the other, much like a Chihuahua and a St. Bernard. Mixing hemp in with a ban on growing marijuana is based on a lot of misconception. No matter where Members of this body come down on medical or recreational marijuana, industrial hemp and marijuana might be related plant species, but there are big differences between them, such as their chemical makeup.

Because they are not the same plant, they should not be treated with the same regulation and prohibitions. In my view, keeping the ban on growing hemp makes about as much sense as instituting a ban on Portobello mushrooms. There is no reason to outlaw a product that is perfectly safe because of what it is related to.

That is why the majority leader Senator MCCONNELL and I came together, with our colleague from Kentucky RAND PAUL and my colleague from Oregon JEFF MERKLEY—we came together on a bipartisan basis to introduce the Industrial Hemp Farming Act. Our bill would make sure hemp does not get lumped into the definition of marijuana in the Controlled Substances Act.

Our bill is all about stopping the unfair punishment of entrepreneurs and farmers who want to be part of a growing ag industry here in America. Companies in our Nation that are importing hemp to use in food, cosmetics, soap, clothing, and auto parts, they ought to be buying that hemp from American farmers and contributing to our agricultural sector.

I will close by way of saying there are also big environmental benefits to industrial hemp. It takes less water to grow hemp than it does to grow cotton, and hemp generally requires fewer pesticides than other crops. I will put it this way, colleagues: If you can buy it at your local supermarket—and I got involved in this because I saw it at Costco when my wife was pregnant with our third child—if you can buy it at the local supermarket, American farmers ought to be able to grow it.

I urge my colleagues to join me, the distinguished majority leader Senator MCCONNELL, his colleague Senator RAND PAUL, and my colleague Senator MERKLEY in our legislation to address this gap in American law and today join me in celebrating National Hemp History Week by learning more about this safe and versatile crop and the potential it holds to bolster American agriculture and the domestic economy.

These products are products that are sold all across America. We ought to have a chance for our farmers—farmers in Nebraska, farmers in Arkansas, farmers in Indiana—to be able to grow this product and reap the benefits of the private economy associated with it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is ''Waste of the Week'' time again, and the waste of the Federal Government's spending just keeps piling up. Today, I am taking a look at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. We all have a stake in this. I am a veteran, but even those of us who are not veterans have a stake in making sure our veterans are getting the use of taxpayer dollars for their benefit for the sacrifices they made.

Over the past year, we have been hearing on the floor and continue to see story after story of mismanagement that is plaguing the VA. Many of these news articles tell the story of our Nation's heroes not receiving the care or the resources they have earned and that they deserve. Last month—just last month—I read yet another frightening headline, frustrating. ''Veterans Affairs improperly spent $6 Billion annually, senior VA official says''—improperly spent $6 billion annually.

According to an internal memo written by the VA's senior official for procurement, the VA has been wasting taxpayer money by violating Federal contracting rules to pay for medical care and expenses. Under law, VA purchases require competitive bidding and proper contracts, but testimony from Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Logistics Jan Frye, before Congress last month revealed that just the opposite is occurring.

So the medical care and supplies our veterans need for their medical needs are being compromised at a cost of $6 billion a year. Mr. Frye wrote:

> Over the past five years, some senior VA acquisition and finance officials have willfully violated the public trust while Federal procurement and financial laws were debased. Their overt actions and dereliction of duties combined have resulted in billions of taxpayer dollars being spent without regard to Federal laws and regulations, making a mockery of Federal statutes.

An example of this violation is found with VA purchase cards. Typically, VA uses these cards for smaller purchases of up to $3,000, according to the rules and regulations. But they were inappropriately used to buy billions of dollars' worth of medical supplies without contracts or oversight. Mr. Frye continued:

> In addition, doors are flung wide open for fraud, waste and abuse when contracts are not executed. For example, by law, prices paid for goods or services subject to contract can only be determined to be fair and reasonable by duly appointed contracting officers. I can state without reservation that VA has and continues to waste millions of dollars by paying excessive prices for goods and services due to breaches of Federal procurement laws.

According to reports, the VA has failed to engage in a competitive bidding or signing contract process ensuring a good deal for the services they are unable to provide in house, such as specialized tests and surgeries and other procedures. In fact, the VA has paid at least $5 billion in such fees in violation of Federal rules.

This is yet but another example of what the White House has recognized—as—and I quote—''corrosive culture'' at the Veterans' Administration. I think we all agree our 8.7 million American veterans and our more than 130 million taxpayers deserve a lot better. Given the large scale of purchases made by the VA, proper procurement procedures ensure the best products for veterans and the best value for taxpayers.

Aside from higher prices, a lack of contracts can result in a lack of oversight. The VA, just like Congress, is accountable and must be accountable for what it spends. Now, I understand the incredible pressure the VA has been under with the recent influx of new

veterans. I appreciate the good work of many people who work at the VA. Still, no matter the growth in need, it is never in order to violate Federal law. This kind of reckless spending cannot and must not be tolerated.

Each year, Congress sends billions of dollars to the VA to care for our veterans. With those funds, comes an obligation to use every dollar of those funds properly. By simply requiring the VA to comply with Federal law, we can save $6 billion. This is a simple fix with large results and we should take it.

Today, I am adding an additional $6 billion to our ever-increasing gauge of taxpayer money that comes to Washington and is spent for improper and unnecessary purposes. We are now two-thirds of the way to our goal of $100 billion. We are going to be doing this every week as long as the Senate is in session this year. I hope we have to add an additional attachment to this gauge because, folks, there is no end to discovering the kind of waste of taxpayers' money for unnecessary programs, violating the law, violating regulations, mismanaging the spending at the Federal level. We are going to continue to point out these issues week after week. Hopefully, we can get the attention of our colleagues and the American people, and they will demand that we do something about this.

While we have not been able—no thanks to the administration—to come up with a sensible, long-term fix to our deficit spending and continuing plunge into debt, we can at least look at these programs that have been identified by the inspector generals, by the Government Accountability Office, and by the Office of Management and Budget as wasting taxpayer dollars.

So there is much we can do while we are trying to get to the point where we have an administration that allows us to address the larger issue; that is, a government out of control, spending taxpayers' money and wasting money, which we will point out every week. Tune in again next week for the next ''Waste of the Week.''

I thank my colleague from Nebraska for generously yielding me the time to do this. I have somewhat of a schedule hitch. She was gracious enough to allow me the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the National Defense Authorization Act or NDAA. The brave men and women who serve in our Armed Forces have protected our Nation for generations. Because of their selflessness, we are able to enjoy many freedoms here at home, but it is important to remember that these liberties are not free.

The sacrifices made by our servicemembers are extraordinary, and we must ensure that they have the resources necessary and needed to defend the United States. That is why the NDAA has been passed each of the last 53 years. I was proud to continue this tradition by working with my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee to pass the fiscal year 2016 NDAA only a few weeks ago.

While this bill is not perfect, it is the result of a bipartisan compromise to perform the most important function of the Federal Government, providing for the national defense. This bill's importance is widely known, but the details are not often given enough attention.

For this reason, I would like to take a moment to discuss some of the key provisions that play such a critical role in preserving the security of our Nation and the effectiveness of our military. Included in this bill are several commonsense proposals to cut inefficiencies and use the savings that are generated to better meet the needs of our warfighters.

For example, the Air Force's next-generation bomber and new tanker program have both suffered delays and they cannot spend the full amount requested when the budget was submitted in February. So this bill reduces funding for these programs accordingly and moves about $660 million in savings to meet unfunded requirements of our military.

Across a large number of budget lines, unjustified increases were reduced, troubled programs were cut, and again the difference was used to meet high-priority requirements of our men and women in uniform.

The bill also combats the continued growth in headquarters staff at the Pentagon and major commands, an issue I discussed with Secretary Carter at his confirmation hearing. Two years ago, the Department announced its intention to reduce 20 percent of its headquarters staff by 2019. However, it has yet to provide the Armed Services Committee with a plan to accomplish these reductions.

This legislation takes action. It reduces funding for headquarters and management staff by 7.5 percent. This goes beyond even the Department's stated goal. It results in $1.7 billion in savings that are reprioritized to support more important needs. In all, the bill moves about $10 billion from unnecessary spending to increase the capabilities of our warfighters. One such area is the development of the advanced technologies.

This bill sets aside $400 million for the offset initiative announced by the Department in November of last year. The technological superiority of our forces has come under increasing threat in recent years. This is an issue that the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, which I chair, has followed closely.

The new funding devoted to this initiative is targeted toward the development of the next-generation technology, such as lasers and railguns that will enable our military's continued advantage on the battlefield of the future.

I am also pleased that this bill will fully support the modernization of our nuclear forces, and it includes additional funding requested by the Department to address critical needs in our nuclear forces identified in reviews last year.

The bill reauthorizes key assistance and training programs, and it also provides the Secretary of Defense new authority to partner with nations in the Middle East, the South Pacific, and Eastern Europe to support U.S. interests in these key regions. It also codifies the Department of Defense's role in defending the Nation in cyber space, and it requires the Department to regularly conduct training exercises with other governmental agencies to meet this responsibility.

The importance of the last two issues I mentioned, cyber security and security assistance programs, was reinforced during a recent trip that I led to Eastern Europe.

Our allies there are deeply concerned by Russia's military intervention in Ukraine and their increasingly provocative behavior. They are all calling for more cooperation with the United States in both of these key areas.

These are just a few of the reasons why the NDAA is such an important piece of legislation. While I strongly support many of its provisions, it is important to repeat that this is the product of bipartisan compromise, not consensus.

One of the most hotly debated topics during the committee's markup process was the use of overseas contingency operations funds to meet basic defense requirements. In a world where ISIL continues to expand its reach, Russia has seized Crimea and pours fighters into eastern Ukraine, and China is intimidating its neighbors and building islands in the South China Sea, we must fund our national defense. To not do so would be unacceptable. We cannot hold our military hostage to a political controversy.

Despite disagreements, the committee has again produced a compromise product—as it has year after year—that supports our national defense and the needs of our men and women in uniform. I am inspired by their service, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to protect our great Nation as the full Senate considers the NDAA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understand that we are now in a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Therefore, it is not in order for me to call up an amendment to the Defense bill. I will come back and get this amendment pending at the appropriate time on the floor.

CITIZENS UNITED DECISION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I wish to take a few minutes now to speak about my amendment No. 1693, which responds to the very unfortunate Citizens United decision. January 2015 was that decision's fifth anniversary, and it has had a pretty nefarious effect on our democracy.

The premise of the decision was that unlimited corporate expenditures would not corrupt or exert improper influence in our American democratic process because there would be a regime of—to quote the decision—''effective disclosure'' that would ''provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters.''

Well, here we are. Everybody in this room knows that there has been no effective disclosure whatsoever. We live in a world of dark money in which special interests spend tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars in elections to buy influence and to try to make sure that people get their way. There is neither public knowledge nor accountability about that dark money spending.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, in an editorial in June 2012, described the problem very well:

> Money. Buckets of it. Tidal waves that one pundit has dubbed the ''tsunami of slime.''

Well, we who are in this political world have experienced firsthand that tsunami of slime that the Citizens United decision unleashed. In the 2014 midterm elections, the Washington Post has reported that at least 31 percent of all independent spending in those elections was spent by groups that don't disclose who their donors are. You don't know who is behind their money.

You know the candidates know who is behind the money. For sure they are going to be told, but the public doesn't know who is behind that money.

And that 31 percent doesn't even count what are called issue ads, where somebody says the Presiding Officer, for instance, has a terrible position on this issue and you need to call her and tell her that her position is terrible, anti-American, wicked, no good, and that she is awful—and on and on they go. That is an issue ad, and so it doesn't even count. So that whole extra bit—also dark—is not even part of the 31 percent.

And the big, obvious thing that the Citizens United decision completely overlooked is that if you give big corporations and hugely wealthy special interests the ability to spend on elections, guess what else you give them. You give them the ability to threaten to spend or to promise to spend, and you know that those threats and promises are never going to be in any regime of effective disclosure. That is the ultimate private exercise of political influence. We have no idea how big the effect is of those silent threats and promises—silent, at least, to the public.

The American people are pretty fed up. The New York Times this week reported on a poll, and I will just quote a little bit from the story:

> The findings reveal deep support among Republicans and Democrats alike for new measures to restrict the influence of wealthy givers, including limiting the amount of money that can be spent by ''super PACs'' and forcing more public disclosure on organizations now permitted to intervene in elections without disclosing the names of their donors.

And the story continues:

> And by a significant margin, they reject the argument that underpins close to four decades of Supreme Court jurisprudence on campaign finance: that political money is a form of speech protected by the First Amendment.

Clearly, money facilitates speech, but it also facilitates bribery. It also facilitates simply bludgeoning political actors and political parties with pressure.

Now, the results here:

> More than four in five Americans [more than 80 percent of Americans] say money plays too great a role in political campaigns . . . while two-thirds say that the wealthy have more of a chance to influence the elections process than other Americans.

That is not healthy when 80 percent of Americans think that money plays too great a part and two-thirds of Americans think that they don't have an equal shot in elections compared to the wealthy.

And it is not only Democrats and independents who feel this way. I will continue to read:

> Those concerns—and the divide between Washington elites and the rest of the country—extend to Republicans. Three-quarters of self-identified Republicans support requiring more disclosure by outside spending organizations. . . . Republicans in the poll were almost as likely as Democrats to favor further restrictions on campaign donations.

So if three-quarters of self-identified Republicans support requiring more disclosure by outside political spending organizations, I would hope that I could get support for this amendment which would require some disclosure.

It would require any company that contracts with the Department of Defense—and they get big contracts with billions, hundreds of billions of dollars—to disclose all of its campaign spending over $10,000. It is a requirement that would apply to all the corporate officers, the board members, and to anyone who owns 5 percent or more of the company.

When there is that much money sloshing around in the defense budget, and when political actors are making the decisions about where that goes, we ought to be able to connect the dots between those corporations and whom they are giving big money to.

So this is a very simple disclosure provision. Again, 75 percent of Republicans support increased disclosure, and, in fact, a considerable number of Republicans in the Senate used to support disclosure. Over and over, you see Members who are still here, including the majority leader, who were ardent supporters of disclosure—ardent supporters of disclosure, that is, until it turned out that after Citizens United, the big, dark money tended to come in on behalf of—guess what—Republicans.

So the disclosure principle evaporated, but I think it has to come back. The public is sick of it. It is time we cleaned up the political process from all this dark money. It is totally consistent with the premise of the Citizens United decision.

So when the time comes for me to call up this amendment and get it pending, I will do so with the hope that we can find some Republican support for the American people being allowed to know who is spending big bucks to influence elections. We are entitled to know that.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, one other thing I wish to speak in favor of is the amendment of Senator REED, my senior Senator—Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island—to cut the so-called OCO budget gimmick from the Defense bill.

I am on the Budget Committee, and I have heard very passionate protestations from my colleagues on the Budget Committee about the importance of reducing the deficit, not dealing with the national debt, reducing borrowing, deficit spending, and all of that. Well, when it comes to this particular bill, suddenly all of those concerns have gone completely out the window. They are funding a significant portion of this Defense authorization with imaginary money, with an account that is not intended to support ongoing, continuing, baseline defense expenditures, and that is reserved for overseas contingencies and that, therefore, doesn't have to be paid for. So it would be a clear increase to the debt and the deficit to go down this road, and we would very much prefer that instead of using the so-called OCO gimmick to fund this authorization with deficit spending, we sit down and have a mature and consequential discussion between the White House and the Senate and the House on where our spending is going to go and with what accounts we are going to be able to do it. Before we start going account by account through the appropriations process, we have a plan in mind so that we don't find that certain favored accounts get dealt with first and then the rug gets pulled out from under the others.

I think that is a reasonable way, and I support Senator REED's amendment and his notion that we should have a bipartisan plan to replace the arbitrary sequester cuts with a balanced deficit-reduction strategy that includes, among other things, closing some wasteful tax loopholes.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered,

OIL EXPORTS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, when we talk about national security issues and the vulnerabilities we have as a nation, I can think of no other area where we face such challenges and yet such opportunities when it comes to our energy assets and how we can utilize our energy policies at their intersection points with our national security policies.

The inability of the United States to export oil is a vulnerability to our nation. At a time when we have risen to be the world's top producer of oil, our outdated 1970s-era ban on oil exports is causing us to miss out on a significant economic- and security-related benefits.

The good news is we can change this. It is within our power to change this, and that is why I have come to the floor this afternoon.

Here is a fact: The United States is the only advanced Nation that prohibits crude oil exports. We are the only one. Countries such as Australia, Denmark, Norway, the United Kingdom, Canada, and even New Zealand all allow for both imports and exports, just like the normal trade in any other commodity. It is distinctly weird that we would prohibit our own exports.

We are also in a position where our friends and our trading partners are openly asking us for assistance. They are coming to us and saying: Hey, can you help? We are your friends. We are your allies. You have the resources.

The world has changed dramatically. We have new alliances. We have new threats. We have new hopes. We have new fears. It is my own hope that while the world may have changed, our Nation's role as a global leader has not eroded. This is an area where we have an opportunity to prove it has not eroded.

Our energy renaissance is a new thing, and sometimes it takes time to understand the implications of new things, of changes, but here is where we have been. We have already held about half a dozen hearings on the topic of oil exports in the House and in the Senate since last January. I introduced this subject last January 2014, and I said at that time that 2014 was going to be the year of the report, where we would seek out the experts, we would ask the think tanks to weigh in on this issue, and so they did. The reports that came out were numerous, they were considered, they were thoughtful, and they were all very helpful. Reports came out of the Brookings Institution, Columbia University, the Center for a New American Security—too many to even list here. The individual experts who are in favor of allowing oil exports are also quite impressive. These are people whom we look to for leadership in a host of different areas.

There was a piece in the Wall Street Journal that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, penned by Leon Panetta and Stephen Hadley, the Defense Secretary in the Obama administration and the National Security Advisor in the Bush administration. They wrote a piece that was entitled ''The Oil-Export Ban Harms National Security.'' It is well-founded, well-written, and to the point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal (Opinion) May 19, 2015]

THE OIL-EXPORT BAN HARMS NATIONAL SECURITY

THE U.S. IS WILLFULLY DENYING ITSELF A TOOL THAT COULD PROVE VITAL IN DEALING WITH THREATS FROM RUSSIA, IRAN AND OTHERS

(By Leon E. Panetta and Stephen J. Hadley)

The United States faces a startling array of global security threats, demanding national resolve and the resolve of our closest allies in Europe and Asia. Iran's moves to become a regional hegemon, Russia's aggression in Ukraine, and conflicts driven by Islamic terrorism throughout the Middle East and North Africa are a few of the challenges calling for steadfast commitment to American democratic principles and military readiness. The pathway to achieving U.S. goals also can be economic—as simple as ensuring that allies and friends have access to secure supplies of energy.

Blocking access to these supplies is the ban on exporting U.S. crude oil that was enacted, along with domestic price controls, after the 1973 Arab oil embargo. The price controls ended in 1981 but the export ban lives on, though America is awash in oil.

The U.S. has broken free of its dependence on energy from unstable sources. Only 27% of the petroleum consumed here last year was imported, the lowest level in 30 years. Nearly half of those imports came from Canada and Mexico. But our friends and allies, particularly in Europe, do not enjoy the same degree of independence. The moment has come for the U.S. to deploy its oil and gas in support of its security interests around the world.

Consider Iran. Multilateral sanctions, including a cap on its oil exports, brought Tehran to the negotiating table. Those sanctions would have proved hollow without the surge in domestic U.S. crude oil production that displaced imports. Much of that foreign oil in turn found a home in European countries, which then reduced their imports of Iranian oil to zero.

The prospect of a nuclear agreement with Iran does not permit the U.S. to stand still. Once world economic growth increases the demand for oil, Iran is poised to ramp up its exports rapidly to nations whose reduced Iranian imports were critical to the sanctions' success, including Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, India and China. U.S. exports would help those countries diversify their sources and avoid returning to their former level of dependence on Iran.

More critically, if negotiations fail, or if Tehran fails to comply with its commitments, the sanctions should snap back into place, with an even tighter embargo on Iranian oil exports. It will be much harder to insist that other countries limit Iranian imports if the U.S. refuses to sell them its oil.

There are other threats arising from global oil suppliers that the U.S. cannot afford to ignore. Libya is racked by civil war and attacks by the Islamic State. Venezuela's mismanaged economy is near collapse.

Most ominous is Russia's energy stranglehold on Europe. Fourteen NATO countries buy 15% or more of their oil from Russia, with several countries in Eastern and Central Europe exceeding 50%. Russia is the sole or predominant source of natural gas for several European countries including Finland, Slovakia, Bulgaria and the Baltic states. Europe as a whole relies on Russia for more than a quarter of its natural gas.

This situation leaves Europe vulnerable to Kremlin coercion. In January 2009, Russia cut off natural gas to Ukraine, and several European countries completely lost their gas supply. A recent EU ''stress test'' showed that a prolonged Russian supply disruption would result in several countries losing 60% of their gas supplies.

Further, revenue from sales to Europe provides Russia with considerable financial resources to fund its aggression in Ukraine. That conflict could conceivably spread through Central Europe toward the Baltic states. So far, the trans-Atlantic alliance has held firm, but the trajectory of this conflict is unpredictable. The U.S. can provide friends and allies with a stable alternative to threats of supply disruption. This is a strategic imperative as well as a matter of economic self-interest.

The domestic shale energy boom has supported an estimated 2.1 million U.S. jobs, according to a 2013 IHS study, but the recent downturn in oil prices has led to massive cuts in capital spending for exploration and production. Layoffs in the oil patch have spread outward, notably to the steel industry. Lifting the export ban would put some of these workers back on the job and boost the U.S. economy.

Why, then, does the ban endure? Habit and myth have something to do with it. U.S. energy policy remains rooted in the scarcity mentality that took hold in the 1970s. Even now, public perception has yet to catch up to the reality that America has surpassed both Russia and Saudi Arabia as the world's largest producer of liquid petroleum (exceeding 11 million barrels a day). The U.S. became the largest natural gas producer in 2010, and the federal government will now license exports of liquefied natural gas.

The fear that exporting U.S. oil would cause domestic gasoline prices to rise is misplaced. The U.S. already exports refined petroleum, including 875,000 barrels a day of gasoline in December 2014. The result is that U.S. gasoline prices approximate the world price. Several recent studies, including by the Brookings Institution, Resources for the Future and Rice University's Center for Energy Studies, demonstrate that crude oil exports would actually put downward pressure on U.S. gasoline prices, as more oil supply hits the global market and lowers global prices.

Too often foreign-policy debates in America focus on issues such as how much military power should be deployed to the Middle East, whether the U.S. should provide arms to the Ukrainians, or what tougher economic sanctions should be imposed on Iran. Ignored is a powerful, nonlethal tool: America's abundance of oil and natural gas. The U.S. remains the great arsenal of democracy. It should also be the great arsenal of energy.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. It said directly: We keep this ban in place, this decades-

old ban. It hurts us as a nation. It harms us from a national security perspective, not to mention the benefits that oil exports will provide when it comes to increased production and increased jobs benefits to our economy.

There are other folks out there who have also weighed in. Larry Summers, formerly the Treasury Secretary for President Clinton and also Director of the National Economic Council for President Obama, said this about lifting the ban on oil exports: ''The merits are as clear as the merits with respect to any significant public policy issue that I have ever encountered.'' This is a guy many people looked to for leadership in a host of different areas. The merits are as clear as the merits with respect to any significant public policy issue he has encountered.

Tom Donilon, formerly the National Security Advisor to President Obama, has said that allowing exports ''will increase diversity of supply, increase competition, reduce volatility and lower prices in global markets.''

The questions we needed to ask about oil exports have been asked, and answered favorably. Independent experts have studied what would happen if we lift the ban and almost universally encouraged us to move forward to lift this outdated, outmoded policy.

This is not a partisan issue. My colleague from North Dakota is on the floor today. We have introduced bipartisan legislation to remove this ban. This is something which is simply in the best interest of the United States, both in terms of our economic strength and in terms of our national security.

I am here today to tell our colleagues, to repeat and remind our colleagues that the time to legislate on oil exports is now. I think the bill we have in front of us, the National Defense Authorization Act being led by our friend and colleague from Arizona, is the perfect vehicle on which to advance this. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to call up and make pending my amendment No. 1594, related to crude oil exports.

Mr. President, I withhold the request to make this amendment pending at this point in time, but if I may proceed to speak to three quick components to the amendment.

The first requires the Department of Energy to assess the impact that lifting sanctions on Iran would have on global oil markets. We would likely see higher Iranian oil exports, even as American producers are prohibited from accessing global markets. So our friends in Japan, India, South Korea, and elsewhere would continue importing from Iran, in part because they cannot get the crude oil from us. They cannot import from us. That situation is simply unacceptable. We would be lifting sanctions on Iranian oil while maintaining them on American oil.

I have made this point and I have repeated it before: Leaving in place the oil export ban on U.S. producers while at the same time sanctions are relieved on Iranian producers effectively sanctions U.S. oil production.

There was an article in Reuters this week that revealed that India is now importing record volumes of oil directly from Iran. Another from May showed record oil exports out of Iraq to global markets. Yet another shows the highest volumes of oil exports from Saudi Arabia in 10 years. So the fact is that we are simply not competing.

The second component of my amendment says that 30 days after completion of this report, all U.S. crude oil may be exported on the same basis as the regulations and law currently allow for exports of petroleum products. Today, we can export gasoline, we can export diesel, we can export jet fuel—really, any refined product we can export without a license—but we cannot export crude oil. It does not make sense, and it is high time we resolve that inconsistency.

The third component of my amendment preserves the authorities of the President to block exports during emergencies, during a national security crisis, and so forth.

So what we have done is we have borrowed language on these authorities directly from the legislation from 20 years ago that authorized oil exports from Alaska's North Slope, which was a measure that passed the Senate on a bipartisan vote, 74 to 25, and was signed into law by President Clinton. What we had over 20 years ago was an overwhelmingly favorable vote well before this American energy renaissance began.

I find the whole idea that oil exports would still be prohibited a little mind-boggling. The Commerce Department keeps a list of commodities that are in short supply. They call this the short supply controls. Historically, these controls were generally not blanket prohibitions; they were on items such as aluminum, copper, iron and steel scrap, diamond bort and powder, nickel selenium, and the polio vaccine—not blanket prohibitions, just bits of them. Only three items remain on the short supply controls list. One of them—you guessed it—is crude oil, the second is western red cedar, and the third is horse for slaughter. There is also a small caveat here that prohibits exports from the Naval Petroleum Reserves, but, really, the list is pretty short. There are three things: crude oil, western cedar trees, and horse for slaughter. Clearly our policy needs to be modernized.

We see many parts of the world in a state of unrest. Many parts of the world are seemingly on fire. America and American energy need to be ready to render vital assistance to our friends who are counting on us to demonstrate that global leadership. This is our chance, and I look forward to further discussion on the floor as we move this NDAA measure forward.

I encourage colleagues to look at this amendment, look at the merits of the reports that have gone down in the past year, and look to updating this very outdated policy that is holding us back as a nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for her remarks. Please count me in. It is very timely and extremely important.

71ST ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this Saturday will be the 71st anniversary of one of the greatest days in history—D-day, June 6, 1944, the day that led to Allied victory in Europe in World War II, the preservation of Western democracy, no less, and freedom for generations to come.

Few days in history belong to individuals, but this day, D-day, belongs to Dwight David Eisenhower. Ike came to this day, which forever established his place in history as a soldier, as a Kansan, and most of all as an American.

I come to the floor today as a Senator, as a marine, and as Ike's fellow Kansan. Most of all, I come to share Ike with my fellow Americans and my colleagues in the Senate.

There are days in history that change nations and the course of history itself. D-day, June 6, 1944, was one of those days. The events growing out of that day changed the course of millions of lives, preserved Western civilization, and led to victory over a ruthless tyranny totally dedicated to destroying democracy.

The sacrifices and human losses were immense. Several weeks ago, on May 8, the whole of Europe—from Amsterdam to Moscow—was not only celebrating European victory in World War II but also remembering the special sacrifices of the brave young Americans who made victory possible when it seemed impossible, especially in June of 1944, when the whole of Europe and much of Russia was under the Nazi boot. These cataclysmic events were set in motion on D-day by the heroic decisionmaking of one man, a Kansan from modest origins and humble roots—Dwight David Eisenhower—who, at the direction of the President of the United States, carried individually the sole responsibility of supreme command of all Allied forces in Europe in World War II.

The decision to launch the invasion was his alone, and the risk of failure was enormous, with huge human losses assured for America and all of its allies. Ike's decision, however, proved correct and was followed by the greatest demonstration of military coalition leadership ever seen in history—before or since D-day. This brilliant leadership by General Eisenhower led to victory in Europe in 1945, followed by the defeat of Japan.

Ike never let his gigantic role in history push his ego ahead of modesty, common sense, and humility. As he famously said in 1945, ''Humility must always be the portion of any man who receives acclaim earned in blood of his followers and sacrifices of his friends.''

Ike's transcending humanity won not only his fellow citizens' respect but also their affection. Indeed, he won the respect and affection of much of the world, and he is celebrated internationally to this very day.

Currently, I am privileged to serve as the chairman of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Two giants of the United States Senate brought me to this role: Congressional Medal of Honor winner Danny Inouye and U.S. Army Flying Tiger pilot Ted Stevens, both combat-decorated World War II veterans who decided Ike, both as general and as President, should be nationally memorialized. They decided and convinced the Congress that the general and President Eisenhower should be nationally celebrated. And the day it all began was D-day.

Senator Inouye from Hawaii and Senator Stevens from Alaska knew that Ike represented more than Kansas, more than America, but the entire world as well and that he spoke to the world. His identity was simple, basic, and convincing. In paying homage in 1945 to the British fathers and mothers of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen who had died under his command, he also said, ''I am not a native of this land. I come from the very heart of America.''

It is a paradox of unfortunate irony that those members of the ''greatest generation'' who come on Honor Flights from all across our great Nation to the World War II Memorial cannot visit, reflect, and pay homage to a memorial to the general who led them to victory.

Today, in the midst of a much different war and during a time when our Nation is searching for resolve, commitment, and leadership, I suggest and recommend that all of my colleagues reflect upon the unique leadership of America's greatest general when the future of Western democracy was in grave peril. Time is of the essence, and now is the time to complete a lasting memorial and tribute to America's greatest wartime general and President of the United States whose legacy was 8 years of peace and prosperity. The veterans of World War II and their families know this, and their counterparts all over the world know this as well. With the completion of the Eisenhower memorial, their children and grandchildren and generations to come will understand the tremendous commitment undertaken in defense of freedom, then and now.

Now is the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

OIL EXPORTS

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before I begin what has turned into my weekly discussion about the sacrifices of 198 North Dakotans who lost their lives in Vietnam, I wish to briefly mention and associate myself with the remarks of my great friend and tremendous colleague, LISA MURKOWSKI from Alaska, as she talks about oil exports.

I will tell you this: There are very few issues we confront in the Senate where there is absolutely nothing on the negative equation. What do I mean by that? Changing this policy has hundreds of good ideas and good reasons, and there is absolutely no reason not to do it. As we continue to pursue fairness for the oil-and-gas-producing industry, allowing them to seek their market as we continue to pursue an opportunity for our consumers to experience lower oil and gas prices, as we kind of move forward with oil and gas policy, I think it is critically important that we understand and appreciate that in this arena, the effort is bipartisan, the effort is essential for energy security in our country, energy independence in our country, and energy security across the world.

I applaud Senator MURKOWSKI for taking on this issue. I believe that as she has said, this is the year it must get done. I look forward to our continuing efforts, our bipartisan efforts to move this along.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before I begin to talk about the 198 North Dakotans who died while serving our country in Vietnam, I want to first mention and publicly thank a great Vietnam veteran, Jim Schothorst of Grand Forks. He is a Vietnam veteran. He enlisted in the Army and served in Vietnam from December 1966 to March 1969 as a construction engineer with the 169th Engineer Battalion.

He was raised in McVille. He now lives in Grand Forks. He received his degree from the University of North Dakota and was employed with the Grand Forks Health Department for 25 years.

Jim has been extraordinarily helpful to the North Dakota congressional delegation whenever we have needed to gather input or hear from Grand Forks area veterans.

Thank you, Jim, for your service to our country.

I want to again extend my comments and talk about 14 men who did not make it home from Vietnam.

WESLEY CRAIG BRENNO

The first soldier whom I will talk about is Wesley Craig Brenno. Craig was from Larson. He was born February 18, 1945. He served in the Marine Corps Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 1st Marines. Craig died on March 28, 1967. He was 22 years old.

He attended school in Columbus and was a star athlete. He was voted most valuable player, and he lettered in baseball, basketball, and football from eighth grade through his senior year of high school.

In 1963, he began his college career at the University of North Dakota on a baseball scholarship and became an active member and officer of the Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity. After finishing his junior year of college, Craig enlisted in the Marine Corps. The Acting Secretary of the Navy wrote the following in Craig's citation for the Silver Star Medal.

> He unhesitatingly assumed the hazardous point position and while fearlessly advancing at the front of his team, he was severely wounded by an enemy mine. Despite intense pain, he valiantly continued to direct his men, urging them forward to complete their mission.

About a week after sustaining that injury, Craig died from his wounds. Nearly 600 people attended Craig's funeral.

In addition to receiving many medals honoring his sacrifice and service, Craig was also inducted into the North Dakota American Legion Baseball Hall of Fame, and his fraternity named their library after him.

His family cherishes an essay entitled ''My Philosophy of Life'' Craig wrote in the eighth grade, where he stated:

> I believe in a free country. People must have courage and be willing to fight for our freedom.

CHRISTOPHER DAVIS

Christopher Davis was from Belcourt and was born June 1, 1942. He served in the Army's 17th Field Hospital as a medic. Chris was 24 years old when he died on March 18, 1967.

He was one of seven children. Also, his nephew, Gerald, was raised by Chris's parents and the two were as close as brothers. Gerald remembers Chris's fun personality and the little jokes and tricks he played on people, like dressing up and impersonating others. Chris loved to sing and play the guitar, and once won second place in a contest singing Ricky Nelson's ''Poor Little Fool.''

While serving in Vietnam, Chris mailed his parents a letter describing seeing more blood in 1 day in the hospital in Vietnam than he had seen in his whole lifetime before that.

After Chris died, Gerald served in the Army in Vietnam. Gerald went to visit the hospital where Chris worked but left almost as soon as he entered because of the awful cries and screams that he heard. Chris's family says that Chris's son Marcus has similar looks and mannerisms to Chris. Marcus was just a baby when Chris died.

DEWAYNE SELBY

DeWayne Selby was from Bismarck. He was born July 6, 1948. He served in the Marine Corps' India Company, 3rd Battalion, 3rd Marines. DeWayne died on May 26, 1968. He was 19 years old.

DeWayne was one of four children. His brother, Richard, also served our country in the Navy. DeWayne's sister, Phyllis, and his wife, Evan, remember what a soft heart DeWayne had. When he was 15 years old, he moved in with his grandparents so he could help take care of his aging grandfather. After high school, DeWayne worked as a mechanic, often fixing cars for free for

people who did not have any money. DeWayne taught Phyllis how to play football and baseball with the boys, but if they got too rough, DeWayne protected his little sister.

DeWayne was shot and killed about a month into his tour of duty in Vietnam.

LARRY WARBIS

Larry Warbis was from Haynes. He was born October 15, 1948. He served in the Army's 9th Infantry Division. He died on October 6, 1968. He was 19 years old.

Larry was one of five children and attended Haynes High School, where he played basketball. He then worked at the Haynes elevator, where his brother managed the elevator.

Larry's sister, Vicki, says that she and Larry spent their free time together hunting, catching snakes, and shooting pheasants year-round. Their mother scolded them for shooting pheasants out of season but then cooked the birds for the family to eat anyway.

Vicki remembers Larry as a kind, soft person. Their cousin, Sharon Campbell, remembers having fun babysitting Larry and what a nice young man he grew up to be.

Larry was killed about 2 months into his tour of duty in Vietnam. Larry's body was returned to his family on his 20th birthday.

DENNIS ''BUDDY'' WOSICK

Dennis ''Buddy'' Wosick was from Grand Forks and was born September 26, 1947. He served in the Army's 11th Infantry Brigade. Buddy died on June 9, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Although Dennis was his name, he was known to all of his family and friends as Buddy. First, he was his dad's little buddy, and as he grew up, he became a buddy to all who knew him.

He had dreams about becoming an astronaut, and he could fix anything, including HAM radios, TVs, and cars. To this day, Buddy's family still hears from people who knew him and people who have beautiful stories about his character, like when he gave up his lunch at school for another boy who had been bullied and whose sandwich was thrown on the ground.

Buddy died saving the men in his barracks from an explosion that could have killed them if he had not bravely jumped into the ammunition truck to drive it from the targeted barracks as it was being attacked. His sister, Kathy, whom I had the privilege to meet last Sunday in Fargo, believes that Buddy knew he was giving his life by driving that truck away, but that was the kind of guy Buddy was.

ERNEST ''ERNIE'' BARTOLINA, JR.

Ernest ''Ernie'' Bartolina, Jr., was a Bismarck native. He was born December 29, 1942. He served as a captain in the Marine Corps flying helicopters. Ernie was 26 years old when he died on February 7, 1969.

He played the French horn in the band while attending Bismarck High School. He later attended Bismarck Junior College and the University of North Dakota where he received a degree in accounting.

Ernie's sister, Jan, says that he liked to have fun and had a good sense of humor. He and his dad enjoyed hunting and fishing together as often as they could.

Ernie was killed when the helicopter he was flying on an emergency medical evacuation mission was shot down and crashed. The only survivor of the crash spoke with Jan and explained that Ernie's calm and collected manner was the reason that survivor was able to live and that Ernie was highly respected by his fellow Marines.

PAUL CHARNETZKI

Paul Charnetzki was from Valley City and was born May 25, 1936. He served in the Army's Military Assistance Command—Vietnam Advisers. Paul was 31 years old when he died on February 7, 1968.

Paul left behind his wife and five sons. One son, also named Paul, said that his father loved this country and the Army. He was a professional soldier, and he respected and cared for his fellow soldiers.

He spent as much time as he could with his sons, settling their fights and pretending to be tackled in their backyard football games.

Paul was killed when the Vietnamese unit he was advising was ambushed. He was shot while assisting his unit members into the evacuation helicopter.

Paul was awarded the Silver Star Medal for his gallantry in action, and his son Paul believes that he would have been proud of that award, but even more proud of what his friends told Paul's family; that he was the ultimate warrior.

JOSEPH ''BILL'' CRARY

Joseph ''Bill'' Crary was from Fargo and was born April 18, 1945. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigade. He was 25 years old when he died on May 27, 1970.

Bill was one of seven children. There were three sets of twins in his family. Bill and his twin sister, Kathy, were the oldest twins in the family. Bill's brother, Mike, also served in Vietnam.

The Crary family honors Mike as a hero for his service and selflessness as well. Mike told Bill that instead of being drafted, Bill should enlist and Mike would offer to sign up for a second tour of duty so Bill would not have to serve in Vietnam, but Bill did not agree.

Bill had earned a degree from St. Louis University and was attending the University of North Dakota Law School when he was drafted.

His siblings believe Bill was special and excelled at everything. They believe he could have held office at the highest level. Bill's cousin, Jim Crary, says Bill always saw the bright side of situations and was determined to do the best at whatever he was doing. Jim wrote a book about Bill titled ''War Doesn't Bother Butterflies (But It Killed Bill).'' Jim's book details Bill's life and death and includes letters Bill wrote to friends and family.

In Vietnam, Bill became a medic and died 1 month after arriving in Vietnam. He was killed after running to provide first aid and evacuate a fellow soldier who had been shot. Bill was awarded the Silver Star for his heroism and his devotion to his duty.

ROGER FOREMAN

Roger Foreman was from New Town and was born August 4, 1947. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Roger died on July 18, 1969. He was 21 years old.

He was the oldest of three children. His father, Earl, was wounded while serving in the Army in World War II.

Roger's brother, Dale, says that Roger was a caring person who loved his family and his country. Roger also loved his mom's home cooking. His mother is still alive today. She is 95 years old.

In his free time, Roger enjoyed hunting, fishing, motorcycles, track, football, and basketball. A highlight of his high school experience was taking second place in the 1963 State Class B Basketball Tournament.

After his death, Roger was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for Valor and the Purple Heart.

JAMES FOWLER

James Fowler was from Bismarck and was born January 7, 1938. He was a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force's 523rd Tactical Fighter Squadron. James was 34 years old when he went missing on June 6, 1972.

In Bismarck, he attended St. Mary's High School. His family says he always loved North Dakota.

In 1960, James earned a degree in architecture from the University of Notre Dame, where there is today a scholarship named after him for his outstanding work called Outstanding ROTC.

In 1972, James and CPT John Seuell were flying an F4D aircraft that was shot down over Vietnam. Their bodies have never been recovered.

In addition to his mother Mildred and his sister Marcene, James left behind his wife Maralyn, daughter Jody, and son Stephen.

In 1989, the sons of the two MIA pilots met by chance. Stephen and Captain John Seuell's son, also named John, met at a banquet, learned that they grew up near each other, and both began attending the Air Force Academy in Florida. Both boys had lifelong dreams to fly and become pilots like their fathers.

ROBERT ''BOB'' HIMLER

Robert ''Bob'' Himler was from Williston and was born October 21, 1942. He served as a captain in the Marine Corps. Robert was 25 years old when he died on October 24, 1968.

He was attending the University of North Dakota with plans to become a doctor, but he paused his studies to enlist in the Marines.

In Vietnam, Robert was killed when the helicopter he was flying was struck by hostile fire, crashed, and burned.

In addition to his parents and siblings, he left behind his wife, Doris.

Robert's family says that everyone loved him and that to this day, whenever his classmates see his sister, Patty, they still talk about him.

Robert's mother's husband, Duane, has a diary that Robert kept while he served in Vietnam. Duane notes the interesting fact that Robert stopped writing in the diary about 5 months before he died.

BYRON KULLAND

Byron Kulland was from New Town and was born on November 9, 1947. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigade. Byron was 24 years old when he went missing on April 2, 1972.

His brother, Lee, says that Byron was always smiling and enjoyed life. He loved music, animals, and he loved his wife, Leona.

Byron was musically gifted. His mother taught him to play the piano, and he taught himself to play the guitar and banjo.

Byron and his brother, Lee, sheared sheep to help pay for Byron's college tuition. Byron graduated from North Dakota State University with a degree in agricultural engineering. He also graduated from ROTC as a second lieutenant.

In Vietnam in 1972, Byron and his helicopter crew were flying on a search and rescue mission when their helicopter was shot down. For over a year, Byron was considered missing in action. One of his passengers was taken as a prisoner of war and returned to the United States in 1973.

In 1993, Byron's remains were uncovered, and today he is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

DAVID ''DAVIE'' DEPRIEST

David ''Davie'' DePriest was from Rugby and was born September 17, 1946. He served in the Army's 20th Engineer Brigade. David died on March 25, 1968. He was 21 years old.

He was the youngest of six kids. He had four brothers and one sister. All five of the boys served our country in the military. The three youngest boys—David, Lane, and Russ—served in the Army in Vietnam, and Richard and Dennis served in the Air Force. The three youngest boys served in Vietnam at the same time.

While in high school, David joined the National Guard and then later decided to join the Army.

David's brother, Russ, says that David was short but muscular and liked to hunt rabbits to improve the accuracy of his shot.

While in Vietnam, the brothers were less than 100 miles apart, but they didn't see each other until the day of David's funeral.

In addition to his siblings and parents, David left behind his wife, Donna, and their young son, Travis.

JOHN BRINKMEYER

John Brinkmeyer was from New England and was born June 19, 1946. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division Artillery. John was 22 years old when he died on November 27, 1968.

John's family says that he loved barefoot waterskiing and flying. John chose to serve so that none of his three brothers would ever have to.

The last letter John mailed to his parents from Vietnam described, with a positive outlook, living and working in less-than-ideal conditions. In his letter, he wrote that he expected to be promoted and receive a better aircraft in about 1 month. But almost 2 weeks after writing the letter, John's aircraft was shot down and John was killed.

His captain wrote John's parents a letter that said:

> John was the most outstanding young officer in my battery.
>
> He was hardworking and conscientious in all that he did. His personal courage on combat operations won him not only the respect of all the officers and men in the battery, but also that of Lt. Col. Bartholomew, the battalion commander, who personally chose John as his pilot.

In addition to his parents, brothers, and sister, John left behind his wife Leona, daughter Lori, and son Michael. John's daughter Lori feels that both her dad and mom were heroes—her dad for his service and sacrifice and her mom for dealing with the pain of losing her husband.

I want to take a moment and thank all of the pages who have been so patient as I have read these stories of these incredible men who gave their lives for our country.

I think one of the reasons why we have periods of commemoration and why we do this is so that we remind not only those of us who lived during this time but we remind a younger generation of that sacrifice and that opportunity to serve our country and to honor those people who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

Our Vietnam veterans had a lot of challenges when they returned home right after Vietnam, and their challenges continue—whether it is untreated post-traumatic stress or just simply being part of a war that generated so much controversy in our country—but it can never diminish the sacrifice these men and their families made for our country.

Again, I thank the pages for their attention, and I hope these are voices and names they will remember for a long time along with me. I know it means a lot to their families.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING ELDER L. TOM PERRY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to honor the memory of Elder L. Tom Perry, an exemplary leader whose kindness, compassion, and love were as boundless as his optimism. Elder Perry quietly passed away on May 30 after a brief battle with thyroid cancer. Serving as an apostle in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for more than 40 years, Elder Perry traveled the world, strengthening congregations, visiting the poor, and ministering to the sick and afflicted. Throughout his ecclesiastical service, his words and actions inspired countless Latter-day Saints and many more outside the church. As millions across the world mourn his passing, we find peace in his teachings and take solace in the memory of a man who consecrated his life to the service of others.

From humble beginnings, Elder Perry developed a strong sense of discipline that would later define his church service. Born to Leslie Thomas and Nora Sonne Perry in 1922, his father was a lawyer and his mother was a teacher by profession. Together, they taught Tom the principles of honest work and self-reliance. Elder Perry was no stranger to hard labor, and some of his earliest memories included long days working the fields, milking the family cow, and cutting hay by hand with an old scythe. From these early experiences, Elder Perry learned that nothing would be handed to him and that he had to work for everything he received. And work he did.

After finishing his first year of college, Elder Perry accepted a call to serve his church in the Northern States Mission. During the 2 years Elder Perry worked as a volunteer missionary, he developed a powerful testimony of Jesus Christ—a testimony that inspired a life of love and selfless service. After serving his church, Elder Perry desired to serve his country. He enlisted in the United States Marine Corps only a month after returning from his church mission.

Elder Perry's marine battalion was deployed to Nagasaki shortly after the Japanese surrender. Observing the devastation and suffering of the Japanese people only softened Elder Perry's already tender heart. In his off-duty hours, he rallied a group of fellow marines to help him rebuild a Protestant chapel. On the same tour, he also helped repair a Catholic orphanage and build another chapel on the island of Saipan. While in Japan, Elder Perry grew especially close to a Protestant congregation. When he was transferred to another city, a group of nearly 200 members of this congregation gathered to bid him farewell. As his train crawled out of the station, each member of the congregation lined up along the track as Elder Perry reached out to touch their hands one by one. He loved these people, and they loved him back, making the goodbye all the more difficult. Last Saturday, thousands of us tasted that same bittersweet emotion when Elder Perry departed this mortal life for the next. Like this small Japanese congregation, we were all moved by his kindness, energized by his enthusiasm, and humbled by his service.

After his honorable release from the Marine Corps, Elder Perry returned to Utah State University, where he earned a degree in finance and married his wife, Virginia Lee. Together, they were the parents of three children: Barbara, Linda Gay, and Lee. Family was always the highest priority for Elder Perry. Although his successful business career demanded much of his attention, he always made special sacrifices to spend time with his wife and children.

Elder Perry was also committed to balancing his busy work schedule with his church service. As his family moved across the country—from Idaho and California, to New York and Boston—Elder Perry served in various leadership positions for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, including two bishoprics, a high council, and two stake presidencies. In April 1974, he accepted a calling to serve in the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. Sadly, after serving as an apostle for only 8 months, Elder Perry's beloved wife, Virginia Lee, died of cancer. Nine years later, cancer would also take his daughter, Barbara. Although Elder Perry's life was marked by tragedy, it was not defined by it. His faith in God was unshakeable, as was his optimism. In response to heartbreak, Elder Perry said, ''[The Lord] is very kind. Even though some experiences are hard, he floods your mind with memories and gives you other opportunities. Life doesn't end just because you have a tragedy—there's a new mountain to climb.''

Elder Perry never stopped climbing those mountains, and he served valiantly as an Apostle of Jesus Christ. In 1976, he married Barbara Dayton—his loving helpmeet and able partner who helped him bear the heavy responsibility of his apostolic calling. I will always remember Elder Perry for the zeal and energy he brought to every facet of his life. Nothing could temper his enthusiasm, and nothing could deter him from doing what was right.

Elder Perry never tired of his calling. He so loved meeting with church members and leaders throughout the world that he once said, ''My association with great men has been not only an education, but an inspiration.'' I can easily say the same of my own association with Elder Perry; it has been both an education and an inspiration, and I will always be grateful for his example.

I will never forget Elder Perry, his life of dedicated service, and his unwavering optimism. I consider myself lucky to have known him and even luckier to call him a friend. I will miss Elder Perry dearly, as will all those who knew him. I send my deepest condolences to his wife, Barbara, and their beautiful family. May God comfort them in this time of grief, and may his love be with them always.

OPENING OF THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL OFFICE IN DENVER, COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to welcome a great new diplomatic development in my home State of Colorado. Last week, Denver was proud to officially welcome the opening of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office, TECO, the de-facto consulate of Taiwan in the United States. The TECO office in Denver will serve Colorado, as well as the States of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

I thank Taiwan's leadership for this wise decision, particularly Dr. Lyushun Shen, the Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States, TECRO in Washington, DC, as well as Mr. Jack J.C. Yang, the Director General of the new TECO Office in Denver.

As Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Cooperation, I am committed to ensuring that the U.S.-Taiwan partnership continues to grow and prosper. Our nations must continue to work together to ensure regional stability and to advance economic ties, including through landmark initiatives such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP.

Our friendship has never been stronger. Taiwan is now the tenth largest trading partner for the U.S., while the U.S. is Taiwan's largest foreign investor. Our people-to-people relations are flourishing, with over 20,000 Taiwanese students studying in the U.S. each year. Over 75 U.S. cities have established sister city relationships with their Taiwanese counterparts, including Colorado Springs, CO, which has been a sister city to Kaohsiung since 1983.

I know our nation's bonds with Taiwan will only grow stronger, and I am proud that Denver will now be front and center in ensuring the continued friendship between our nations and peoples. I am confident that our Taiwanese friends will not find more hospitable and welcoming hosts for their diplomats and visitors than the people of the great State of Colorado.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SONNY SMITH

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the service and sacrifice of Johnson County Auxiliary Sheriff Deputy Sonny Smith who gave his life while in the line of duty on May 15, 2015.

Deputy Smith led a life of service. The last 11 years he dedicated to safety and law enforcement as a detention officer. He continued to serve for the past 6 years as an auxiliary deputy protecting the people of Johnson County on a volunteer basis.

Service was an important part of Sonny's life. He served his country in the United States Navy and continued that commitment to his community when he left the military. Sonny was known for his compassion and leadership throughout Johnson County. His generosity was always on display. His fellow officers say they will remember Sonny as a humble man who was always willing to serve his neighbors. As a father of high school students, Sonny attended all the pep rallies, football games and fundraisers. He was always helping Clarksville High School. His daughters Makayla and Callie describe their dad as a man always willing to help others in need.

While he made a living working as a security guard at Arkansas Nuclear One, Sonny was a reliable handyman that many in the community reached out to for help repairing their garage doors.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Sonny's family, including his wife Amy, his daughters, and sons Dakota and Charlie.

Deputy Sonny Smith was a true hero, not only because of the uniform he wore, but also because of his final actions. By taking the lead when he responded to a residential burglary call and exercising his professional training, he saved the lives of his fellow officers.

I humbly offer my appreciation and gratitude for his selfless service to Arkansas.•

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I spoke on the floor about two of the outstanding Federal workers at the National Institutes of Health and I indicated at the time that I would be speaking periodically about other Federal workers who are doing extraordinary things on behalf of the American taxpayer. People wonder where their tax dollars go; I would like to provide a few examples.

As I said at the time, ''Government workers guard our borders; protect us from terrorists; treat our wounded veterans; dispense Social Security checks to our retirees; find cures for diseases; guide the Nation's air traffic; explore the tiniest particles and the vast expanse of outer space; ensure our air is safe to breathe, our water is safe to drink, and our food is safe to eat; support our servicemen and women in harm's way; and promote our interests and ideals abroad. Who does the government work for? Government Works for America.''

The Partnership for Public Service announced the finalists for the 2015 Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals, also known as the ''Sammies,'' last month during Public Service Recognition Week. As the Partnership notes, ''Federal employees are responsible for many noteworthy and inspiring accomplishments that are seldom recognized or celebrated. The Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals

highlight excellence in our Federal workforce and inspire other talented and dedicated individuals to go into public service.''

Also last month, on May 5, the Washington Post, citing an Office of Personnel Management—OPM—exit survey of senior government managers who have retired or moved to other, nonfederal jobs, reported that the single biggest factor for leaving is the ''political environment'', which was blamed as a contributing factor ''to a great extent'' or ''to a very great extent'' by 42 percent of the individuals surveyed. The article, by Post columnist Joe Davidson, quoted Brian M. Kent, a retired senior-level Federal scientist, who said, ''Expect to be overworked, undercompensated and mistreated by both parties on the Hill, who do not appreciate the value of our expertise, our dedication and our talents.''

Congress and the American people need to realize that the Federal workforce is a crucial asset. There are some people who dislike government so much that they want to demonize and demoralize the workforce and deter young people from considering a career in public service. That is counterproductive. Find and remove the bad apples—yes, but acknowledge that they are few and far between. Overwhelmingly, Federal workers are hard-working and patriotic Americans. Rather than denigrate them, we should treat them with respect in acknowledging their service to our Nation.

One way to acknowledge that service is through the Sammies. I am proud that so many of the finalists this year work and/or live in Maryland, spread across several agencies and several of the award categories. I would like to mention a few today.

DR. GRETCHEN K. CAMPBELL AND DR. RONALD ROSS

The mission of the National Institute of Standards & Technology, NIST, which is headquartered in Gaithersburg, MD, is to ''promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life''. NIST's weights and measures services, a job assigned to the Federal Government in the Constitution, provide the basis for the fairness and efficiency of sales. These services underpin the efficiency of about one-half of the U.S. economy, or about $7 trillion of the U.S. gross domestic product—GDP. Eighty percent of global merchandise trade is influenced by testing and other measurement-related requirements of regulations and standards. U.S. companies increasingly depend on NIST to help ensure access to global markets that create new business and jobs.

Gretchen K. Campbell is a physicist at NIST and is a finalist in the 2015 ''Call To Service'' Medal. This medal recognizes a Federal employee whose professional achievements reflect the important contributions that a new generation brings to public service. We are all familiar with electronics. Now, scientists like Dr. Campbell are exploring a new frontier—a circuitry system that uses the flow of atoms rather than electrons that may lead to a wide range of future technological advances. Dr. Campbell, who is just 35, is a pioneer and intellectual leader in this new and theoretical field of physics known as atomtronics, and has conducted a series of seminal experiments that show its promise and possibilities.

Using light to control matter, Dr. Campbell created the first controllable atomtronic circuit in 2011 by moving ultra-cold atoms through a wire made of light—just as electrons flow through a metal wire. She added a permeable barrier to this circuit, also made of light, to serve as the control element, much as a transistor can control the current in an electronic circuit.

Just as electronic devices manipulate the flow of electrons, atomtronic devices manipulate the flow of atoms, which are made up of electrons, protons, and neutrons. Since atoms have properties that are very different from electrons—they do not have charged particles, for instance—atomtronic devices have the potential to go beyond the capabilities of electronics.

Atomtronics will not supplant electronics, but may offer new kinds of functions and applications. An atomtronic circuit, for example, could be useful in applications such as rotation sensors, improving the functioning of gyroscopes used to stabilize spacecraft and airplanes. Atomtronic circuitry may be able to perform quantum computations that could offer a significant leap forward in computing speed, performance, and capability and lead to the next generation of technology that will enable smaller and cheaper devices.

Dr. Ronald Ross, a Fellow at NIST, is a finalist for the 2015 Homeland Security & Law Enforcement Medal. This medal recognizes a Federal employee for a significant contribution to the Nation in activities related to homeland security and law enforcement. Mr. ROSS, called the ''rock star of cybersecurity'' by his colleagues, developed and implemented a state-of-the-art system to assess risks and protect Federal computer networks from cyberattacks, helping secure information critical to the Nation's national and economic security. Most recently, Dr. Ross helped to establish the government-wide program for cloud security assessment and authorization.

The Federal Government used to rely on a rigid checklist approach to securing computer networks, often ignoring changing threats and evolving technology, and not always distinguishing what information needed higher security and what data was of lesser importance. Dr. Ross, belying the image of a hidebound bureaucrat, designed the Risk Management Framework as a way for government agencies to decide how critical their various data sets are and to pick the right level of protection. With the framework Dr. Ross developed, agencies can go through an assessment process and decide where to concentrate resources and tighten security.

The impact of Dr. Ross's work includes reducing the cost of implementing cybersecurity controls and demonstrating compliance with multiple security requirements, and enhancing system interoperability among Federal agencies. Dr. Ross and his team have worked with the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security to test and validate the risk framework unveiled earlier this year that will be used by cloud computing service providers, allowing them to host some of the Federal Government's most sensitive information. And as the principal architect of a new national testing program and infrastructure, Dr. Ross also has been collaborating with the National Security Agency to develop the first-ever network of commercial testing laboratories capable of evaluating the security of information technology—IT—products.

ROBERT BUNGE, MICHAEL GERBER, MARK PAESE, AND GREGORY ZWICKER

The National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—is headquartered in Silver Spring, MD. NOAA's mission is ''Science, Service, and Stewardship''. The agency attempts ''to understand and predict changes in climate, weather, oceans, and coasts; to disseminate that knowledge and information; and to conserve and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and resources''. NOAA's research, services, and products—ranging from daily weather forecasts, severe storm warnings and climate monitoring to fisheries management, coastal restoration and supporting marine commerce—affect more than one-third of America's GDP.

Robert Bunge, Michael Gerber, Mark Paese, and Gregory Zwicker of the National Weather Service's Wireless Emergency Alerts Team at NOAA are also finalists for the 2015 Homeland Security & Law Enforcement Medal. They have developed a fast and geographically targeted cell phone alert system, launched in 2012, for weather emergencies such as tornadoes, flash floods, and hurricanes that reaches millions of people, saving lives and preventing injuries. So far, the system has transmitted more than 13,000 warnings for the most dangerous types of severe weather to the cell phones of millions of people potentially in harm's way across the United States.

While other weather alert systems have been in use for years, this new method of using mobile devices and targeting very precise geographic areas is a significant improvement. It took many years of coordination with the Federal Communications Commission,

DHS, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the major wireless telecommunications providers.

Previously, weather emergency alerts from one of the 122 weather service offices around the country were emailed to the Washington, D.C. office and then forwarded to FEMA, which sent the alert to affected counties using television and radio broadcast technology. Cellular companies could independently text the warning information to their cell phone customers in the affected county, but the system was slow and too broadly targeted. The new weather alert system structures the information into concise messages—90 or fewer characters—and uses geo-targeted data to broadcast the messages rapidly over cell phones only in the affected areas.

The team worked with six of the largest cell phone companies to build the sophisticated technology needed to make the system work. They developed the infrastructure and protocol for the alerts, facilitated the decision-making for the weather alerts to be transmitted, and conducted extensive public awareness and educational programs. Mr. Bunge led the technical team, overseeing the software development, the data specialists, the coding, the host servers and other information technology needs, and helped create a system that targets the cell phone alerts to specific geographic locations. Mr. Gerber is a meteorologist and a specialist in how the weather service information is disseminated, and he played a critical role in making sure the right kind of weather alerts would be available and properly transmitted. He also is credited with convincing the wireless carriers to participate and make the needed investments. Mr. Paese handled many of the complicated management issues while Mr. Zwicker was involved in training some 2,000 weather forecasters in more than 122 offices around the country to use the system in coordination with Federal emergency management officials.

Here's an example of how effective the new system is: on July 1, 2013, a tornado obliterated a dome in East Windsor, CT, where 29 children had been playing soccer. Seconds before the tornado struck, a cell phone alert prompted the camp manager to rush the children out of the dome and into an adjacent building, preventing injuries and quite possibly fatalities.

DR. HYUN LILLEHOJ

The Agricultural Research Service—ARS—is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's USDA chief scientific in-house research agency, with headquarters colocated here in Washington, DC and in Beltsville, MD. The agency's job is ''to find solutions to agricultural problems that affect Americans every day from field to table''. ARS conducts research to develop and transfer solutions to agricultural problems of high national priority and provide information access and dissemination to: ensure high-quality, safe food, and other agricultural products; assess the nutritional needs of Americans; sustain a competitive agricultural economy; enhance the natural resource base and the environment; and provide economic opportunities for rural citizens, communities, and society as a whole.

Dr. Hyun Lillehoj, a senior research molecular biologist at ARS in Beltsville, is a finalist for the 2015 Career Achievement Medal. This medal recognizes a Federal employee for significant accomplishments throughout a lifetime of achievement in public service. Dr. Lillehoj has pioneered industry-leading research to improve the health of commercial poultry without the use of antibiotics, protecting consumers and making the U.S. poultry industry more competitive by saving it billions of dollars.

There is growing concern over the widespread use of antibiotics in poultry and other food industries, which health experts say contributes to the development of drug-resistant bacteria. These so-called ''superbugs'' infect hundreds of thousands and kill tens of thousands of Americans each year, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

During three decades as a molecular biologist at ARS, Dr. Lillehoj has helped mitigate the use of antibiotics in poultry, finding that certain food supplements, probiotics, and nutrients can replace antibiotics as an effective means of enhancing the immune system and fighting common parasitic diseases and bacterial infections. The USDA estimates that the poultry diseases Dr. Lillehoj is working to combat cause more than $600 million in losses in the United States and $3.2 billion worldwide.

Dr. Lillehoj has developed novel diagnostic and therapeutic products and discovered DNA markers for the genetic selection of disease-resistant chickens, paving the way for breeding healthier chickens that will benefit both consumers and the Nation's $45 billion poultry industry. She has done this by creating one of the first gene libraries from commercial chickens and depositing more than 55,000 individual gene sequences from this database into the public domain, providing other researchers with information that could lead to breeding poultry with superior resistance to parasites. She also has identified natural antimicrobial molecules that have anti-cancer properties and kill infectious parasites; discovered a second-generation parasite vaccine with an improved protection profile over current vaccines; developed therapeutic antibodies that boost immunity for poultry; formulated health-promoting probiotics for veterinary use; and discovered organic, plant-derived herbal extracts and essential oils that fight infectious diseases affecting animals and humans. She is recognized as a world leader in understanding host-pathogen interactions of an avian parasite closely related to human malaria that is a major cause of disease affecting poultry and livestock. She also has done original research on a bacterium that is one of the most common causes of food-borne illness in the U.S. Her scientific breakthroughs are documented in 10 U.S. and international patents, more than 350 peer-reviewed scientific papers, 14 book chapters, and 230 worldwide collaborations with academia, foreign governments and private industry. She has mentored more than 120 young scientists.

Dr. Lillehoj embodies the American Dream. She is from South Korea. She came to the United States in 1969 after her father died, when she was just out of high school, and with just $200 in her pocket. At first, she wanted to be a cancer researcher, but her focus soon turned to immunology and she received a government scholarship. After she received her Ph.D., she went to work at the National Institutes of Health. USDA successfully recruited her in 1984, and she has been at ARS ever since. The government's investment in her has paid enormous dividends.

These are just a few of the Nation's talented, creative, dedicated, and hard-working Federal employees. I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in congratulating them on their successes and thanking them for their public service. We are a strong and prosperous Nation, in part, because of our Federal workforce. We cannot take it for granted.●

REMEMBERING BILL GALLAGHER

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, William ''Bill'' Gallagher Jr., was an incredible father, teacher, farmer, husband, and public servant who was called home on May 22 at the age of 55. I am also honored to have also called him a friend.

Bill earned his bachelor's degree from Western Montana College, which led him to Plains, MT as the high school's new history teacher. He later moved to Polson, where he worked in the insurance business. His career then led him to Helena, where he learned how to farm before going on to earn his law degree from the University of Montana Law School.

Bill was an accomplished attorney in Helena, but his heart for our State eventually led him to public service. As the former chairman of the Montana Public Service Commission, Bill worked tirelessly for the people of Montana. Because of his efforts, he helped Montana reacquire hydroelectric dams to bring good-paying jobs back to our State.

He has left an incredible mark on our State and will be truly missed by all who knew him. His wife Jennifer, and children David and Catrina, as well as his five grandchildren, are in my thoughts and prayers.●

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT COLONEL KEVIN KNUF

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Lt. Col. Kevin

Knuf on his retirement after nearly 32 years of service to the Nevada Air National Guard. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of dedication to protecting the United States of America and Nevada.

Lt. Col. Knuf enlisted on July 11, 1983, and was commissioned from the Academy of Military Science in Knoxville, TN. He most recently earned a degree from the School of Aerospace Medicine as a bioenvironmental engineer. He has been a great asset to the Nevada Air National Guard throughout his years, serving as deputy base civil engineer, base civil engineer, civil engineering squadron commander, and most recently as the officer in charge of the Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight and as the base environmental manager in the 152nd Medical Group of the Nevada Air National Guard. Throughout his service, Lieutenant Colonel Knuf deployed to Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and to Saudi Arabia in support of Operation Southern Watch. His selfless contribution to this country is invaluable.

Lieutenant Colonel Knuf's service to the United States of America earns him a place among the heroes who have so valiantly defended our Nation. I offer my greatest appreciation to Lieutenant Colonel Knuf for his courageous contributions to defending our freedom. Words could never fully express my deep appreciation for his sacrifice or for the sacrifices of all veterans and active military members across the country.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. Lieutenant Colonel Knuf's sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Lieutenant Colonel Knuf has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Nevada Air National Guard. I am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan, and today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lt. Col. Kevin Knuf for his years of service. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING JUNE AND ROBERT SEBO

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize June and Robert Sebo for their generous contribution to Honor Flight Nevada, honoring their best friend, Ray Parks. Mr. Parks was a World War II veteran who served in the U.S. Coast Guard for well over 30 years. Mr. and Mrs. Sebos' contribution to this amazing organization is not only a grand gesture in memory of Mr. Park's service to our country, but also a great gift to Nevada's heroes. The $37,000 will send more than 30 veterans to visit our Nation's capital, giving them an opportunity to visit their memorials.

I would also like to recognize both Mayor Gino Martini and the City of Sparks for accommodating the Third Annual Honor Flight Pancake Breakfast, a great event that helps make Honor Flight Nevada possible. The annual pancake breakfast provides Nevadans with an opportunity to support their local veterans and help Honor Flight Nevada succeed. The generous donation of Mayor Martini and his wife, Ruth Martini, as well as their commitment to helping Honor Flight Nevada, are shining examples of the strength of our Nevada community. The breakfast could also not take place without the hard work of Teri Bath, who coordinates the entire event. I have had the privilege of attending this pancake breakfast, and I can say first hand her work with this organization is invaluable.

Honor Flight Nevada is a nonprofit organization committed to honoring the brave men and women who so valiantly defended our freedom. The organization sets up trips from Nevada to Washington, DC, providing our Nation's veterans with an incredible opportunity to visit the memorials honoring their service. From the National World War II Memorial, to the Korean War Veterans Memorial, to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, all the way to Arlington Cemetery, every veteran has the chance to see the memorials that stand as a testimony to the great sacrifice they have made.

The organization is led by Jon Yuspa, an individual who has truly impacted the lives of heroes across the State. Honor Flight Nevada offered its first trip to 30 World War II veterans in 2012 and now does as many as four trips per year. I have personally been at the Reno-Tahoe International Airport to send off the veterans as they prepare to depart from Nevada and have also met them in our Nation's capital as they observed the World War II Memorial. I can attest to the positive impact that accompanies their journey. This truly is a life-changing experience for those who deserve only the greatest gratitude for their service.

Honor Flight Nevada's mission is noble, and I thank everyone who contributed for their commitment and compassion to Nevada's veterans. Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing the many Nevadans who make these trips possible, especially Mr. and Mrs. Sebo for their donation. I wish Honor Flight Nevada the best of luck in all of its future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO TELLIS JEROME CHAPMAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Rev. Dr. Tellis Jerome Chapman of Galilee Missionary Baptist Church in Detroit, MI as the congregation and the broader community celebrate his 30th pastoral anniversary.

Born and raised in the State of Mississippi, Reverend Chapman is a graduate of Jackson State University and has received honorary doctoral degrees from Natchez College and Dallas Baptist College. Reverend Chapman has served as pastor in churches across the South. On March 31, 1985, Reverend Chapman was called to the pastorate of Galilee Missionary Baptist Church where he has been devoted to serving for the past 30 years. Through his charismatic and dynamic leadership he has left a permanent mark on the congregation and Greater Detroit community.

The congregation has steadily grown under Pastor Chapman's leadership. His original vision of a church with classrooms, a daycare, and a senior citizen building came to fruition in 1997. The purchase of the property located on East Outer Drive included 7 acres of land and a building that provided seating capacity for 1,000, with facilities to accommodate all of the church's ministries. The new edifice was inaugurated on Sunday May 31, 1998. Seven years later the church acquired adjacent property and a new building with a new edifice.

Reverend Chapman has been called many times to serve in a leadership capacity among his ministerial peers and with Christian associations. He was an advisor on the Faith-Based Advisory Board of Governor Jennifer Granholm, and currently works as a president of the Baptist Missionary and Educational State Convention of Michigan. He has served as vice moderator and vice president of the Michigan District Baptist Association and Congress of Michigan. Respected for his knowledge, he is well versed in parliamentary procedure and served as parliamentarian for the Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention of the State of Michigan.

Reverend Chapman has been involved in Detroit's recent growth and the development of mass transit through his work as a board member on the city of Detroit Department of Transportation Commission for several years. Reverend Chapman's community service is not without energetic and influential involvement. He is the founder and president of the Chapel Vision Community Development Corporation, serving greater southeast Detroit. He is also Founder and President of the Mid-West Community Development Corporation, serving greater southeastern Michigan.

Reverend Chapman's efforts, both at the pulpit and beyond, have been strengthened by the love and support of his wife Eunice, and their four children, Cecil, Brandie, Candace, and Brannon.

It is an honor to recognize the profound impact that Rev. Dr. Tellis Jerome Chapman has made on the congregation of Galilee Missionary Baptist Church for the last 30 years and the

larger impact he has made on the Greater Detroit community. I wish Reverend Chapman, his family, and the congregants of Galilee many more rewarding years of spiritual fellowship.●

RECOGNIZING PAINTING WITH A TWIST

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President. Louisiana has a rich culture and history known for fostering artistic and musical creativity. After the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, two Louisiana entrepreneurs opened a small business to provide their friends and neighbors with a safe and fun distraction during the recovery and rebuilding process. This week's ''Throwback Thursday'' honorary Small Business of the Week is Painting with a Twist of Mandeville, LA.

In 2007, longtime friends Cathy Deano and Renee Maloney became business partners after seeing a need in the greater New Orleans area for a distraction and relief after Hurricane Katrina. The pair opened a small painting studio, Painting with a Twist, formerly known as Corks N Canvas, where folks could learn to paint and enjoy a glass of wine at the same time. Today, Painting with a Twist has expanded to over 210 franchise locations across the country, with Deano and Maloney retaining ownership of four locations while also maintaining the franchise headquarters in Mandeville. Painting with a Twist owns copyrights to over 3,500 pieces of art and is also the country's largest employer of aspiring artists.

When they first started their small business, Deano and Maloney set aside one day's salary each week per month to donate to local charities, in order to support the recovery and restoration efforts in southeast Louisiana. Today, that tradition continues with their campaign ''Painting with a Purpose.'' Held monthly at all Painting with a Twist locations, this event raises funds for charities and nonprofits in each franchise's area.

Congratulations again to Painting with a Twist for being selected as this week's ''Throwback Thursday'' honorary Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to advancing the arts in Louisiana and for your continued dedication to giving back to your community.●

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ''THE GOONIES''

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this Sunday marks the 30th anniversary of the release of the beloved film, ''The Goonies.'' With enduring and relatable themes of adventure, adolescence, and friendship, ''The Goonies'' has withstood the test of time and firmly established its place in American culture as a cult classic. A large part of what makes this film unique and impactful is its iconic setting along the stunning Oregon coastline. Indeed, so significant is the film's location that thousands of fans from around the world are gathering this week for a four-day festival in Astoria, Oregon—or, ''The Goon Docks''—to celebrate the magic that is ''The Goonies.'' In fact, Astoria has held a Goonies-based festival every year since the film's release in 1985.

''The Goonies'' 30th anniversary celebration will include a variety of events around Astoria, as well as Cannon Beach, OR—another Oregon coastal town that served as an idyllic backdrop for the film. Most notably, Cannon Beach's impressive Haystack Rock is featured prominently in the film's opening scene. Fans will be able to relive their favorite Goonies memories by participating in festivities such as tours of the filming locations, treasure hunts, and a group ''truffle shuffle.'' Astoria's Oregon Film Museum also invites festival attendees to visit its Goonies gallery, take a mug shot with friends, and even make their own feature film. Needless to say, it is sure to be a weekend of fun, nostalgia, and, in typical Goonie fashion, adventure.

Just as the original Goonies fans and stars have grown and matured since the film's release in 1985, so has Oregon's film industry. With its magnificent and diverse natural beauty, Oregon has become a much sought after location for film production. As the backdrop for major television shows and box-office hits alike, film production in Oregon brings with it good-paying jobs and tourism that in turn support local businesses and economic development across the State. Certainly all film producers in Oregon and across the country should aspire to achieve the remarkable success of ''The Goonies''.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES REFERRED

The following measure, having been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, pursuant to the order of May 27, 1988, for a period not to exceed 60 days:

S. 710. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 710. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ann Donnelly, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Dale A. Drozd, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

LaShann Moutique DeArcy Hall, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Eileen Maura Decker, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years.

John W. Huber, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1502. A bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1503. A bill to provide for enhanced Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a

Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1504. A bill to prohibit employers from requiring low-wage employees to enter into covenants not to compete, to require employers to notify potential employees of any requirement to enter into a covenant not to compete, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 1505. A bill to amend part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1506. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1507. A bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1508. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign $20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1509. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1510. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1511. A bill to promote the recycling of vessels in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1512. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1513. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1514. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the application of Medicare secondary payer rules to certain workers' compensation settlement agreements and qualified Medicare set-aside provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the tax treatment for certain build America bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1518. A bill to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1519. A bill to amend the Labor Relations Management Act, 1947 to address slowdowns, strikes, and lock-outs occurring at ports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1520. A bill to protect victims of stalking from violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase access for the uninsured to high quality physician care; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI:

S. Res. 192. A resolution requiring that legislation considered by the Senate be confined to a single issue; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 193. A resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the historic Griswold v. Connecticut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and expressing the sense of the Senate that the case was an important step forward in helping ensure that all people of the United States are able to use contraceptives to plan pregnancies and have healthier babies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 202

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 626, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 982

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law.

S. 1110

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to publish in the Federal Register a strategy to significantly increase the role of volunteers and partners in National Forest System trail maintenance, and for other purposes.

S. 1117

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct to include removal of certain other employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1218

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 1229

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1229, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1363

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1363, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a report assessing the capability of the Department of Energy to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and fission reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at sites owned by the Department of Energy.

S. 1382

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1389, a bill to authorize exportation of consumer communications devices to Cuba and the provision of telecommunications services to Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 180

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 180, a resolution urging additional sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1468

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1468 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1485

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1485 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1494

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1494 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1498

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1498 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1522

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

RUBIO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1522 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1524

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1524 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1525

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1525 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1526

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1526 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1538

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1538 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1540

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1540 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1549

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1549 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1550

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1550 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1551

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1551 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1557

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1557 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1558

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1558 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1559

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1559 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1578 intended to be proposed to H. R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1582

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1582 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1601

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1601 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1602

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1602 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1607

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1607 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1513. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I join with Senator PORTMAN to reintroduce the bipartisan Second Chance Reauthorization Act. This legislation builds on the success of the original law and takes important new steps to ensure that people coming out of prison are given a fair chance to turn their lives around. When inmates are released from prison, they face many

challenges, including finding housing and employment, combating substance abuse, and accessing physical and mental healthcare. This legislation aims to improve their ability to reenter society, become productive members of their families and communities, and reduce the likelihood that they will reoffend. Investing in reentry services has been proven to reduce recidivism and bring down prison costs. It is also the right thing to do.

This legislation is urgently needed. While the United States is home to less than 5 percent of the world's population, we have nearly 25 percent of the world's prison population. With more than two million people behind bars, and 650,000 ex-offenders being released each year, we need to reauthorize these critical programs that reduce crime and increase public safety.

Budgets at the State and Federal level are strained by our system of mass incarceration, and we all suffer as a result. The truth is that when so much money goes to locking people away, we have fewer resources for programs that actually prevent crime in the first place. Investing in reentry programs that break the cycle of crime helps reduce prison costs and keeps us all safer. That is why law enforcement groups like the National Association of Police Organizations support this bill. They understand better than most that we cannot afford to stay on our current path.

My home State of Vermont was recently awarded a grant to implement a Statewide Recidivism Reduction Program through the Second Chance Act. The Commissioner of the Vermont Department of Corrections, Andrew Pallito, says that he sees the positive impact of Second Chance programming every day. In Commissioner Pallito's words, ''The Second Chance Act is not just about giving incarcerated individuals another opportunity to succeed, it is about significantly improving the outcomes we all want for children, families and communities.''

We have seen that these programs are succeeding in States across the country. North Carolina, with the help of six Second Chance grants, has reduced its recidivism rate by 18.1 percent since 2007. It has focused on individualized case planning, use of evidence-based practices, and coordination of services through local reentry councils.

Georgia has reduced its recidivism rate by 13.5 percent since 2007 by directing greater resources to rehabilitation, community supervision, and programs addressing reentry needs. Thirteen Second Chance grants have helped support these successful efforts and the statewide incarceration rate has decreased by 4.8 percent.

These programs are working, and it would be irresponsible not to continue supporting these critical efforts that are improving public safety and bringing down prison costs.

I am introducing this bill so that it can be a part of our conversation in the Judiciary Committee and the full Senate about the urgent need for criminal justice reform. Recidivism rates at the State and local levels are unacceptably high. Nearly ⅔ of former inmates are rearrested within 3 years of release and about half ofthem end up back behind bars. Any serious effort to address reform must include efforts to support reentry. Nearly all prisoners will return to our communities at some point and it is wise policy to help make that transition successful. We all benefit—our families, our neighborhoods, our economy—when people become productive, stable members of society. That is the goal of the Second Chance Act. That is why it is supported by American Probation and Parole Association, the National Association of Counties, the American Bar Association, and the United Methodist Church, among many others.

Let me be specific. This bill will help former inmates overcome some of the obstacles they face in finding a job, a place to live, and accessing healthcare services. Meeting these basic needs has become increasingly difficult because people coming out of jail are too often treated as second class citizens for the rest of their lives. As a former prosecutor, I believe in tough sentences for those who break out laws. However, once someone has paid their debt to society, he should not be burdened by past mistakes forever.

Chairman GRASSLEY convened a Judiciary Committee hearing last month that highlighted just this issue. The hearing focused on the importance of the right to counsel for poor defendants charged with misdemeanors. During that hearing, we heard testimony about Melinda, a single mother in Ohio who suffered a seizure while cleaning her house. When the police and paramedics arrived, they found unsecured cleaning supplies and Melinda ended up with a conviction for child endangerment. Years later, she was fired from her job when her employer learned of her criminal record. This left her unable to pay her rent, buy food for her family, or lead a productive life. This is just not right, and it certainly does not make any of us safer.

Any criminal conviction, no matter how minor, can hinder a person's chances of success for their entire lives. The Second Chance Act equips people to deal with this difficult environment, and that assistance starts before inmates are even released. Grants under this program have enabled states to hire case managers who meet with inmates while they are in jail to plan for their release, and continue to be a resource once they have returned home. Case managers help former offenders identify where to continue substance abuse treatment, apply for jobs, and enroll in parenting classes. They also help them build conflict resolution skills and avoid certain people or places that threaten their recovery.

A key component to remaining crime-free is getting and keeping a job, and this reauthorization implements a new ''Transitional Jobs Strategy'' to help identify and address the root causes of chronic unemployment for ex-offenders. This new strategy will support those individuals committed to working hard and getting their lives back on track by offering programs like vocational education, life skills training, or child care services. I am proud of this addition to the bill and believe it will improve lives and stimulate our economy.

We have learned from recent reports by the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General that our Nation's aging prison population is costing the Federal Bureau of Prisons millions every year due to their increasing medical needs. Many of these older prisoners no longer represent a threat to public safety, so this bill increases the discretion of prison officials to determine when inmates over 60 should be released to home detention. It simply doesn't make sense to spend money incarcerating and caring for elderly inmates who are not dangerous.

Although the Second Chance reauthorization has passed with strong bipartisan support through the Judiciary Committee each of the last two Congresses, the act expired in 2010. We need to pass this legislation this Congress as part of comprehensive criminal justice reform.

I am hopeful that with partners like Senator PORTMAN and Representatives SENSENBRENNER and DAVIS we will finally reauthorize it this Congress. We have been working hard to reach an agreement that is fair, fiscally responsible, and meets the needs of key stakeholders. We have the support of faith groups, law enforcement, and groups who provide services to the mentally ill and those struggling with addiction. This broad coalition has one thing in common—we all want to see our justice system work better.

I thank Senator PORTMAN, Representative SENSENBRENNER, and Representative DAVIS for their hard work and cooperation. We have come together in a truly exceptional way in this bipartisan, bicameral effort. I look forward to joining with Democrats and Republicans to get this bill passed and signed into law.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CASEY, in introducing the Power Efficiency and Resilience, POWER, Act.

The POWER Act would expand tax incentives for industrial energy efficiency systems, including combined heat and power, CHP, and waste heat to power, WHP, technologies, making

the incentives more accessible an providing parity with other forms of renewable energy. The upfront costs of CHP and WHP can be expensive, and facilities seeking to lower their energy bills often lack access to the capital needed for purchasing the equipment. The POWER Act aims to spur investment in these efficient technologies that capture wasted heat from electricity generation and industrial processes and use it to heat or cool buildings or to generate additional electricity. Capturing this otherwise wasted resource has the potential to increase electrical generation efficiency by nearly 80 percent and reduce electricity costs for industrial users.

While technologies such as solar energy and fuel cells currently benefit from a 30 percent investment tax credit, ITC, the incentives for CHP are more limited. CHP systems are only eligible for a 10 percent ITC for the first 15 megawatts, MW, of projects that are smaller than 50 MW in capacity. Moreover, while WHP has the potential to produce 15 gigawatts of emissions-free electricity nationwide, it currently does not qualify for the ITC. The limits on the size and scope of the ITC have hampered companies from making important investments to increase their efficiency. The POWER Act would increase the ITC for CHP to 30 percent, allow WHP to qualify for the credit, remove the limit on project size to ensure large industrial systems are eligible, and extend the credit through December 2018 to allow time for equipment purchase, installation, and permitting.

By making our industrial sector more efficient, we would be reducing costs for manufacturers and helping them to better compete in the global marketplace. CHP can also help us be a more resilient nation. Critical institutions that have combined heat and power can keep the power on even when the lights go out. That is why some hospitals, wastewater treatment plants, and military bases are installing CHP—they have to keep operating even in extreme weather or during blackouts. The POWER Act can save energy, reduce costs, build resilience, and reduce emissions.

Woodard & Curran, headquartered in Portland, Maine, noted in its support for the bill that the POWER Act: ''. . . will allow more companies to reduce energy use and costs by installing combined heat and power, CHP, systems. As a developer of such projects, we know that this technology poses a significant opportunity to generate new businesses, create jobs, and reduce our Nation's energy consumption. CHP is still largely an untapped resource, and we could double its installed capacity over the next decade with the right policies in place.'' Another company in Scarborough, ME, Self-Gen, Inc., stated: ''Every year, the United States sends enough wasted heat from electricity generation up our chimneys to power Japan. Combined heat and power can harness this heat as a resource to create more electricity, nearly doubling efficiency. Senator Collins' POWER Act will help us use this technology throughout Maine and across the nation, moving the United States towards increased energy independence.''

The POWER Act would allow more U.S. companies to install CHP and WHP systems, which would help improve the energy efficiency and lower costs for some of the largest energy users. The legislation has the support of a broad coalition of businesses from across the country, several environmental organizations, and a number of trade associations. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—REQUIRING THAT LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE BE CONFINED TO A SINGLE ISSUE

Mr. ENZI submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 192

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SINGLE-ISSUE REQUIREMENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or resolution that is not confined to a single subject.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or resolution. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISTORIC GRISWOLD V. CONNECTICUT DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CASE WAS AN IMPORTANT STEP FORWARD IN HELPING ENSURE THAT ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES ARE ABLE TO USE CONTRACEPTIVES TO PLAN PREGNANCIES AND HAVE HEALTHIER BABIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 193

Whereas, prior to the landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), married women in many States were lawfully forbidden from using family planning tools such as contraceptives and condoms;

Whereas the historic Griswold case provided precedent for future cases in the Supreme Court that extended the right to use contraceptives to all women, regardless of marital status;

Whereas, since Griswold, millions of women have used contraceptives to plan pregnancies, resulting in healthier women, healthier pregnancies, healthier families, and greater financial security for families;

Whereas, despite having the legal right to use contraceptives, many women who need family planning and sexual health services still face financial and other barriers to getting the necessary care;

Whereas, because of limited access to affordable family planning services, low-income women are 5 times more likely to have an unintended pregnancy compared to women with higher incomes, and unintended pregnancy rates are increasing for poor and low-income women while decreasing for women with higher incomes;

Whereas black and Latino women are disproportionately affected by the lack of access to contraceptives and reproductive health care;

Whereas programs such as the population research and voluntary family planning programs under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.) and the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) help low-income women access high-quality, affordable family planning care, including contraceptives, that helps women plan pregnancies and stay healthy;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) is helping realize the promise of Griswold by removing barriers to care by requiring that all insurance providers offer contraceptives and reproductive preventive health care services at no cost to women, and, as of 2014, more than 55,000,0000 women were benefitting from coverage without cost-sharing for preventive services, including birth control, according to the Department of Health and Human Services;

Whereas, each year, publicly funded contraceptives and family planning services help prevent approximately 2,000,000 unplanned pregnancies, 800,000 abortions, 400,000 miscarriages, and 200,000 pre-term and low birth rate births;

Whereas, in 2015, the Institute of Medicine listed using birth control to reduce unintended pregnancies as 1 of 15 core measures for furthering health progress and improving health;

Whereas, as the number of contraceptive methods expands, it is more important than ever that all women have access to the full range of contraceptive methods, including the most effective methods, so that each woman can choose the method that works best for her; and

Whereas every dollar invested in publicly funded contraceptive saves taxpayers $7.09: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Griswold v. Connecticut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States;

(2) recognizes that birth control constitutes basic health care for women;

(3) recognizes that, despite the monumental Griswold decision, affordable contraceptives unfortunately remain inaccessible to many poor and low-income women;

(4) encourages robust investment in publicly funded family planning services as a means to help women plan pregnancies and have healthier babies;

(5) recognizes that investments in publicly funded family planning services help prevent unplanned pregnancies and abortions and help save taxpayer dollars;

(6) acknowledges that all women, regardless of income or zip code, should have affordable access to the tools that help women plan and space their pregnancies; and

(7) recognizes the value of the publicly funded family planning safety net in helping to realize the promise of the Griswold decision.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1614. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1615. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1616. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1617. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1618. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1619. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1620. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1621. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1622. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1623. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1624. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1625. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1626. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1627. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1628. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1629. Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1630. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1631. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1632. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1633. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1634. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1635. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1636. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1637. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1638. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1639. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1640. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1641. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1642. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1643. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1645. Mr. MARKEY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1646. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1647. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1648. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1649. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1650. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1651. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1652. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1653. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1654. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1655. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1656. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1657. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1658. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1659. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN

to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1660. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1661. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1662. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1663. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1664. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1665. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1666. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1667. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1668. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1669. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1670. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1671. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1672. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1673. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1674. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1675. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1676. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1677. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1678. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1679. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1680. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1681. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1682. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1683. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1684. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1685. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1686. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1687. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HATCH , Mr. HELLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1688. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1689. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1690. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1691. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1692. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1693. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1694. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1695. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1696. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1697. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1698. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1699. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1700. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1701. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1702. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1703. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1704. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1705. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1706. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1707. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1708. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1709. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1710. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1711. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1712. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1713. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1714. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1715. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1716. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1717. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1718. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1719. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1720. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1721. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1722. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1723. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1724. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1725. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1726. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1727. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1728. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1729. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1730. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1731. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1732. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1733. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1734. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1735. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1736. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1737. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1738. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1739. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1740. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1741. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1742. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1743. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1744. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1745. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1746. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1747. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1748. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1749. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1750. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1751. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1752. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1753. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1754. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1755. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1756. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1757. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1758. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1759. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1760. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1761. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1762. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1763. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1764. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1765. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1768. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1769. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1770. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1771. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1772. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1773. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1774. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1775. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1776. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1777. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1778. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1779. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1780. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1781. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1782. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McConnell to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

SA 1783. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1784. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1785. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1786. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1787. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1788. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1789. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1790. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1791. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1792. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1793. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1794. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1614. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. REQUIREMENT THAT PASSENGER AIRCRAFT IN CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET HAVE SECONDARY COCKPIT BARRIERS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall require for any passenger aircraft participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet—

(1) the installation of a barrier, other than the cockpit door, that prevents access to the flight deck of the aircraft; and

(2) for any such aircraft—

(A) that is equipped with a cockpit door, that the barrier required under paragraph (1) remain locked while—

(i) the aircraft is in flight; and

(ii) the cockpit door separating the flight deck and the passenger area is open; and

(B) that is not equipped with a cockpit door, that the barrier required under paragraph (1) remain locked as determined appropriate by the pilot in command.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET.—The term ''Civil Reserve Air Fleet'' has the meaning given such term in section 9511 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) PASSENGER AIRCRAFT.—The term ''passenger aircraft'' means a passenger aircraft, as such term is defined in such section 9511, that—

(A) has 75 or more seats; and

(B) has a gross take-off weight of 75,000 pounds or more.

SA 1615. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. CREDIT FOR STATE LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS OF MILITARY SPOUSES ARISING BY REASON OF A PERMANENT CHANGE IN THE DUTY STATION OF THE MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ANOTHER STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

''SEC. 25E. STATE LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS OF MILITARY SPOUSE ARISING FROM TRANSFER OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES TO ANOTHER STATE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an eligible individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the qualified relicensing costs of such individual which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

''(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by this section with respect to each change of duty station shall not exceed $500.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'eligible individual' means any individual—

''(A) who is married to a member of the Armed Forces of the United States at the time that the member moves to another State under a permanent change of station order, and

''(B) who moves to such other State with such member.

''(2) QUALIFIED RELICENSING COSTS.—The term 'qualified relicensing costs' means costs—

''(A) which are for a license or certification required by the State referred to in paragraph (1) to engage in the profession that such individual engaged in while within the State from which the individual moved, and

''(B) which are paid or incurred during the period beginning on the date that the orders referred to in paragraph (1)(A) are issued and ending on the date which is 1 year after the reporting date specified in such orders.

''(d) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—The amount of any deduction or other credit allowable under this chapter for any expense taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of the credit under this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25D the following new item:

''Sec. 25E. State licensure and certification costs of military spouse arising from transfer of member of Armed Forces to another State.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 1616. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 716 and insert the following:

SEC. 716. DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN NON-DEPARTMENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS WITH KNOWLEDGE RELATING TO TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDER READINESS DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall develop a system by which any non-Department mental health care provider that meets eligibility criteria established by the Secretary of Defense relating to the knowledge described in paragraph (2) receives a mental health provider readiness designation from the Department of Defense.

(2) KNOWLEDGE DESCRIBED.—The knowledge described in this paragraph is the following:

(A) Knowledge and understanding with respect to the culture of members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and family members and caregivers of members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(B) Knowledge with respect to evidence-based treatments that have been approved by the Department for the treatment of mental health issues among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ON DESIGNATION.—

(1) REGISTRY.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and update as necessary a registry that is available to the public of all non-Department mental health care providers that are currently designated under subsection (a)(1).

(2) PROVIDER LIST.—The Secretary concerned shall update all lists maintained by such Secretary of non-Department mental health care providers that provide mental health care under the laws administered by such Secretary by indicating the providers that are currently designated under subsection (a)(1).

(3) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that the registry established and updated under paragraph (1) is available to the public on an Internet website maintained by each such Secretary.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NON-DEPARTMENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDER DEFINED.—The term ''non-Department mental health care provider''—

(A) means a health care provider that—

(i) specializes in mental health;

(ii) is not a health care provider of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(iii) provides health care to members of the Armed Forces or veterans; and

(B) includes psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses, social workers, mental health counselors, marriage and family therapists, and other mental health care providers designated by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to matters concerning the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 1617. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 713 and insert the following:

SEC. 713. IMPROVEMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) TRAINING ON RECOGNITION AND MANAGEMENT OF RISK OF SUICIDE.—

(1) INITIAL TRAINING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall ensure that all primary care and mental health care providers under the jurisdiction of such Secretary receive, or have already received, evidence-based training on the recognition and assessment of individuals at risk for suicide and the management of such risk.

(2) ADDITIONAL TRAINING.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that providers who receive, or have already received, training described in paragraph (1) receive such additional training thereafter as may be required based on evidence-based changes in health care practices.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH WORKFORCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the mental health workforce of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and the long-term mental health care needs of members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their dependents for purposes of determining the long-term requirements of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for mental health care providers.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) The number of mental health care providers of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs as of the date of the submittal of the report, disaggregated by specialty, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, mental health counselors, and marriage and family therapists.

(B) The number of mental health care providers that are anticipated to be needed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(C) The types of mental health care providers that are anticipated to be needed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(D) Locations in which mental health care providers are anticipated to be needed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES TO MEASURE MENTAL HEALTH DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall develop a plan for the development of procedures to compile and assess data relating to the following:

(A) Outcomes for mental health care provided under the laws administered by such Secretary.

(B) Variations in such outcomes among different medical facilities under the jurisdiction of such Secretary.

(C) Barriers, if any, to the implementation by mental health care providers under the jurisdiction of such Secretary of the clinical practice guidelines and other evidence-based treatments and approaches recommended for such providers by such Secretary.

(2) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress each of the plans developed under paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives

(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to matters concerning the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 1618. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1618

In the appropriate place please insert the following:

SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the accidental transfer of live Bacillus anthracis. also known as anthrax, from an Army laboratory to more than 28 laboratories located in at least 12 states and three countries discovered in May 2015 represents a serious safety lapse;

(2) the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should continue to investigate the cause of this lapse and determine if protective protocols should be strengthened;

(3) the Department of Defense should reassess standards on a regular basis to ensure they are current and effective to prevent a reoccurrence; and

(4) the Department of Defense should keep Congress apprised of the investigation, any potential public health or safety risk, remedial actions taken and plans to regularly reassess standards.

SA 1619. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. ESTABLISHMENT OF BREASTFEEDING POLICY FOR THE ARMY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall develop a comprehensive policy regarding breastfeeding by female members of the Army who are breastfeeding. At a minimum, the policy shall address the following:

(1) The provision of a designated room or area that will provide the member with adequate privacy and cleanliness and that includes an electrical outlet to facilitate the use of a breast pump. Restrooms should not be considered an appropriate location.

(2) An allowance for appropriate breaks, when practicable, to permit the member to breastfeed or utilize a breast pump.

SA 1620. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) EXCHANGES DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) FOCUS OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) CIVIL-MILITARY AFFAIRS.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include activities and exercises focused on civil-military relations, including parliamentary relations.

(e) LOCATION OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall be conducted in both the United States and Taiwan.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''senior military officer'', with respect to the Armed Forces, means a general or flag officer of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(2) The term ''senior official'', with respect to the Department of Defense, means a civilian official of the Department of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or above.

SA 1621. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1024. PROHIBITION ON RETIREMENT OF NUCLEAR POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIERS BEFORE FIRST REFUELING.

Section 5062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) A nuclear powered aircraft carrier may not be retired before its first refueling.''.

SA 1622. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1628. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REVIEWING AND CONSIDERING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS ON CYBER CAPABILITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should review and consider any findings and recommendations of the Council of Governors pertaining to cyber mission force requirements and any proposed reductions in and synchronization of the cyber capabilities of active or reserve components of the Armed Forces.

SA 1623. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 706. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR READJUSTMENT COUNSELING FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO INCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall commence a three-year pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of furnishing counseling under Section 1712A(a) of title 38, United States Code, to any member of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces who has a behavioral health condition or psychological trauma.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT.—Counseling furnished under the pilot program may include a comprehensive individual assessment under section 1712A(a)(1)(B)(i) of such title.

(c) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under the pilot program is protected to the same extent as the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under section 1712A(a) of such title.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to the pilot program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the individuals who benefitted from counseling under the pilot program.

(B) A description of any impediments to the Secretary in furnishing counseling under the pilot program.

(C) A description of any impediments encountered by individuals in receiving counseling under the pilot program.

(D) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of furnishing counseling under the pilot program to all members of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces who have behavioral health conditions or psychological trauma.

(E) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate with respect to the furnishing of counseling to such members.

(e) VET CENTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Vet Center'' means a center for readjustment counseling and related mental health services for veterans under section 1712A of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1624. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 706. PROVISION OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH READINESS SERVICES TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE BASED ON NEED.

(a) PROVISION AUTHORIZED.—Section 1074a(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) The Secretary concerned may also provide to any member of the Selected Reserve not described in subsection (d)(1) or (f) care for behavioral health conditions if the Secretary determines, based on the most recent medical exam or mental health assessment of such member, that the receipt of such care by such member will ensure that such member meets applicable standards of medical readiness.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Subject to applicable provisions of appropriations Acts, amounts available to the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program shall be available for the provision of behavioral health services under section 1074a(g) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)).

(c) BUDGETING FOR HEALTH CARE.—In determining the amounts to be required for behavioral health services for members of the Selected Reserve under section 1074a(g) of title 10, United States Code (as so amended), for purposes of the budget of the President for fiscal years after fiscal year 2016, as submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs shall consult with appropriate officials having responsibility for the administration of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, including the Chief of the National Guard Bureau with respect to the National Guard.

SA 1625. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CREDIT PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS.

(a) ACTIVE DUTY FREEZE ALERTS.—Section 605A of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c–1) is amended—

(1) in the heading for such section, by striking ''**AND ACTIVE DUTY ALERTS**'' and inserting ''**, ACTIVE DUTY ALERTS, AND ACTIVE DUTY FREEZE ALERTS**'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) through (h) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) ACTIVE DUTY FREEZE ALERTS.—Upon the direct request of an active duty military consumer, or an individual acting on behalf of or as a personal representative of an active duty military consumer, a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) that maintains a file on the active duty military consumer and has received appropriate proof of the identity of the requester, at no cost to the active duty military consumer while the consumer is deployed, shall—

''(1) include an active duty freeze alert in the file of that active duty military consumer, and also provide that alert along with any credit score generated in using that file, during a period of not less than 12 months, or such longer period as the Bureau shall determine, by regulation, beginning on the date of the request, unless the active duty military consumer or such representative requests that such freeze alert be removed before the end of such period, and the agency has received appropriate proof of the identity of the requester for such purpose;

''(2) during the 2-year period beginning on the date of such request, exclude the active duty military consumer from any list of consumers prepared by the consumer reporting agency and provided to any third party to offer credit or insurance to the consumer as part of a transaction that was not initiated by the consumer, unless the consumer requests that such exclusion be rescinded before the end of such period; and

''(3) refer the information regarding the active duty freeze alert to each of the other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p), in accordance with procedures developed under section 621(f).'';

(4) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''extended, and active duty alerts'' and inserting ''extended, active duty, and active duty freeze alerts''; and

(B) by striking ''extended, or active duty alerts'' and inserting ''extended, active duty, or active duty freeze alerts'';

(5) in subsection (f), as so redesignated—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''or active duty alert'' and inserting ''active duty alert, or active duty freeze alert'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d), in the case of a referral under subsection (d)(3).'';

(6) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking ''or active duty alert'' and inserting ''active duty alert, or active duty freeze alert''; and

(7) in subsection (i), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR ACTIVE DUTY FREEZE ALERTS.—

''(A) NOTIFICATION.—Each active duty freeze alert under this section shall include information that notifies all prospective users of a consumer report on the consumer to which the freeze alert relates that the consumer does not authorize the establishment of any new credit plan or extension of credit, including any credit under an open-end credit plan (as defined in section 103(i)), in the name of the consumer, or issuance of an additional card on an existing credit account requested by a consumer, or any increase in credit limit on an existing credit account requested by a consumer.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON USERS.—No prospective user of a consumer report that includes an active duty freeze alert in accordance with this section may establish a new credit plan or extension of credit, including any credit under an open-end credit plan (as defined in section 103(i)), in the name of the consumer, or issue an additional card on an existing credit account requested by a consumer, or grant any increase in credit limit on an existing credit account requested by a consumer.''.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall prescribe regulations to define what constitutes appropriate proof of identity for purposes of section 605A(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, as amended by subsection (a).

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 603(q)(2) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(q)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading for such paragraph, by striking ''ACTIVE DUTY ALERT'' and inserting ''ACTIVE DUTY ALERT; ACTIVE DUTY FREEZE ALERT''; and

(2) by inserting ''and 'active duty freeze alert' '' before ''mean''.

SA 1626. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 1116. ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 6329. Disabled veteran leave

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) notwithstanding section 6301, the term 'employee'—

'(A) has the meaning given such term in section 2105; and

''(B) includes an officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or of the Postal Regulatory Commission;

''(2) the term 'service-connected' has the meaning given such term in section 101(16) of title 38; and

''(3) the term 'veteran' has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38.

''(b) LEAVE CREDITED.—During the 12-month period beginning on the first day of the employment of an employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated as 30 percent or more disabling, the

employee is entitled to leave, without loss or reduction in pay, for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability for which sick leave could regularly be used.

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) AMOUNT OF LEAVE.— The leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) may not exceed 104 hours.

''(2) NO CARRY OVER.—Any leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) that is not used during the 12-month period described in such subsection may not be carried over and shall be forfeited.

''(d) CERTIFICATION.—In order to verify that leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) is used for treating a service-connected disability, the employee shall submit to the head of the employing agency a certification, in such form and manner as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may prescribe, that the employee used the leave for purposes of being furnished treatment for the disability by a health care provider.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 6328 the following:

''6329. Disabled veteran leave.''.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an employee (as that term is defined in section 6329(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)) hired on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1627. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 141. C–130 FLEET MODERNIZATION.

(a) AFFIRMATION OF AUTHORITY TO MODERNIZE.—Congress affirms that, for the purposes of modernizing the C–130 aircraft fleet, the Air Force has authority to undertake safety and compliance upgrades in lieu of the C–130 aircraft avionics modernization program of record to meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration by 2020.

(b) REPLACEMENT OF LIMITATION.—Section 134 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3317) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection (b):

''(b) COORDINATION WITH FAA IN IMPLEMENTATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM.—If the Secretary of the Air Force implements in accordance with subsection (a)(2) the alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program described in subsection (a)(1)(3), the Secretary shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in the implementation of such program in order to meet or otherwise satisfy applicable safety and compliance airspace regulations.''

SA 1628. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1272, and insert the following:

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels into and directed at the territory of Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels into and directed at the territory of Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The activities described in paragraphs (1) and (3) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress the following:

(A) The Secretary has finalized a memorandum of understanding or other formal agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1).

(B) The understanding or agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the cooperative research and development projects; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(3) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Government of Israel, is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in paragraph (1).

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains a copy of the memorandum of understanding and other documents between the United States and Israel as described in subsection (c)(2).

(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1629. Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3124. ENSURING UNITED STATES CIVIL NUCLEAR COMPONENTS ARE NOT ILLEGALLY DIVERTED TO NUCLEAR NAVAL PROPULSION PROGRAMS.

Section 57 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2077) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary may not make an authorization under subsection b.(2) with respect to a foreign country with a nuclear naval propulsion program unless—

''(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief of Naval Operations jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the risks of diversion, and the likely consequences of such diversion, of the technology and material covered by such authorization; and

''(B) following the date on which such assessment is submitted, the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

''(i) there is sufficient diversion control as part of the authorization; and

''(ii) the authorization presents a minimal risk of diversion of such technology and material to a military program that would degrade the technical advantage of the United States.

''(2) The limitation under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to France or the United Kingdom.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the following:

''(A) The congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code).

''(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

''(C) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.''.

SA 1630. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REQUIREMENT TO CONTACT CERTAIN TRICARE PROVIDERS TO DETERMINE INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING IN CHOICE PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) SUBMITTAL OF LIST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a list of all health care providers who participate in the TRICARE program and who are not health care providers of the Department of Defense.

(2) UPDATE.—Not less frequently than twice each year after the submittal of the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs an update to such list.

(b) DETERMINATION OF INTEREST IN PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall contact each provider included in the list submitted under paragraph (1) or any update to such list submitted under paragraph (2) to determine whether any such provider would be interested in furnishing care to veterans under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(c) TRICARE PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''TRICARE program'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1631. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MAINTENANCE BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF CERTAIN JOINT VENTURES WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding the policy statement of the Department of Veterans Affairs dated May 12, 2015, and entitled ''Veterans Health Administration Hierarchy for Purchased Care'' or any other policy of the Department relating to purchased care for purposes of implementing section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not—

(1) withdraw from any arrangement under which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense jointly operate a hospital;

(2) reduce or eliminate staffing, funding, or the provision of other resources to a hospital that is so jointly operated; or

(3) limit the access of veterans to any such hospital.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out an action listed in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) with respect to a hospital if the Secretary submits a report to the Secretary of Defense, the appropriate committees of Congress, and each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives who represents the State in which the hospital is located—

(1) providing 180 days advance notice of the intent of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the action; and

(2) specifying the reasons of the Secretary for carrying out the action.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1632. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle ____—Border Security Effectiveness Metrics

SEC. ___1. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(2) COCAINE REMOVAL EFFECTIVENESS RATE.—The term ''cocaine removal effectiveness rate'' means the percentage that results from dividing—

(A) the amount of cocaine removed by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components inside or outside a transit zone, as the case may be; by

(B) the total documented cocaine flow rate, as contained in Federal drug databases.

(3) CONSEQUENCE DELIVERY SYSTEM.—The term ''Consequence Delivery System'' means the series of consequences applied by the Border Patrol to persons unlawfully entering the United States to prevent unlawful border crossing recidivism.

(4) FEDERAL LANDS.—The term ''Federal lands'' includes all land under the control of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Secretary of the Interior along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(5) GOT AWAY.—The term ''got away'' means an unlawful border crosser who, after making an unlawful entry into the United States, is not turned back or apprehended.

(6) MAJOR VIOLATOR.—The term ''major violator'' means a person or entity that has engaged in serious criminal activities at any land, air, or sea port of entry, including—

(A) possession of illicit drugs;

(B) smuggling of prohibited products;

(C) human smuggling;

(D) weapons possession;

(E) use of fraudulent United States documents; or

(F) other offenses serious enough to result in arrest.

(7) SITUATIONAL AWARENESS.—The term ''situational awareness'' means knowledge and unified understanding of current unlawful cross-border activity, including—

(A) threats and trends concerning illicit trafficking and unlawful crossings;

(B) the ability to forecast future shifts in such threats and trends;

(C) the ability to evaluate such threats and trends at a level sufficient to create actionable plans; and

(D) the operational capability to conduct continuous and integrated surveillance of the international borders of the United States.

(8) TRANSIT ZONE.—The term ''transit zone'' means the sea corridors of the western Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, and the eastern Pacific Ocean through which undocumented migrants and illicit drugs transit, either directly or indirectly, to the United States.

(9) TURN BACK.—The term ''turn back'' means an unlawful border crosser who, after making an unlawful entry into the United States, returns to the country from which such crosser entered.

(10) UNLAWFUL BORDER CROSSING EFFECTIVENESS RATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate'' means the percentage that results from dividing—

(i) the number of apprehensions and turn backs; by

(ii) the number of apprehensions, turn backs, and got aways.

(B) MANNER OF COLLECTION.—The data used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to determine the unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate shall be collected and reported in a consistent and standardized manner across all Border Patrol sectors, informed by situational awareness.

SEC. ___2. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER BETWEEN PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Chief of the Border Patrol shall develop metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security between ports of entry. The metrics developed under this subsection shall include—

(1) an unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate, which is informed by situational awareness;

(2) a probability of detection, which compares the estimated total unlawful border crossing attempts not detected by the Border Patrol to the unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate;

(3) a weight-to-frequency rate, which compares the average weight of marijuana seized per seizure by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to such weight-to-frequency rate for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(4) a situational awareness achievement metric, which measures the amount of situational awareness achieved in each Border Patrol sector;

(5) an illicit drugs seizure rate, which compares the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Border Patrol in the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(6) in consultation with the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the United States Southern Command, a cocaine seizure effectiveness rate, which is the percentage resulting from dividing—

(A) the amount of cocaine seized by the Border Patrol; by

(B) the total documented cocaine flow rate between ports of entry along the Southern land border;

(7) estimates, using alternative methodologies, including recidivism data, survey data, known-flow data, and technologically measured data, of—

(A) total attempted unlawful border crossings;

(B) the rate of apprehension of attempted unlawful border crossers; and

(C) the inflow into the United States of unlawful border crossers who evade apprehension; and

(8) estimates of the impact of the Border Patrol's Consequence Delivery System on the rate of recidivism of unlawful border crossers over multiple fiscal years and an examination of each consequence, including—

(A) voluntary return;

(B) warrant of arrest or notice to appear;

(C) expedited removal;

(D) reinstatement of removal;

(E) alien transfer exit program;

(F) streamline;

(G) standard prosecution; and

(H) Operation Against Smugglers Initiative on Safety and Security.

(b) METRICS CONSULTATION.—In developing the metrics required under subsection (a), the Chief of the Border Patrol shall consult with staff members of the Office of Policy of the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. ___3. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER AT PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner for the Office of Field Operations in U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall develop metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security at ports of entry. The metrics developed under this subsection shall include—

(1) an inadmissible border crossing rate, which is measured by dividing—

(A) the number of known inadmissible border crossers who are denied entry, excluding those border crossers who voluntarily withdraw their applications for admission; by

(B) the total estimated number of inadmissible border crossers who attempt entry;

(2) an illicit drugs seizure rate, which compares the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in any fiscal year to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(3) in consultation with the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the United States Southern Command, a cocaine seizure effectiveness rate, which is the percentage resulting from dividing—

(A) the amount of cocaine seized by the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; by

(B) the total documented cocaine flow rate at ports of entry along the Southern land border;

(4) estimates, using alternative methodologies, including survey data and randomized secondary screening data, of—

(A) total attempted inadmissible border crossers;

(B) the rate of apprehension of attempted inadmissible border crossers; and

(C) the inflow into the United States of inadmissible border crossers who evade apprehension;

(5) the number of infractions related to personnel and cargo committed by major violators who are apprehended by the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection at ports of entry, and the estimated number of such infractions committed by major violators who are not apprehended;

(6) a measurement of how border security operations affect border crossing times;

(7) the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection at United States seaports during the previous fiscal year; and

(8) a cargo scanning rate, which compares the number of cargo containers scanned by the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection at each United States seaport during the previous fiscal year to the total number of cargo containers entering the United States at each seaport during the previous fiscal year.

(b) METRICS CONSULTATION.—In developing the metrics required under subsection (a), the Assistant Commissioner for the Office of Field Operations shall consult with staff members of the Office of Policy at the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. ___4. METRICS FOR SECURING THE MARITIME BORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and the Assistant Commissioner for the Office of Air and Marine for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall jointly implement metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security in the maritime environment. The metrics developed under this subsection shall include—

(1) an estimate of the total number of undocumented migrants who were not interdicted by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components;

(2) an undocumented migrant interdiction rate, which compares the flow of undocumented migrants interdicted against the total estimated number of undocumented migrants who were not interdicted by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components;

(3) an illicit drugs removal rate, which compares the amount and type of illicit drugs removed by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components inside a transit zone in any fiscal year to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs removed by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components inside a transit zone for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(4) an illicit drugs removal rate, which compares the amount and type of illicit drugs removed by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components outside a transit zone in any fiscal year to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs removed by the Department of Homeland Security's maritime security components outside a transit zone for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(5) a cocaine removal effectiveness rate inside a transit zone and outside a transit zone; and

(6) a response rate, which compares the ability of the maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security to respond to and resolve known maritime threats, whether inside and outside a transit zone, by placing assets on-scene, to the total number of events with respect to which the Department has known threat information.

(b) METRICS CONSULTATION.—In developing the metrics required under subsection (a), the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine shall consult with staff members of the Office of Policy at the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. ___5. AIR AND MARINE SECURITY METRICS IN THE LAND DOMAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner for the Office of Air and Marine for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall implement metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security in the aviation environment. The metrics developed under this subsection shall include—

(1) a requirement effectiveness rate, which compares U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Office of Air and Marine flight hours requirements to the number of flight hours actually flown by such Office;

(2) a funded flight hours effectiveness rate, which compares the number of funded flight hours appropriated to U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Office of Air and Marine to the number of actual flight hours flown by such Office;

(3) a readiness rate, which compares the number of aviation missions flown by U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Office of Air and Marine to the number of aviation missions cancelled by such Office due to weather, maintenance, operations, or other causes;

(4) the number of subjects detected by U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Office of Air and Marine through the use of unmanned aerial systems;

(5) the number of apprehensions assisted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Office of Air and Marine through the use of unmanned aerial systems;

(6) the number and quantity of illicit drug seizures assisted by U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Office of Air and Marine through the use of unmanned aerial systems; and

(7) a detailed description of how, where, and for how long data and images collected through the use of unmanned aerial systems by U.S. Customs and Border Protection is collected and stored.

(b) METRICS CONSULTATION.—In developing the metrics required under subsection (a), the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine shall consult with staff members of the Office of Policy at the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. ___6. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER ON FEDERAL LANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Chief of the Border Patrol shall develop metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security between ports of entry on Federal lands. The metrics developed under this subsection shall include—

(1) an unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate, which is informed by situational awareness;

(2) a probability of detection, which compares the estimated total unlawful border crossing attempts not detected by the Border Patrol to the unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate;

(3) a weight-to-frequency rate, which compares the average weight of marijuana seized

per seizure by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to such weight-to-frequency rate for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(4) a situational awareness achievement metric, which measures the amount of situational awareness achieved in each Border Patrol sector;

(5) an illicit drugs seizure rate, which compares the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to an average of the amount and type of illicit drugs seized by the Border Patrol in the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years;

(6) in consultation with the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the United States Southern Command, a cocaine seizure effectiveness rate, which is the percentage resulting from dividing—

(A) the amount of cocaine seized by the Border Patrol; by

(B) the total documented cocaine flow rate between ports of entry on Federal lands along the Southern land border;

(7) estimates, using alternative methodologies, including recidivism data, survey data, known-flow data, and technologically measured data, of—

(A) total attempted unlawful border crossings;

(B) the rate of apprehension of attempted unlawful border crossers; and

(C) the inflow into the United States of unlawful border crossers who evade apprehension.

(b) METRICS CONSULTATION.—In developing the metrics required under subsection (a), the Chief of the Border Patrol shall consult with the Office of Policy of the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. ___7. EVALUATION BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The metrics required under sections ___2 through ___6, and the data and methodology used to develop such metrics, shall be provided annually to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) the Comptroller General of the United States; and

(3) the head of a national laboratory within the Department of Homeland Security laboratory network with prior experience in border security, who shall be selected by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after receiving the data and methodology referred to in subsection (a), and annually thereafter for the following 10 years, the Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the individual selected under subsection (a)(3), shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) analyzes the suitability and statistical validity of such data and methodology; and

(2) includes recommendations to the Secretary of Homeland Security for other suitable metrics that may be used to measure the effectiveness of border security.

SA 1633. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. BORDER SECURITY ON FEDERAL LANDS ALONG THE SOUTHERN BORDER.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BORDER SECURITY.—The term ''border security'' means—

(A) the functioning and operational capability to conduct continuous and integrated manned or unmanned, monitoring, sensing, or surveillance of 100 percent of Southern border mileage within the Tucson and Yuma sectors or the immediate vicinity of the Southern border within the Tucson and Yuma Sectors; and

(B) the apprehension or turn back of illegal entries across the Southern border in the Tucson and Yuma sectors.

(2) FEDERAL LANDS.—The term ''Federal lands'' includes all land under the control of the Secretary concerned that is located—

(A) within 100 miles of the international border between the United States and Mexico; and

(B) within the Tucson and Yuma sectors of United States Border Patrol.

(3) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) SUPPORT FOR BORDER SECURITY NEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To achieve border security on Federal lands—

(A) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned shall provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel with immediate access to Federal lands for border security activities, including—

(i) routine motorized patrols; and

(ii) the deployment of communications, surveillance, and detection equipment;

(B) the Secretary concerned may provide education and training to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the natural and cultural resources present on individual Federal land units; and

(C) the security activities described in subparagraph (A) shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines will best protect the natural and cultural resources on Federal lands.

(2) INTERMINGLED STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any private or State-owned land within the boundaries of Federal lands.

(3) SUNSET.—The requirements under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the requirements under subsection (b) are scheduled to terminate, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an analysis of the effectiveness of the actions taken pursuant to such subsection, including the impact of such actions on—

(A) border security activities; and

(B) the natural and cultural resources on impacted Federal lands;

(2) an assessment of the 2006 Memos of Understanding between the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior regarding access to Federal and Indian lands for border security activities, including—

(A) how such memoranda, as in force on the date of the enactment of this Act, impacted border security activities;

(B) the best way to improve such memoranda and their application;

(C) specific ways in which such memoranda could be used to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security receives timely access to Federal lands for critical border security activities; and

(D) the number of agency personnel required to effectively and efficiently execute such memoranda;

(3) a sector-by-sector analysis of the expected impact of applying the requirements under subsection (b) to the entire land border of the United States, including—

(A) an assessment of—

(i) how border security activities and natural, cultural, and historic resources on Federal and Indian lands would be impacted, including the potential impact on wildlife, including endangered species;

(ii) any actions the Department of Homeland Security would need to take to mitigate the impact of border security actions, including the estimated costs of such actions; and

(iii) whether lack of access hinders border security; and

(B) an examination of the impact of providing the Department of Homeland Security with increased access to Federal and Indian lands located within—

(i) 25 miles of the United States border;

(ii) 50 miles of the United States border, or

(iii) 100 miles of the United States border; and

(4) a sector-by-sector analysis of—

(A) the costs incurred by each Secretary concerned relating to managing and mitigating for illegal border activity on Federal lands, including the cost of restoring natural resources that were damaged by illegal border activity;

(B) the impact of illegal traffic on wildlife, including endangered species and critical habitat; and

(C) the impact of illegal traffic on natural, cultural, and historic resources on Federal lands.

SA 1634. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 706. INCLUSION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES NOT SUBJECTED OR EXPOSED TO OPERATIONAL RISK FACTORS IN REQUIRED MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.

Section 1074m(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code is amended by striking ''determines that—'' and all that follows through ''providing such assessment'' and inserting ''determines that providing such assessment''.

SA 1635. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 403. LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF END STRENGTH FOR ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any authorized strength specified in any annual national defense authorization Act enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, the authorized strength for active duty personnel of the Armed Forces for any fiscal year may not be reduced below the applicable number for fiscal year 2016 specified in section 401 until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the report required by section 904(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 816; 10 U.S.C. 111 note).

SA 1636. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. CERTIFICATION ON ACTIONS TO ENSURE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF DISSIDENTS HOUSED AT CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall certify, in writing, to the congressional defense committees whether the Central Government of Iraq is taking appropriate and sufficient actions to ensure the safety and security of dissidents housed at Camp Liberty, Iraq.

SA 1637. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ARM OR EQUIP THE IRAQ MILITARY PENDING CERTIFICATION ON ACTIONS TO ENSURE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF DISSIDENTS HOUSED AT CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for the Department of Defense may be used to arm or equip any personnel or units of the military forces of Iraq until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a certification that appropriate actions have been taken to ensure the safety and security of dissidents housed at Camp Liberty, Iraq.

SA 1638. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 706. ENHANCEMENT OF ANNUAL MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1074n(b) of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) include a thorough dialogue between the individual conducting the mental health assessment and the member to determine whether the member has had any experiences that could lead to future mental health concerns;

''(4) include a thorough screening of the member for key indicators of post-traumatic stress and mild to severe traumatic brain injury; and

''(5) include the creation of a recorded, verified history of events, including non-combat related events, for each member to determine the cause and correlation of symptoms of mild traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress that may appear months or years after the causal incident.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a plan for the implementation of paragraphs (3) through (5) of section 1074n(b) of such title, as added by subsection (a)(3) of this section.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the annual mental health assessment for members of the Armed Forces provided under section 1074n of such title can be improved by providing members undergoing such an assessment with a record of events, including non-combat related events, to substantiate latent mental health issues that appear months or years after the causal incident;

(2) some members do not know how to ask for help with mental health concerns in connection with such assessment as conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act and not all health care providers adequately discuss mental health during such assessment;

(3) the majority of mild traumatic brain injury inducing incidents are not diagnosed during combat deployment, so when symptoms do appear, there is no mechanism for health care providers to link the injury back to the causal incident;

(4) the provision of such assessment as conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act does not recognize incidents described in paragraph (3) unless the member indicates such incidents on a survey or has a very proactive health care provider;

(5) when latent mental health symptoms appear after a member is discharged, the member is not eligible to receive treatment from the Department without a record of causal justification; and

(6) the Secretary of Defense has an obligation to localize as quickly and efficiently as possible without disrupting military readiness the mental health concerns that persist among members of the Armed Forces unbeknownst to those members and the health care providers of those members.

SA 1639. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. AUTHORITY FOR UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY TO CHARGE AND RETAIN TUITION FOR INSTRUCTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL DETAILED FOR INSTRUCTION AT THE INSTITUTE.

(a) INSTITUTE INSTRUCTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL.—Section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as paragraph (4) of subsection (d), as so redesignated; and

(3) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

''(a) MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OTHER THAN THE AIR FORCE WHO ARE DETAILED TO THE INSTITUTE.—(1) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Homeland Security shall bear the cost of the instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology that is received by members of the armed forces detailed for that instruction by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Homeland Security, respectively.

''(2) Members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may only be detailed for instruction at the Institute on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

''(b) FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN AIR FORCE EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DETAILED TO THE INSTITUTE.—(1) The United States Air Force Institute of Technology shall charge tuition for the cost of providing instruction at the Institute for any civilian employee of a military department (other than a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force), of another component of the Department of Defense, or of another Federal agency who is detailed to receive instruction at the Institute.

''(2) The cost of any tuition charged an individual under this subsection shall be borne by the department, agency, or component that details the individual for instruction at the Institute. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

''(c) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to any of the following persons:

''(A) A member of the armed forces not detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned.

''(B) A civilian employee of a military department, of another component of the Department of Defense, of another Federal agency, or of the National Guard of a State not detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned or head of the other Department of Defense component, other Federal agency, or the National Guard.

''(C) A United States citizen who is the recipient of a competitively selected Federal or Department of Defense sponsored scholarship or fellowship with a defense focus in areas of study related to the academic disciplines offered by the Institute and which requires a service commitment to the Federal government in exchange for educational financial assistance.

''(3) If a scholarship or fellowship described in paragraph (2)(C) includes a stipend, the Institute may accept the stipend payment from the scholarship or fellowship sponsor and make a direct payment to the individual.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATED TO REDESIGNATION AND OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''ADMISSION AUTHORIZED'' and inserting ''DEFENSE INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''paragraph (4)''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), by striking ''ELIGIBLE DEFENSE INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES.—'';

(2) in subsection (f)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(1)'';

(3) in subsection (g)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''under subsections (c) and (d)''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''who are detailed to receive instruction at the Institute under subsection (b)''; and

(4) in subsection (h), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking ''defense industry employees enrolled under this section'' and inserting ''persons enrolled under this section who are not members of the armed forces or Government civilian employees''.

(c) CONDITIONS ON ADMISSION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRY CIVILIANS.—Subsection (e)(2) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking ''will be done on a space-available basis and not require an increase in the size of the faculty'' and inserting ''will not require an increase in the permanently authorized size of the faculty''.

(d) STATUTORY REORGANIZATION.—Chapter 901 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by transferring subsections (d) and (f) of section 9314 to the end of section 9314b and redesignating such subsections as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) in subsection 9314, by striking subsection (e).

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADINGS.—(A) The heading of section 9314 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 9314. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: degree-granting authority''.

(B) The heading of section 9314a of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: reimbursement and tuition; instruction of persons other than Air Force personnel''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 901 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 9314 and 9314a and inserting the following new items:

''9314. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: degree-granting authority.

''9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: reimbursement and tuition; instruction of persons other than Air Force personnel.''.

SA 1640. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

(a) POLICY REQUIRED.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall establish a joint policy under which military installations that control military lands that are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities coordinate with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, local governments, and hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups the periods during which such lands shall be open and closed to the public. To the maximum extent practicable such coordination shall be undertaken sufficiently in advance of the commencement of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons in order for State fish and wildlife managers can plan for the opening and closing dates of seasons and the conditions under which fish and wildlife can be taken during the season.

(b) INSTALLATION LEVEL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The policy established under subsection (a) may authorize the creation of installation level advisory committees on the use of military lands for hunting, fishing, and recreational uses. Any such advisory committee shall not be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SA 1641. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 152. FUNDING FOR COAST GUARD ICEBREAKER FLEET.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense such funds as may be necessary to support the maintenance and refurbishment of the Coast Guard icebreaker fleet and the design and construction of new icebreakers.

(b) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized under this section may be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security.

SA 1642. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2822. LAND ACQUISITION, FORT GREELY SCHOOL, DELTA JUNCTION, ALASKA.

(a) LAND ACQUISITION AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire, without consideration, from the Delta/Greely School District (in this section referred to as the ''District''), all right, title, and interest of the District in and to a parcel of property, including improvements thereon, consisting of the Fort Greely School, Delta Junction, Alaska.

(b) TERMINATION OF GROUND LEASE.—Upon the acquisition authorized under subsection (a), the ground lease between Delta/Greely School District and the Army will be terminated and the District shall be relieved from all liability for the demolition of the building or remediation of the site except for environmental contamination that was the result of sole willful misconduct of the District during the period that the District owned the Fort Greely School.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the acquisition under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SA 1643. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. GUARANTEED TRANSPORTATION FOR NEXT OF KIN TO ATTEND TRANSFER CEREMONY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

Section 481f(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) The discretion to authorize transportation under paragraph (1) shall not apply, and the Secretary of the military department concerned is instead required to provide such transportation, whenever the death of the member overseas occurs in the line of duty in a combat or humanitarian relief operation or in combat zone designated by the Secretary of Defense.''.

SA 1644. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. APPROVAL OF EXPORT LICENCES AND LETTERS OF REQUEST TO ASSIST THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall provide the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all export license applications, including requests for marketing licenses, for the sale of defense articles and defense services to Ukraine. The list shall include the date when the application or request was first submitted, the current status of each application or request, and the estimated timeline for adjudication of such applications or requests. The Secretary should give priority to processing these applications and requests.

(2) LETTERS OF REQUEST.—The Secretary of State shall also provide the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all pending Letters of Request for Foreign Military Sales to Ukraine, including the date when the letter was first submitted, the current status, and the estimated timeline for adjudication of such letters.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report outlining the status of the applications, requests for marketing licenses and Letters of Request described under subsection (a). The report shall terminate upon certification by the President that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Government of Ukraine has been restored or 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs first.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1645. Mr. MARKEY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EXPORTS OF CRUDE OIL.

It is the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to allies and partners of the United States should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest and the purposes of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

SA 1646. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 515. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NON-FEDERALIZED NATIONAL GUARD TO SUPPORT CIVILIAN AUTHORITIES IN PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO NON-CATASTROPHIC DOMESTIC DISASTERS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Section 10504 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''REPORT.—'' and inserting ''REPORT ON STATE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.—(1)'';

(2) by striking ''(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS.—'' and inserting ''(2)'';

(3) by striking ''annual report of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau'' and inserting ''annual report required by paragraph (1)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection (b):

''(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON NON-FEDERALIZED SERVICE NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Not later than January 31 of each of calendar years 2016 through 2022, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the officials specified in paragraph (5) a report setting forth the personnel, training, and equipment required by the National Guard during the next fiscal year to carry out its mission, while not Federalized, to provide prevention, protection mitigation, response, and recovery activities in support of civilian authorities in connection with non-catastrophic natural and man-made disasters.

''(2) To determine the annual personnel, training, and equipment requirements of the National Guard referred to in paragraph (1), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall take into account, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) Core civilian capabilities gaps for the prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery activities in connection with natural and man-made disasters, as collected by the Department of Homeland Security from the States.

''(B) Threat and hazard identifications and risk assessments of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and the States.

''(3) Personnel, training, and equipment requirements shall be collected from the States, validated by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and be categorized in the report required by paragraph (1) by each of the following:

''(A) Emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

''(B) Federal Emergency Management Agency regions.

''(4) The annual report required by paragraph (1) shall be prepared in consultation with the chief executive of each State, other appropriate civilian authorities, and the Council of Governors.

''(5) In addition to the congressional defense committees, the annual report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the following officials:

''(A) The Secretary of Defense.

''(B) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(C) The Council of Governors.

''(D) The Secretary of the Army.

''(E) The Secretary of the Air Force.

''(F) The Commander of the United States Northern Command.

''(G) The Commander of the United States Cyber Command.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 10504. Chief of the National Guard Bureau: annual reports''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 10504 and inserting the following new section:

''10504. Chief of the National Guard Bureau: annual reports.''.

SA 1647. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

SA 1648. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMY FOR TUITION ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EFFECTIVE UPON COMPLETION OF INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING IN THE ARMY.

Notwithstanding Army policy ALARACT 317/2013 or any similar policy, any individual who is enlisted, inducted, or appointed as a member of the Army, including the Army National Guard of the United States and the Army Reserve, after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be eligible for tuition assistance through the Department of Defense for members of the Armed Forces upon completion of initial entry training, rather than upon completion of one year of service after completion of initial entry training, to the same extent such members would have been eligible for such tuition assistance before the issuance of ALARACT 317/2013.

SA 1649. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE REBALANCE TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region is right for the United States, and the United States Army is essential to this effort given the importance of land armies in the region;

(2) the Asia-Pacific region is home to 7 of the 10 largest armies in the world, and 21 of the 27 chiefs of defense in the region are army officers;

(3) the dynamic security environment in the Asia-Pacific region demands capabilities the Army has to offer, from supporting humanitarian operations to conducting military exercises with most important regional partners and allies of the United States;

(4) the spending limits in the Budget Control Act of 2011 impose hard choices on the Department of Defense that could force the Army to make strategically unwise cuts to its end strength;

(5) it is the responsibility of Congress to remove defense and non-defense spending limits to give Federal agencies the certainty they need to make sound budgetary decisions; and

(6) despite fiscal pressure, the Army should strengthen its posture in the Asia-Pacific region and make future force structure decisions in line with the commitment of the United States to rebalance to the region.

SA 1650. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REVIEW OF DISCHARGE CHARACTERIZATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DISCHARGED UNDER THE DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with this section, the appropriate discharge boards—

(1) shall review the discharge characterization of covered members at the request of the covered member; and

(2) if such characterization is any characterization except honorable, may change such characterization to honorable.

(b) CRITERIA.—In changing the discharge characterization of a covered member to honorable under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that such changes are carried out consistently and uniformly across the military departments using the following criteria:

(1) The original discharge must be based on Don't Ask Don't Tell (in this section referred to as ''DADT'') or a similar policy in place prior to the enactment of DADT.

(2) Such discharge characterization shall be so changed if, with respect to the original discharge, there were no aggravating circumstances, such as misconduct, that would have independently led to a discharge characterization that was any characterization except honorable. For purposes of this paragraph, such aggravating circumstances may not include—

(A) an offense under section 925 of title 10, United States Code (article 125 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), committed by a covered member against a person of the same sex with the consent of such person; or

(B) statements, consensual sexual conduct, or consensual acts relating to sexual orientation or identity, or the disclosure of such statements, conduct, or acts, that were prohibited at the time of discharge but after the date of such discharge became permitted.

(3) When requesting a review, a covered member, or the member's representative, shall be required to provide either—

(A) documents consisting of—

(i) a copy of the DD–214 form of the member;

(ii) a personal affidavit of the circumstances surrounding the discharge; and

(iii) any relevant records pertaining to the discharge; or

(B) an affidavit certifying that the member, or the member's representative, does not have the documents specified in subparagraph (A).

(4) If a covered member provides an affidavit described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3)—

(A) the appropriate discharge board shall make every effort to locate the documents specified in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph within the records of the Department of Defense; and

(B) the absence of such documents may not be considered a reason to deny a change of the discharge characterization under subsection (a)(2).

(c) REQUEST FOR REVIEW.—The appropriate discharge board shall ensure the mechanism by which covered members, or their representative, may request to have the discharge characterization of the covered member reviewed under this section is simple and straightforward.

(d) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After a request has been made under subsection (c), the appropriate discharge board shall review all relevant laws, records of oral testimony previously taken, service records, or any other relevant information regarding the discharge characterization of the covered member.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATERIALS.—If additional materials are necessary for the review, the appropriate discharge board—

(A) may request additional information from the covered member or the member's representative, in writing, and specifically detailing what is being requested; and

(B) shall be responsible for obtaining a copy of the necessary files of the covered member from the member, or when applicable, from the Department of Defense.

(e) CHANGE OF CHARACTERIZATION.—The appropriate discharge board shall change the discharge characterization of a covered member to honorable if such change is determined to be appropriate after a review is conducted under subsection (d) pursuant to the criteria under subsection (b). A covered member, or the member's representative, may appeal a decision by the appropriate discharge board to not change the discharge characterization by using the regular appeals process of the board.

(f) CHANGE OF RECORDS.—For each covered member whose discharge characterization is changed under subsection (e), or for each covered member who was honorably discharged but whose DD–214 form reflects the sexual orientation of the member, the Secretary of Defense shall reissue to the member or the member's representative a revised DD–214 form that reflects the following:

(1) For each covered member discharged, the Separation Code, Reentry Code, Narrative Code, and Separation Authority shall not reflect the sexual orientation of the member and shall be placed under secretarial authority. Any other similar indication of the sexual orientation or reason for discharge shall be removed or changed accordingly to be consistent with this paragraph.

(2) For each covered member whose discharge occurred prior to the creation of general secretarial authority, the sections of the DD–214 form referred to paragraph (1) shall be changed to similarly reflect a universal authority with codes, authorities, and language applicable at the time of discharge.

(g) STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered member whose discharge characterization is changed under subsection (e) shall be treated without regard to the original discharge characterization of the member, including for purposes of—

(A) benefits provided by the Federal Government to an individual by reason of service in the Armed Forces; and

(B) all recognitions and honors that the Secretary of Defense provides to members of the Armed Forces.

(2) REINSTATEMENT.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall reinstate all recognitions and honors of a covered member whose discharge characterization is changed under subsection (e) that the Secretary withheld because of the original discharge characterization of the member.

(h) REPORTS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the consistency and uniformity of the reviews conducted under subsection (a).

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter for a four-year period, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the reviews under paragraph (1). Such reports shall include any comments or recommendations for continued actions.

(i) HISTORICAL REVIEW.—The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that oral historians of the department—

(1) review the facts and circumstances surrounding the estimated 100,000 members of the Armed Forces discharged from the Armed Forces between World War II and September 2011 because of the sexual orientation of the member; and

(2) receive oral testimony of individuals who personally experienced discrimination and discharge because of the actual or perceived sexual orientation of the individual so that such testimony may serve as an official record of these discriminatory policies and their impact on American lives.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate discharge board'' means the boards for correction of military records under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, or the discharge review boards under section 1553 of such title, as the case may be.

(2) The term ''covered member'' means any former member of the Armed Forces who was discharged from the Armed Forces because of the sexual orientation of the member.

(3) The term ''discharge characterization'' means the characterization under which a member of the Armed Forces is discharged or released, including ''dishonorable'', ''general'', ''other than honorable'', and ''honorable''.

(4) The term ''Don't Ask Don't Tell'' means section 654 of title 10, United States Code, as in effect before such section was repealed pursuant to the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–321).

(5) The term ''representative'' means the surviving spouse, next of kin, or legal representative of a covered member.

SA 1651. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES RELATED TO THE SALE AND TRANSFER OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLES MRAPS TO STRATEGIC PARTNERS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interest of the United States to build relationships with strategic partners through security assistance programs, including the Foreign Military Sales, Excess Defense Articles, and Foreign Military Financing of Direct Commercial Contracts programs;

(2) these security assistance programs incentivize partners to meet the requirements of United States law in order to purchase United States military equipment, secure special access privileges for the United States military, and reassure allies of United States security commitments;

(3) as the United States deepens security ties in key regions, it remains vital that it strike a balance between remaining an attractive security partner and establishing robust oversight over all security assistance programs;

(4) absent robust oversight, sales and transfers of sensitive weapon systems to foreign countries and military units with human rights violations carry the risk of harming United States interests;

(5) Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles are a highly sensitive weapon system that have the potential to be used for repressive purposes, including to suppress legitimate domestic civil unrest and peaceful protests; and

(6) the Defense Security Cooperation Agency and the Department of State should submit the sale and transfer of MRAP vehicles to foreign countries to the Enhanced End-Use Monitoring process in order to ensure an added layer of compliance and accountability with United States assistance and to deter the misuse of this weapon system.

SA 1652. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Improvement of Health Care for Women Members of the Armed Forces

SEC. 741. CONTRACEPTION COVERAGE PARITY UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1074d of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''FOR MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS'' after ''SERVICES AVAILABLE'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

''(b) CARE RELATED TO PREVENTION OF PREGNANCY.—Female covered beneficiaries shall be entitled to care related to the prevention of pregnancy described by subsection (d)(3).

''(c) PROHIBITION ON COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1074g(a)(6) of this title or any other provision of law, cost-sharing may not be imposed or collected for care related to the prevention of pregnancy provided pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), including for any method of contraception provided, whether provided through a facility of the uniformed services, the TRICARE retail pharmacy program, or the national mail-order pharmacy program.''.

(b) CARE RELATED TO PREVENTION OF PREGNANCY.—Subsection (d)(3) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''(including all methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling in connection therewith)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1077(a)(13) of such title is amended by striking ''section 1074d(b)'' and inserting ''section 1074d(d)''.

SEC. 742. ACCESS TO BROAD RANGE OF METHODS OF CONTRACEPTION APPROVED BY THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND MILITARY DEPENDENTS AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that every military treatment facility has a sufficient stock of a broad range of methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Office of Population Affairs of the Department of Health and Human Services, to be able to dispense at any time any such method of contraception to any women members of the Armed Forces and female covered beneficiaries who receive care through such facility.

(b) COVERED BENEFICIARY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered beneficiary'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(5) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 743. PREGNANCY PREVENTION ASSISTANCE AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES FOR WOMEN WHO ARE SEXUAL ASSAULT SURVIVORS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide in statute, and to enhance, existing regulations that require health care providers at military treatment facilities to consult with survivors of sexual assault once clinically stable regarding options for emergency contraception and any necessary follow-up care, including the provision of the emergency contraception.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The assistance specified in subsection (c) shall be provided at every military treatment facility to the following:

(1) Any woman who presents at a military treatment facility and states to personnel of the facility that she is a victim of sexual assault or is accompanied by another individual who states that the woman is a victim of sexual assault.

(2) Any woman who presents at a military treatment facility and is reasonably believed by personnel of such facility to be a survivor of sexual assault.

(c) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The assistance specified in this subsection shall include the following:

(A) The prompt provision by appropriate staff of the military treatment facility of comprehensive, medically and factually accurate, and unbiased written and oral information about all methods of emergency contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

(B) The prompt provision by such staff of emergency contraception to a woman upon her request.

(C) Notification to the woman of her right to confidentiality in the receipt of care and services pursuant to this section.

(2) NATURE OF INFORMATION.—The information provided pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall be provided in language that is clear and concise, is readily comprehensible, and meets such conditions (including conditions regarding the provision of information in languages other than English) as the Secretary may provide in the regulations under this section.

SA 1653. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXPANSION OF DUTIES OF UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS.

Section 136(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and health affairs'' and inserting the following: ''health affairs, and the coordination, use, acquisition, or exchange of joint requirements and resources with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and implementation of recommendations made under section 320(c)(1) of title 38''.

SA 1654. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 355. BRIEFING ON CHANGING CLIMATE CONDITIONS AND MILITARY INSTALLATION READINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to interested Senators on the Department of Defense's strategy and initiatives to address the impact of changing climate conditions on military installations, including expected increased water shortages and instances of wildfire due to increased drought and flooding due to sea level rise and coastal erosion from storm surges, and efforts to mitigate the associated national security risk and ensure optimal military readiness.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of how changing conditions are affecting operations and military readiness at military installations.

(2) A description of efforts to disseminate and implement best practices across military installations.

(3) An assessment whether the Department of Defense faces challenges in carrying out preparedness and resilience initiatives, and recommendations for legislation needed to increase security on military installations.

(4) A description of opportunities for effective public private partnerships or contracts with industry to address and mitigate the effects of these changing conditions.

SA 1655. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 355. UPGRADES TO LONG-RANGE RADAR ADVERSELY IMPACTED IN A SIGNIFICANT MANNER BY THE DEVELOPMENT OR CONSTRUCTION OF WIND ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Secretary of Defense shall upgrade any Long Range Air Route Surveillance Radar that is, or risks being, adversely impacted in a significant manner by the development or construction of wind energy infrastructure.

SA 1656. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1227, before the end quote and final period, insert the following:

''(17) REPORT INFORMING THE PROCESSING TIME FOR APPLICANTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to shall submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that includes—

''(A) the number of applicants in the 'administrative processing' phase of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa application process, broken down by month, during the most recent 12-month period;

''(B) the shortest and longest period that an application described in subparagraph (A) has been in such phase; and

''(C) a description of the steps that the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security have taken to reduce the length of the administrative processing phase, while maintaining adequate security review and screening of such applications.

SA 1657. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1251 and insert the following:

SEC. 1251. UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by title XV and available for overseas contingency operations as specified in the funding tables in division D, $300,000,000 may be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide appropriate security assistance and intelligence support, including training, equipment, and logistics support, supplies and services, to military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine for the purposes as follows:

(1) To enhance the capabilities of the military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine to defend against further aggression.

(2) To assist Ukraine in developing the combat capability to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(3) To support the Government of Ukraine in defending itself against actions by Russia and Russian-backed separatists that violate the ceasefire agreements of September 4, 2014, and February 11, 2015.

(b) APPROPRIATE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT.—For purposes of subsection (a), appropriate security assistance and intelligence support includes the following:

(1) Real time or near real time actionable intelligence, including by lease of such capabilities from United States commercial companies.

(2) Lethal assistance such as anti-armor weapon systems, mortars, crew-served weapons and ammunition, grenade launchers and ammunition, and small arms and ammunition.

(3) Counter-artillery radars, including medium-range and long-range counter-artillery radars that can detect and locate long-range Russian artillery.

(4) Unmanned aerial tactical surveillance systems.

(5) Cyber capabilities.

(6) Counter-electronic warfare capabilities such as secure communications equipment and other electronic protection systems.

(7) Other electronic warfare capabilities.

(8) Training required to maintain and employ systems and capabilities described in paragraphs (1) through (7).

(9) Training for critical combat operations such as planning, command and control, small unit tactics, anti-armor tactics, counter-artillery tactics, logistics, countering improvised explosive devices, battlefield first aid, and medical evacuation.

(10) Training for strategic and operational planning at and above the brigade level.

(c) FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND LIMITATION.—

(1) TRAINING.—Up to 20 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be used to support training pursuant to section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), relating to the Global Security Contingency Fund.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be obligated or expended until an amount equal to 20 percent of such amount has been obligated or expended for appropriate security assistance described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) for the Government of Ukraine.

(3) ALTERNATIVE USE OF FUNDS.—In the event funds otherwise available pursuant to subsection (a) are not used by reason of the limitation in paragraph (2), such funds may be used at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide security assistance and intelligence support, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies and services to military and other national-level security forces of Partnership for Peace nations other than Ukraine that the Secretary of Defense determines face an elevated risk of Russian military aggression and that the Secretary determines is appropriate to defending their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(d) UNITED STATES INVENTORY AND OTHER SOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to make available to the Government of Ukraine weapons and other defense articles, from the United States inventory and other sources, and defense services, in such quantity as the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate to achieve the purposes specified in subsection (a).

(2) REPLACEMENT.—Amounts for the replacement of any items provided to the Government of Ukraine pursuant to paragraph (1) may be derived from funds available for this section or from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for overseas contingency operations for weapons procurement.

(e) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and other appropriate agencies, submit to Congress a report setting forth in detail the following:

(1) The current criteria governing the provision of security assistance and intelligence support to the Government of Ukraine.

(2) The plan, including timelines for delivery, types and quantities of security assistance, and costs, to ensure that such assistance and support are being provided in compliance with the authorized purposes specified in subsection (a).

(g) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Assistance may not be provided under the authority in this section after December 31, 2017.

SA 1658. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. ESTABLISHMENT OF STRATEGIC UNIFORM DRUG FORMULARY FOR THE PROVISION OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDERGOING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly establish a process to make available to individuals undergoing the transition from the receipt of health care services through the Department of Defense to the receipt of such services through the Department of Veterans Affairs systemic pain and psychotropic drugs that are critical to the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for the appropriate and effective provision of health care services to such individuals.

(b) STRATEGIC UNIFORM FORMULARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly establish, and from time to time update, a strategic, evidence-based, uniform formulary for the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs that includes all appropriate systemic pain and psychotropic drugs that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly determine are critical to the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for the appropriate and effective provision of health care services to individuals described in such subsection.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the establishing and updating of the formulary required by paragraph (1).

(c) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from each maintaining their own formularies.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the establishment of the formulary under subsection (b).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1659. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 604.

SA 1660. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT OF FOREIGN FORCES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATIONS TO DISARM AND END ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY BOKO HARAM.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States Government to—

(1) provide timely civilian and military assistance to the Government of Nigeria and regional partners for efforts to assist civilians harmed by Boko Haram;

(2) permit appropriate members and units of the Armed Forces to train, advise, and assist the security forces of regional partners, including Nigeria, as they conduct operations against Boko Haram and operations to reduce and eliminate the safe havens from which terrorist activity can be perpetrated;

(3) support the long-term capacity of the Government of Nigeria to provide security for schools to protect girls seeking an education, and to combat gender-based violence and gender inequality;

(4) coordinate United States Government efforts with those of other nations and intergovernmental organizations to increase contributions for rescue and recovery efforts and better leverage those contributions to enhance the capacity of the law enforcement and military services of the Government of Nigeria; and

(5) strengthen the operational capacity of the civilian police and judicial system in Nigeria to enhance public safety and prevent crime and gender-based violence, while strengthening accountability measures to prevent corruption and abuses.

(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General may provide logistic support, supplies, and services, communications, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets to foreign countries participating in operations to mitigate and eliminate the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to be a declaration of war, an authorization for the use of military force, or any similar authority, nor shall it be construed to limit the authority of the President under the Constitution as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for operation and maintenance, not more than $35,000,000 may be utilized in each such fiscal year to provide support under subsection (b).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS ACROSS FISCAL YEARS.—Amounts available under this subsection for a fiscal year for support under the authority in subsection (b) may be used for support under that authority that begins in such fiscal year but ends in the next fiscal year.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may not use the authority in subsection (b) to provide any type of support that is otherwise prohibited by any provision of law.

(2) MILITARY SUPPORT.—Military support may be provided under the authority in subsection (b) only by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may not use the authority in subsection (b) to provide support to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of support under any other provision of law.

(4) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may not use the authority in subsection (b) to provide any type of support to Nigerian forces unless the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines that the Government of Nigeria is—

(A) undertaking significant efforts to promote the rule of law and hold its security forces accountable for any abuses or criminal activity;

(B) coordinating efforts to combat Boko Haram with neighboring countries;

(C) taking steps to counter extremist ideologies; and

(D) prioritizing the protection of women and girls from gender-based violence.

(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES FOR MILITARY SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense may not provide support under subsection (b) for the national military forces of a country determined to be eligible for such support under that subsection until the Secretary notifies the appropriate committees of Congress of the eligibility of the country for such support.

(g) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON SUPPORT TO BE PROVIDED.—Not less than 15 days before the date on which funds are obligated to provide support under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice setting forth the following:

(1) The type of support to be provided.

(2) The national government to be supported.

(3) The objectives of such support.

(4) The estimated cost of such support.

(5) The intended duration of such support.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''logistic support, supplies, and services'' has the meaning given that term in section 2350(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(i) EXPIRATION.—The authority provided under this section may not be exercised after September 30, 2017.

SA 1661. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEVELOPING WEAPONS TECHNOLOGIES.

It is the sense of Congress that railgun and other developing weapons technologies are vital to the future of national security and should be provided the necessary infrastructure to support the continued development of such weapons systems, including all secure space (SCIFs) necessary to incorporate cyber security into weapons systems during development.

SA 1662. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO THE UNITED STATES OVERHEAD SATELLITE ARCHITECTURE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The current approach to the overhead satellite architecture of the United States is increasingly unsustainable in the long run

due to high and growing costs, long design time, over reliance on large, expensive vehicles that need heavy launch and represent potential single points of failure, an inability to take full advantage of rapid technological innovation in the commercial sector, a lack of commercial-like acquisition practices, a lack of competition, inadequate communications paths and ground processing systems, and the vulnerability to anti-satellite attack without an adequate capability to replace and replenish lost or damaged space vehicles.

(2) The overhead satellite capabilities of the United States are in grave peril due to an over reliance on a big government, centralized planning, and an acquisition model based on a series of 10-year plans.

(3) In past years, the National Reconnaissance Office was the United States model for excellence in acquisition and program management. This was in no small part due to competition within the National Reconnaissance Office between Program A (the Air Force satellite reconnaissance element), Program B (the Central Intelligence Agency satellite reconnaissance element), and Program C (the Navy reconnaissance element), for the best, most innovative, and most cost-effective satellite and aircraft reconnaissance systems, which were delivered on time and under budget. Programs A, B, and C existed from 1962 to 1992.

(4) On September 23, 1971, National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger issued a short memo regarding the President's decision to pursue the first electro-optical imaging (EOI) satellite, to be undertaken ''under a realistic funding program, with a view toward achieving an operational capability in 1976.'' It took almost exactly 5 years to design and launch the first KH–11 satellite into orbit on December 19, 1976. The United States needs to get back to this kind of timeline in designing and launching United States overhead reconnaissance satellites.

(5) The United States cannot afford to wait a decade or more from design to launch of a satellite if the United States is to maintain its technological edge.

(6) The culture of innovation and competition must be fostered and reinforced in the requirements, planning, design, and research and development processes for the United States entire overhead satellite architecture, to take into account and prioritize—

(A) the intelligence requirements of United States warfighters and national policymakers;

(B) the need for resiliency and rapid reconstitution of the architecture in an increasingly contested space environment; and

(C) the ability to leverage rapid developments and innovation in commercial sector satellite, processing and sensor technology.

(7) Space is no longer an uncontested environment, as it had been in the past. The United States must be open to innovative solutions such as distributed, disaggregated architectures that could allow for better resiliency against the space threat, and also allow for ready reconstitution, constant replenishment, and frequent technological refresh.

(8) The current cost-constrained budget environment dictates that the United States can no longer ignore the costs of systems and potentially less expensive alternatives.

(9) In April 2009, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said that the United States needed to reform acquisition across the Department of Defense, that the costs of the ''exquisite solution'' were making defense unaffordable, and that ''we needed to shift away from the 99-percent exquisite service-centric platforms that are so costly and so complex that they take forever to build and only then in very limited quantities. With the pace of technological and geopolitical change and the range of possible contingencies, we must look more to the 80 percent multi-service solution that can be produced on time, on budget and in significant numbers.''.

(10) The National Space Policy of the United States of America issued on June 28, 2010, states ''To promote a robust domestic commercial space industry, departments and agencies shall:

''Purchase and use commercial space capabilities and services to the maximum practical extent when such capabilities and services are available in the marketplace and meet United States Government requirements;

''Modify commercial space capabilities and services to meet government requirements when existing commercial capabilities and services do not fully meet these requirements and the potential modification represents a more cost-effective and timely acquisition approach for the government;

''Develop governmental space systems only when it is in the national interest and there is no suitable, cost-effective United States commercial or, as appropriate, foreign commercial service or system that is or will be available;''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) overhead satellite collection and processing known as commodity overhead satellite collection and processing should be undertaken as much as possible by the commercial sector in order to offload cost and risk from the taxpayer, while national programs should continue their tradition of excellence in innovation to address the truly complex exquisite problem sets and requirements that cannot be addressed by the commercial sector;

(2) overhead satellite architecture should be designed in such a way that a number of elements common to nearly all spacecraft should be standardized, which would bring costs down, simplify execution and preserve the industrial base; and

(3) the entire overhead satellite architecture of the United States, including programs funded by the Department of Defense or by an element of the intelligence community, commercial imagery providers, and foreign partner capabilities, should be viewed and treated as an integrated whole, not simply as a series of satellite systems of the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, or private entities;

(4) the state of the current overhead architecture and planning for the future architecture should receive priority personal attention from the President, the senior national security and scientific advisors to the President, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure that the architecture—

(A) meets the needs of the United States in peacetime and in wartime; responsibly stewards the taxpayers' dollars;

(B) accurately takes into account cost and performance tradeoffs of the architecture;

(C) meets realistic requirements;

(D) produces and fosters excellence, innovation, and competition;

(E) produces innovative satellite systems in under 5 years that are able to leverage common, standardized design elements and commercially available technologies;

(F) takes advantage of rapid advances in commercial technology, innovation, and commercial-like acquisition practices; and

(G) fosters competition and a robust industrial base.

(c) STRATEGY ON THE UNITED STATES OVERHEAD SATELLITE ARCHITECTURE.—

(1) REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGY.—The Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall develop a strategy, with milestones and benchmarks, to ensure that there is a wholesale review of the entire approach of the United States to overhead satellite architecture, including programs of the Department of Defense that are funded under the Military Intelligence Program, programs of elements of the intelligence community that are funded under the National Intelligence Program, programs carried out by the commercial satellite and imagery sectors, and foreign partner capabilities, to ensure that such architecture comports with the principles of the Sense of Congress in subsection (b).

(2) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the strategy required by paragraph (1).

SA 1663. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION TO ENCOURAGE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS TO HIRE VETERANS WITH MILITARY TRAINING IN CYBER AND CYBER-RELATED FIELDS.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall direct the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to issue proposed rules by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and, final rules by not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

(1) to require contractors who are subject to the cost accounting standards under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and who received at least $25,000,000 in aggregated contracts in each of the prior two fiscal years to develop and maintain a single company-wide veterans employment plan that, at a minimum, includes—

(A) performance metrics for the hiring and training of veterans;

(B) a plan to hire veterans, with a particular focus on veterans who served on active duty in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001; and

(C) actions that can be used for training veterans for civilian certifications not later than one year after hiring them in skills applicable to Government contracts relating to cyber and cyber related work;

(2) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work and is to be performed by a veteran assigned to work on such contract and the contractor provides training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such assignment;

(3) to require contractors to validate that—

(A) the veterans hired by the contractors after the date of the enactment of this Act meet the minimum skill qualification requirements under the contract based on military training; and

(B) the contractors provide training to such veterans in order to meet the original qualification requirement of such contract within one year of such assignment; and

(4) to modify such audit, oversight, and allowable cost requirements as may be applicable to Federal contracts to recognize and take into account the actions taken by a contractor under paragraph (3) as being in compliance with the terms and conditions of a contract.

SA 1664. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 811. IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE-BASED ACQUISITIONS.

(a) VALUE-BASED ACQUISITION PROCESS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of each of the military departments shall independently submit to the congressional defense committees a study that proposes methodologies for measuring and optimizing the targeted and returned value of each department's acquisition portfolio, as quantifiable and verifiable as a function of utility, monetary cost, and time-to-capability and for purposes of comprising the disparate capability options that might populate an optimal portfolio.

(2) SCOPE OF METHODOLOGY.—The value based acquisition portfolio management methodology proposed under this subsection shall—

(A) consider demonstrated commercial and government best practice for value-centric management, engineering, and procurement;

(B) consider watchdog report recommendations regarding Department of Defense aquisition shortcomings;

(C) be consistent with the intent of existing and emerging acquisition and related policies;

(D) address linkages and collaboration across Defense [PPBS, JCIDS, A&A], Engineering, Procurement, and Sustainment processes; and

(E) provide mathematically robust, tailorable, optimization algorithms suitable for supporting value-based acquisition portfolio investment decisions, and management across the spectrum of Department of Defense programs.

SA 1665. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. USE OF ORGANIC INDUSTRIAL BASE FOR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN ITEMS.

(a) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency, shall issue feasible policy recommendations that could increase the efficiency and effectiveness within the existing capabilities of the organic industrial base.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing implementation of the guidance issued under subsection (a) and including recommendations to increase efficiency and effectiveness within the existing capabilities of the organic base.

SA 1666. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 145. Veterans Day

"The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation, beginning at—

"(1) 3:11 p.m. Atlantic standard time;

"(2) 2:11 p.m. eastern standard time;

"(3) 1:11 p.m. central standard time;

"(4) 12:11 p.m. mountain standard time;

"(5) 11:11 a.m. Pacific standard time;

"(6) 10:11 a.m. Alaska standard time; and

"(7) 9:11 a.m. Hawaii-Aleutian standard time.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"145. Veterans Day.".

SA 1667. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, renounced violence and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as "protected persons" under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq has increased the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to ensure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes the steps that would need to be taken by the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Camp Liberty residents to potentially relocate some residents to the United States;

(6) encourage the residents of Camp Liberty to fully cooperate with United States, Iraq, and international authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in expediting the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

SA 1668. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD MISSION CHANGES AND IMPACTS TO PUBLIC AIRPORTS.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the number of Air National Guard units that have undergone a mission change in the previous 5 years and who are tenants at a public airport.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A comprehensive list of Air National Guard units, by State, that have undergone a mission change from a flying mission to a remotely piloted aircraft mission, an intelligence mission, or any other type of mission that does not involve operating and maintaining manned aircraft at a public airport in the previous 5 years.

(B) An assessment of which units listed in subparagraph (A), prior to undergoing a mission change, had an Airport Joint Use Agreement in place with the public airport where the unit is a tenant in order to financially compensate that airport for the use of runways, taxiways, air traffic control towers, crash, rescue and firefighting services, or any other relevant services.

(C) The annual amount for the previous 5 years that each Air National Guard unit listed under subparagraph (B) paid to the public airport at which they are a tenant under that unit's Airport Joint Use Agreement.

(D) An assessment of which units listed under subparagraph (B) have subsequently canceled their Airport Joint Use Agreement since undergoing a mission change.

(E) A cost assessment, by unit listed in subparagraph (D), of what the rental value is for the property that the unit occupies at the public airport where the unit is a tenant.

(F) An evaluation from the Office of Economic Adjustment on whether and under what circumstances the Office can offer financial assistance to public airports that have an Air National Guard unit as a tenant that has undergone a mission change that resulted in the termination of an Airport Joint Use Agreement.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) In this section, the term ''public airport,'' means an airport that is open to civilian air traffic, both private and commercial.

(2) In this section, the term ''rental value,'' means the amount which, in a competitive market, a well-informed and willing lessee would pay and which a well-informed and willing lessor would accept for the temporary use and enjoyment of the property.

SA 1669. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PROVISION OF STATUS UNDER LAW BY HONORING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES AS VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 107 the following new section:

''§ 107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components

''Any person who is entitled under chapter 1223 of title 10 to retired pay for nonregular service or, but for age, would be entitled under such chapter to retired pay for nonregular service shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled to any benefit by reason of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 107 the following new item:

''107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components.''.

SA 1670. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 653, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(D) Australia.

(E) Japan.

SA 1671. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. SPECIAL FOREIGN MILITARY SALES STATUS FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in sections 3(d)(2)(B), 3(d)(3)(A)(i), 3(d)(5), 21(e)(2)(A), 36(b), 36(c), 36(d)(2)(A), 62(c)(1), and 63(a)(2), by inserting ''the Philippines,'' before ''or New Zealand'' each place it appears;

(2) in section 3(b)(2), by inserting ''the Government of the Philippines,'' before ''or the Government of New Zealand''; and

(3) in section 21(h), by inserting ''the Philippines,'' before ''or Israel'' each place it appears.

SA 1672. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ASSESSMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL BASE TO MANUFACTURE CERTAIN AUXILIARY SHIP COMPONENTS.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall conduct an assessment of the ability of the industrial base to manufacture and support the following components for auxiliary ships:

(1) Auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services.

(2) Propulsion system components, including engines, reduction gears, and propellers.

(3) Shipboard cranes and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

(b) SCOPE.—In conducting the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall examine the potential cost, schedule, and performance impacts by ship class if procurement of the components described in such subsection were limited to manufacturers in the National Technology and Industrial Base.

(c) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—Upon completion of the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make a determination whether manufacturers of the components described in such subsection should be included in the National Technology and Industrial Base.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than February 15, 2016, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees based on the results of the assessment required under subsection (a) and the determination required under subsection (c).

SA 1673. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. STUDY ON PROVIDING CONCURRENT CERTIFICATION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PHYSICIANS SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a study on the feasibility and advisability of providing any member of the Armed Forces on active duty serving as a physician with certification to practice as a physician for the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to facilitate the transition of such member to employment in the Department of Veterans Affairs upon the retirement, separation, or release of such member from the Armed Forces.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of providing members of the Armed Forces on active duty serving as physicians with the certification described in subsection (a).

SA 1674. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PILOT PROGRAM ON SHARING OF PHYSICIAN WORKFORCE AMONG DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of allowing medical facilities of the Department of Defense and medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs that are located within 40 miles of each other to share primary care physicians for the purpose of performing routine medical care.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS NECESSARY.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly determine the administrative action required to be taken by each Secretary—

(1) to ensure the sharing of scheduling records and medical records between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(2) to minimize the impact of the pilot program on wait times and patient load at each medical facility participating in the pilot program; and

(3) to maintain a high quality of care at each such medical facility.

(c) LOCATION OF CARE.—To the maximum extent possible, health care provided to a patient under the pilot program shall be provided at the location in which the patient would have been provided health care if the pilot program was not being carried out.

SA 1675. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. AUTHORIZATION FOR CONDUCT OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PILOT PROGRAMS.

The Secretary of Defense may carry out one or more pilot programs through the research laboratories of the Department of Defense to expand technology transfer activities by partnering with regional research universities and nonprofit research corporations to spur innovation, economic growth, and a high-tech, diverse workforce.

SA 1676. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO INCLUDE SERVICE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN ENTRY LEVEL AND SKILL TRAINING UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE BETWEEN 18 AND 24 MONTHS.—Section 3311(b)(5)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''excluding'' and inserting ''including''.

(b) FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM, OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM, OR CERTAIN OTHER CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—Section 3311(b) of such title is amended in paragraphs (6)(A) and (7)(A) by striking ''excluding service on active duty in entry level and skill training'' and inserting ''including service on active duty in entry level and skill training for individuals who served on active duty in the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or any other contingency operation (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 10) and excluding service on active duty in entry level and skill training for all other individuals''.

SA 1677. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO AIRBORNE HAZARDS AND OPEN BURN PITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs such information in the possession of the Secretary of Defense as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers necessary to supplement and support—

(1) the development of information to be included in the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry established by the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note); and

(2) research and development activities conducted by the Department of Veterans Affairs to explore the potential health risks of exposure by members of the Armed Forces to environmental factors in Iraq and Afghanistan, in particular the connection of such exposure to respiratory illnesses such as chronic cough, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, constrictive bronchiolitis, and pulmonary fibrosis.

(b) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the information submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under subsection (a) information on any research and surveillance efforts conducted by the Department of Defense to evaluate the incidence and prevalence of respiratory illnesses among members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to open burn pits while deployed overseas.

SA 1678. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of taking such tabulation are—

''(1) fully and accurately counted; and

''(2) properly attributed to the State in which their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

SA 1679. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION, TREATMENT, MANAGEMENT, AND USE, FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 449 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following:

''§ 4781. Natural gas production, treatment, management, and use, Fort Knox, Kentucky

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army (referred to in this section as the 'Secretary') may provide, by contract or otherwise, for the production, treatment, management, and use of natural gas located under Fort Knox, Kentucky, without regard to section 3 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 352).

''(b) LIMITATION ON USES.—Any natural gas produced pursuant to subsection (a)—

''(1) may only be used to support activities and operations at Fort Knox; and

''(2) may not be sold for use elsewhere.

''(c) OWNERSHIP OF FACILITIES.—The Secretary may take ownership of any gas production and treatment equipment and facilities and associated infrastructure from a contractor in accordance with the terms of a contract or other agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a).

''(d) NO APPLICATION ELSEWHERE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority provided by this section applies only with respect to Fort Knox, Kentucky.

''(2) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section authorizes the production, treatment, management, or use of natural gas resources underlying any Department of Defense installation other than Fort Knox.

''(e) APPLICABILITY.—The authority of the Secretary under this section is effective beginning on August 2, 2007.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 449 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''4781. Natural gas production, treatment, management, and use, Fort Knox, Kentucky.''.

SA 1680. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. DECLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE OF CERTAIN REDACTED PORTIONS OF THE JOINT INQUIRY INTO INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES BEFORE AND AFTER THE TERRORIST ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 2001.

(a) DECLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE OF THE JOINT INQUIRY INTO INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES BEFORE AND AFTER THE TERRORIST ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 2001.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and subject to subsection (b), the President shall declassify and release to the public the previously redacted portions of the report on the Joint Inquiry into Intelligence Community Activities Before and After the Terrorist Attacks of September 2001, filed in the Senate and the House of Representatives on December 20, 2002, including all the material under the heading ''Part Four—Findings, Discussion and Narrative Regarding Certain Sensitive National Security Matters''.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR NAMES AND INFORMATION OF INDIVIDUALS AND CERTAIN METHODOLOGIES.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the President is not required to declassify and release to the public the names and identifying information of individuals or specific methodologies described in the report referred to in subsection (a) if such declassification and release would result in imminent lawless action or compromise presently on-going national security operations.

SA 1681. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. PROCUREMENT OF ANCHOR AND MOORING CHAIN.

Section 2534(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by inserting ''AND MOORINGS'' after ''NAVAL VESSELS''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) Department of Defense moorings and components.''.

SA 1682. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title III, add the following:

SEC. 302. ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT.

(a) ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 for operation and maintenance is hereby increased by $33,100,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, for the Office of Economic Adjustment for the Defense Industry Adjustment.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 1503 for procurement for overseas contingency operations is hereby reduced by $33,100,000, with the amount of the reduction to be applied to amounts available for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund for Staff and Infrastructure.

SA 1683. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SECTION 706. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER TRICARE.—Section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g)(1) Subject to paragraph (4), in providing health care under subsection (a), the treatment of developmental disabilities (as defined in section 102(8) of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002(8))), including autism spectrum disorder, shall include behavioral health treatment, including applied behavior analysis, when prescribed by a physician or psychologist.

''(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that—

''(A) except as provided by subparagraph (B)—

''(i) in the case of a State that requires licensing or certification of applied behavioral analysts under State law, applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment is provided by an individual who is licensed or certified to provide such analysis or treatment in accordance with the laws of the State; and

''(ii) in the case of a State other than a State described in clause (i), applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment is provided by an individual who is licensed or certified by an accredited national certification board to provide such analysis or treatment; and

''(B) applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment may be provided by an employee, contractor, or trainee of a person described in subparagraph (A) if the employee, contractor, or trainee meets minimum qualifications, training, and supervision requirements as set forth by the Secretary.

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting or otherwise affecting the benefits provided to a covered beneficiary under—

''(A) this chapter;

''(B) title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

''(C) any other law.

''(4)(A) Treatment may be provided under this subsection in a fiscal year only to the extent that amounts are provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the provision of such treatment for such fiscal year in the Defense Dependents Developmental Disabilities Account.

''(B) Funds for treatment under this subsection may be derived only from the Defense Dependents Developmental Disabilities Account.''.

(b) DEFENSE DEPENDENTS DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ACCOUNT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the ''Defense Dependents Developmental Disabilities Account'' (in this subsection referred to as the ''Account'').

(B) SEPARATE ACCOUNT.—The Account shall be a separate account for the Department of Defense, and shall not be a subaccount within the Defense Health Program account of the Department.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The Account shall consist of amounts authorized to be appropriated or transferred to the Account.

(3) EXCLUDED SOURCES OF ELEMENTS.—Amounts in the Account may not be derived from transfers from the following:

(A) The Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund under chapter 56 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The Coast Guard Retired Pay Account.

(C) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Operations, Research, and Facilities Account.

(D) The Public Health Service Retirement Pay and Medical Benefits for Commissioned Officers Account.

(4) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts in the Account shall be available for the treatment of developmental disabilities in covered beneficiaries pursuant to subsection (g) of section 1077 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)). Amounts in the Account shall be so available until expended.

(5) FUNDING.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense for the Defense Dependents Developmental Disabilities Account, $50,000,000.

(B) TRANSFER FOR CONTINUATION OF EXISTING SERVICES.—From amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer to the Defense Dependents Developmental Disabilities Account $270,000,000.

SA 1684. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Reproductive and Fertility Preservation Assistance for Members of the Armed Forces

SEC. 741. PROVISION OF FERTILITY TREATMENT AND COUNSELING TO SPOUSES, PARTNERS, AND GESTATIONAL SURROGATES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FERTILITY TREATMENT AND COUNSELING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall furnish fertility treatment and counseling, including through the use of assisted reproductive technology, to a spouse, partner, or gestational surrogate of a severely

wounded, ill, or injured member of the Armed Forces who has an infertility condition incurred or aggravated while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR TREATMENT AND COUNSELING.—Fertility treatment and counseling shall be furnished under paragraph (1) to a spouse, partner, or gestational surrogate of a member of the Armed Forces described in such paragraph without regard to the sex or marital status of such member.

(3) IN VITRO FERTILIZATION.—In the case of in vitro fertilization treatment furnished under paragraph (1), the Secretary may furnish not more than three completed cycles or six attempted cycles of in vitro fertilization, whichever occurs first, to a spouse, partner, or gestational surrogate described in such paragraph.

(b) PROCUREMENT OF GAMETES.—If a member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) is unable to provide their gametes for purposes of fertility treatment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, at the election of such member, allow such member to receive such treatment with donated gametes and pay or reimburse such member the reasonable costs of procuring gametes from a donor.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Secretary—

(1) to find or certify a gestational surrogate for a member of the Armed Forces or to connect a gestational surrogate with a member of the Armed Forces; or

(2) to find or certify gametes from a donor for a member of the Armed Forces or to connect a member of the Armed Forces with gametes from a donor.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FERTILITY TREATMENT.—The term ''fertility treatment'' includes the following:

(A) Procedures that use assisted reproductive technology.

(B) Sperm retrieval.

(C) Egg retrieval.

(D) Artificial insemination.

(E) Embryo transfer.

(F) Such other treatments as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(2) ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''assisted reproductive technology'' includes in vitro fertilization and other fertility treatments in which both eggs and sperm are handled when clinically appropriate.

(3) PARTNER.—The term ''partner'', with respect to a member of the Armed Forces, means an individual selected by the member who agrees to share with the member the parental responsibilities with respect to any child born as a result of the use of any fertility treatment under this section.

SEC. 742. ESTABLISHMENT OF FERTILITY PRESERVATION PROCEDURES AFTER AN INJURY OR ILLNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, shall establish procedures for the retrieval of gametes, as soon as medically appropriate, from a member of the Armed Forces in cases in which the fertility of such member is potentially jeopardized as a result of an injury or illness incurred or aggravated while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces in order to preserve the medical options of such member.

(b) CONSENT FOR RETRIEVAL OF GAMETES.—Gametes may be retrieved from a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) only—

(1) with the specific consent of the member; or

(2) if the member is unable to consent, if a medical professional determines that—

(A) the future fertility of the member is potentially jeopardized as a result of an injury or illness described in subsection (a) or will be potentially jeopardized as a result of treating such injury or illness;

(B) the member lacks the capacity to consent to the retrieval of gametes and is likely to regain such capacity; and

(C) the retrieval of gametes under this section is in the medical interest of the member.

(c) CONSENT FOR USE OF RETRIEVED GAMETES.—Gametes retrieved from a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) may be used only—

(1) with the specific consent of the member; or

(2) if the member has lost the ability to consent permanently, as determined by a medical professional, as specified in an advance directive or testamentary instrument executed by the member.

(d) DISPOSAL OF GAMETES.—In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary for purpose of this subsection, the Secretary shall dispose of gametes retrieved from a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a)—

(1) with the specific consent of the member; or

(2) if the member—

(A) has lost the ability to consent permanently, as determined by a medical professional; and

(B) has not specified the use of their gametes in an advance directive or testamentary instrument executed by the member.

SEC. 743. CRYOPRESERVATION AND STORAGE OF GAMETES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide members of the Armed Forces on active duty in the Armed Forces with the opportunity to cryopreserve and store their gametes prior to deployment to a combat zone.

(b) PERIOD OF TIME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for the cryopreservation and storage of gametes of any member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a), at no cost to the member, in a facility of the Department of Defense or of a private entity pursuant to a contract under subsection (d) until the date that is one year after the retirement, separation, or release of the member from the Armed Forces.

(2) CONTINUED CRYOPRESERVATION AND STORAGE.—At the end of the one-year period specified in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall permit an individual whose gametes were cryopreserved and stored in a facility of the Department as described in that paragraph to select, including pursuant to an advance medical directive or military testamentary instrument completed under subsection (c), one of the following options:

(A) To continue such cryopreservation and storage in such facility with the cost of such cryopreservation and storage borne by the individual.

(B) To transfer the gametes to a private cryopreservation and storage facility selected by the individual.

(C) To transfer the gametes to a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs if cryopreservation and storage is available to the individual at such facility.

(3) DISPOSAL OF GAMETES.—If an individual described in paragraph (2) does not make a selection under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of such paragraph, the Secretary may dispose of the gametes of the individual not earlier than the date that is 90 days after the end of the one-year period specified in paragraph (1) with respect to the individual.

(c) ADVANCE MEDICAL DIRECTIVE AND MILITARY TESTAMENTARY INSTRUMENT.—A member of the Armed Forces who elects to cryopreserve and store their gametes under this section must complete an advance medical directive, as defined in section 1044c(b) of title 10, United States Code, and a military testamentary instrument, as defined in section 1044d(b) of such title, that explicitly specifies the use of their cryopreserved and stored gametes if such member dies or otherwise loses the capacity to consent to the use of their cryopreserved and stored gametes.

(d) AGREEMENTS.—To carry out this section, the Secretary may enter into agreements with private entities that provide cryopreservation and storage services for gametes.

SEC. 744. COORDINATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ON FURNISHING OF FERTILITY TREATMENT AND COUNSELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall share best practices and facilitate referrals, as they consider appropriate, on the furnishing of fertility treatment and counseling to individuals eligible for the receipt of such counseling and treatment from the Secretaries.

(b) MEMORADUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into a memorandum of understanding—

(1) providing that the Secretary of Defense will ensure access by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to any gametes of veterans stored by the Department of Defense for purposes of furnishing fertility treatment; and

(2) authorizing the Department of Veterans Affairs to compensate the Department of Defense for the cryopreservation and storage of gametes of veterans under section 743.

SA 1685. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF PAYMENT OF SPECIAL SURVIVOR INDEMNITY ALLOWANCES UNDER THE SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN.

Section 1450(m) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(I), by striking ''fiscal year 2017'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''September 30, 2017'' and inserting ''September 30, 2020''; and

(B) by striking ''October 1, 2017'' each place it appears and inserting ''October 1, 2020''.

SA 1686. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 593. REPORT ON EXEMPTION FROM FURLOUGH DURING A LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR POSITIONS FILLED BY INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN MILITARY EQUIPMENT AND WEAPON SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the exemption from furlough during a lapse in appropriations for positions filled by individuals engaged in military equipment and weapon system maintenance within the Department of Defense, including the position of military technician (dual status) and positions of field and depot level maintenance and engineers.

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

(1) An analysis of the Department of Defense positions described in subsection (a), and the personnel, that were exempted from furlough during the most recent lapse in appropriations for the Department.

(2) An analysis of positions filled by individuals engaged in military equipment and weapon system maintenance within the Department, and the personnel, that were not exempted from the furlough described in paragraph (1).

(3) A cost analysis of the exemption of positions from furlough as described in paragraph (1).

SA 1687. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE GROUSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Federal resource management plan'' means—

(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public lands pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for National Forest System lands pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(2) The term ''Greater Sage Grouse'' means a sage grouse of the species *Centrocercus urophasianus*.

(3) The term ''State management plan'' means a State-approved plan for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is—

(1) to facilitate implementation of State management plans over a period of multiple, consecutive sage grouse life cycles; and

(2) to demonstrate the efficacy of the State management plans for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(c) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973 FINDINGS.—

(1) DELAY REQUIRED.—Any finding by the Secretary of the Interior under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) with respect to the Greater Sage Grouse made during the period beginning on September 30, 2015, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall have no force or effect in law or in equity, and the Secretary of the Interior may not make any such finding during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2025.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—The delay imposed by paragraph (1) is, and shall remain, effective without regard to any other statute, regulation, court order, legal settlement, or any other provision of law or in equity.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSERVATION STATUS.—Until the date specified in paragraph (1), the conservation status of the Greater Sage Grouse shall remain warranted for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but precluded by higher-priority listing actions pursuant to clause (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)).

(d) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND STATE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In order to foster coordination between a State management plan and Federal resource management plans that affect the Greater Sage Grouse, upon notification by the Governor of a State with a State management plan, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may not amend or otherwise modify any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State in a manner inconsistent with the State management plan for a period, to be specified by the Governor in the notification, of at least five years beginning on the date of the notification.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECT.—In the case of any State that provides notification under paragraph (1), if any amendment or modification of a Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State was issued during the one-year period preceding the date of the notification and the amendment or modification altered management of the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat, implementation and operation of the amendment or modification shall be stayed to the extent that the amendment or modification is inconsistent with the State management plan. The Federal resource management plan, as in effect immediately before the amendment or modification, shall apply instead with respect to management of the Greater Sage Grouse and its habitat, to the extent consistent with the State management plan.

(3) DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY.—Any disagreement regarding whether an amendment or other modification of a Federal resource management plan is inconsistent with a State management plan shall be resolved by the Governor of the affected State.

(e) RELATION TO NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—With regard to any Federal action consistent with a State management plan, any findings, analyses, or conclusions regarding the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) shall not have a preclusive effect on the approval or implementation of the Federal action in that State.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter through 2021, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the Secretaries' implementation and effectiveness of systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation, this section, including determinations made under subsection (d)(3), shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. _____. IMPLEMENTATION OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN RANGE-WIDE CONSERVATION PLAN AND OTHER CONSERVATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—The terms ''Candidate Conservation Agreement'' and ''Candidate and Conservation Agreement With Assurances'' have the meaning given those terms in—

(A) the announcement of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce entitled ''Announcement of Final Policy for Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances'' (64 Fed. Reg. 32726 (June 17, 1999)); and

(B) sections 17.22(d) and 17.32(d) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) RANGE-WIDE PLAN.—The term ''Range-Wide Plan'' means the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, as endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on October 23, 2013, and published for comment on January 29, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 4652).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TREATMENT AS THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any prior action by the Secretary, the lesser prairie-chicken shall not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) before January 31, 2021.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PROPOSAL.—Effective beginning on January 31, 2021, the lesser prairie-chicken may not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) unless the Secretary publishes a determination, based on the totality of the scientific evidence, that conservation (as that term is used in that Act) under the Range-Wide Plan and the agreements, programs, and efforts referred to in subsection (c) have not achieved the conservation goals established by the Range-Wide Plan.

(c) MONITORING OF PROGRESS OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall monitor and annually submit to Congress a report on progress in conservation of the lesser prairie-chicken under the Range-Wide Plan and all related—

(1) Candidate Conservation Agreements and Candidate and Conservation Agreements With Assurances;

(2) other Federal conservation programs administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Agriculture;

(3) State conservation programs; and

(4) private conservation efforts.

SEC. _____. REMOVAL OF ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR AMERICAN BURYING BEETLE.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the American Burying Beetle'' (54 Fed. Reg. 29652 (July 13, 1989)), the American

burying beetle shall not be listed as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 1688. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the United States should establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CROSS-BORDER SEGMENT.—The term ''cross-border segment'' means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at the national boundary of the United States with Canada or Mexico.

(2) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The term ''Electric Reliability Organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

(3) INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR.—The term ''Independent System Operator'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(4) MODIFICATION.—The term ''modification'' includes—

(A) a change in ownership;

(B) a volume expansion;

(C) a downstream or upstream interconnection; or

(D) an adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations).

(5) NATURAL GAS.—The term ''natural gas'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a).

(6) OIL.—The term ''oil'' means petroleum or a petroleum product.

(7) REGIONAL ENTITY.—The term ''regional entity'' has the meaning given the term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

(8) REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.—The term ''Regional Transmission Organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (g), no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment under this section.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a cross-border segment for which a request is received under this section, the relevant official identified under subparagraph (B), in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment unless the relevant official finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment is not in the public interest of the United States.

(B) RELEVANT OFFICIAL.—The relevant official referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) the Secretary of State with respect to oil pipelines; and

(ii) the Secretary of Energy with respect to electric transmission facilities.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing for the request under subparagraph (A), that the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(i) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(ii) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—This section shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico—

(A) if the cross-border segment is operating for the import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) if a permit described in subsection (f) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued;

(C) if a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has previously been issued under this subsection; or

(D) if an application for a permit described in subsection (f) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which the application is denied; or

(ii) July 1, 2016.

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (g) affects the application of any other Federal law to a project for which a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment is sought under this subsection.

(B) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (g) shall affect the authority of the President under section 103(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212(a)).

(d) IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c) For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—In the case of an application for the importation or exportation of natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico, the Commission shall approve the application not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the application.''.

(e) TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE REGULATIONS.—Subsection (e) of section 202 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)(B)) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)''.

(B) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–4(b)) is amended by striking ''the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act'' and all that follows through the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting ''the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.''.

(f) NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under an applicable provision described in paragraph (2) shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility.

(2) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—Paragraph (1) applies to—

(A) section 301 of title 3, United States Code;

(B) Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note);

(C) Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note);

(D) Executive Order 10485 (15 U.S.C. 717b note);

(E) Executive Order 12038 (42 U.S.C. 7151 note); and

(F) any other Executive order.

(g) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No certificate of crossing under subsection (c), or permit described in subsection (f), shall be required for a modification to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility—

(1) that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico as of the date of enactment of the Act;

(2) for which a permit described in subsection (f) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(3) for which a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility has previously been issued under subsection (c).

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (c) through (g), and the amendments made by those subsections, take effect on July 1, 2016.

(2) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official described in subsection (c)(2)(B) shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (c); and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (c).

SA 1689. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1274. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and again not later than 180 days after the cessation of violence in Syria, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

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

(1) A description of violations of internationally recognized human rights, war crimes, and crimes against humanity perpetrated during the civil war in Syria, including—

(A) an account of incidents that may constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and all forces fighting on its behalf;

(B) an account of incidents that may constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, and any other combatants in the conflict;

(C) a description of any incidents that may violate the principle of medical neutrality and, when possible, an identification of the individual or individuals who engaged in or organized such violations; and

(D) where possible, a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such crimes and, the origins of the weapons.

(2) A description of efforts by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to ensure accountability for violations of internationally recognized human rights, international humanitarian law, and crimes against humanity perpetrated against the people of Syria by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad, violent extremist groups, and other combatants involved in the conflict, including—

(A) a description of initiatives that the United States Government has undertaken to train investigators in Syria on how to document, investigate, and develop findings of war crimes, including the number of United States Government or contract personnel currently designated to work full-time on these issues and an identification of the authorities and appropriations being used to support training efforts;

(B) a description and assessment of Syrian and international efforts to ensure accountability for crimes committed during the Syrian conflict, including efforts to promote a transitional justice process that would include criminal accountability and the establishment of an ad hoc tribunal to prosecute the perpetrators of war crimes committed during the civil war in Syria; and

(C) an assessment of the influence of accountability measures on efforts to reach a negotiated settlement to the conflict during the reporting period.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) may be in unclassified or classified form, but shall include a publicly available annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1690. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE ANNUAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR CONTRACT SERVICES.

Section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1489), as most recently amended by section 813 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3429) is further amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ''or 2015'' and inserting ''2015, or 2016'';

(2) in subsection (c)(3), by striking ''and 2015'' and inserting ''2015, and 2016'';

(3) in subsection (d)(4), by striking ''or 2015'' and inserting ''2015, or 2016''; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''.

SA 1691. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), such officer shall have the title of ''Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator''.

(2) DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph (1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Coordinator shall be limited to hostage cases outside the United States.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in subsection (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.

(2) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DESCRIBED.—The members of Congress described in this paragraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where a hostage described in subsection (a)(1) resides.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to make concessions to a state sponsor of terrorism or an organization that the Secretary of State has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) or any other hostage-takers.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator designated under subsection (a).

(2) HOSTILE GROUP.—The term ''hostile group'' means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(3) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term ''state sponsor of terrorism''—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) includes North Korea.

SA 1692. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016

for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. SUNSET OF 2001 AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless reauthorized.

SA 1693. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM DEFENSE CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) DISCLOSURE BY DEFENSE CONTRACTORS .—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

''(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

''(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

''(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

''(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than $200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

''(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

''(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to that account during—

''(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

''(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

''(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

''(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

''(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

''(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered entity' means—

''(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

''(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person has been awarded a contract from the Department of Defense for the procurement of goods or services during the previous two fiscal years.

''(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered disbursement' means a disbursement for any of the following:

''(A) An independent expenditure.

''(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

''(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

''(ii) is made—

''(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

''(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and

''(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

''(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered transfer' means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

''(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'disclosure date' means—

''(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000; and

''(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

''(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC..—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to disbursements made, and transfers received, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1694. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. SECURE ENERGY INNOVATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a program to develop and support projects designed to foster secure and reliable sources of energy for military installations, including incorporation of advanced energy metering, renewable energy, energy storage, and redundant power systems.

(b) METRICS.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop metrics for assessing the costs and benefits associated with secure energy projects proposed or implemented as part of the program conducted under subsection (a). The metrics shall take into account financial and operational costs associated with sustained losses of power resulting from natural disasters or attacks that damage electrical grids serving military installations.

SA 1695. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. AUTHORITY TO USE ENERGY SAVINGS INVESTMENT FUND FOR ENERGY MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.

Section 2919(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking '', to the extent provided for in an appropriations Act,''.

SA 1696. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military

activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. PLAN TO ENHANCE MISSION READINESS THROUGH GREATER ENERGY SECURITY AT CRITICAL MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall identify ten military installations that are—

(1) critical to mission readiness, and

(2) susceptible to interruptions of power due to geographic location, dependence on connections to the electric grid, or other factors determined by the Secretary.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report with a plan for integrating energy storage, micro-grid technologies, and on-site power generation systems at the military installations identified under subsection (a) to enhance mission readiness.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex as necessary.

SA 1697. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION OF FUEL LOGISTICS SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS, REQUIREMENTS DEVELOPMENT, AND ACQUISITION PROCESSES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the implementation of section 332 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4420; 10 U.S.C. 2911 note (in this section referred to as ''section 332'')), including a description of the implementation to date of the requirements for consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in the planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes.

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

(1) A list of acquisition solicitations that incorporate analysis established and developed under section 332.

(2) An analysis of the extent to which Department of Defense planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes incorporate or rely on the fully burdened cost of energy and energy key performance parameters in relation to other metrics.

(3) An estimate of the total fuel costs avoided as a result of inclusion of the fully burdened cost of energy and energy key performance parameter in acquisitions, including an estimate of monetary savings and fuel volume savings.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which energy security requirements of the Department of Defense are enhanced by incorporation of section 332 requirements in the acquisition process, and recommendations for further improving section 332 requirements to further enhance energy security and mission capability requirements.

(c) ENERGY SECURITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''energy security'' has the meaning given the term in section 2924(3) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1698. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1533, add the following:

(f) PROVISION TO CERTAIN FOREIGN FORCES THROUGH OTHER UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should increase efforts to combat the use by the terrorist group the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) of improvised explosive devices and the illicit smuggling of improvised explosive device precursor materials.

(2) PROVISION THROUGH OTHER AGENCIES.—If jointly agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the head of another department or agency of the United States Government, the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds available under subsection (a) to such department or agency for the provision by such department or agency of training, equipment, supplies, and services to ministries and other entities of the Government of Iraq and nations that border Iraq (other than Iran and Syria), as described in that subsection.

SA 1699. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH REPOSITORY FOR OPERATIONAL ENERGY-RELATED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPOSITORY REQUIRED.—Not later than December 31, 2016, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and in collaboration with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs and the Secretaries of the military departments, shall establish a centralized repository for all operational energy-related research and development efforts of the Department of Defense, including with respect to the inception, operational, and complete phases of such efforts.

(b) INTERNET ACCESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the repository required by subsection (a) is accessible through an Internet website of the Department of Defense and by all employees of the Department and members of the Armed Forces whom the Secretary determines appropriate, including all program managers involved in such research and development efforts, to enable improved collaboration between military departments on research and development efforts described in subsection (a), enable sharing of best practices and lessons learned relating to such efforts, and reduce redundancy in such efforts.

SA 1700. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. STUDY ON POWER STORAGE CAPACITY REQUIREMENT.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the costs and benefits associated with requiring 25 percent of National Guard and Reserve facilities to have at least a 21-day on-site power storage capacity to assist with providing support to civil authorities in case of manmade or natural disasters.

SA 1701. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 117, insert between lines 12 and 13, the following

(b) LOCATION OF RETIREMENT.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''If the Secretary'';

(3) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking '', and no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is location,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''within the United States'' after ''to another location''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply if a United States citizen living abroad adopts the dog at the time of retirement.''.

SA 1702. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such

fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXPANSION OF DUTIES OF UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS.

Section 136(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and health affairs'' and inserting the following: ''health affairs, and the coordination, use, acquisition, or exchange of joint requirements and resources with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and implementation of recommendations made under subsection (c)(1) of section 320 of title 38 and the functions enumerated under subsection (d) of such section''.

SA 1703. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 636, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(10) Training and best practices to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder among Ukrainian Armed Forces and National Guard personnel.

SA 1704. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC INFORMATION REGARDING CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ACTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that any online consumer tool offered or supported by the Department of Defense that provides information to servicemembers regarding specific postsecondary educational institutions, such as Tuition Assistance DECIDE or any successor or similar program, includes for each such institution an accounting of pending investigations and civil or criminal actions against the institution by Federal agencies and State attorneys general, to the extent such information is publicly available.

(b) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In gathering publicly available information on investigations and civil or criminal actions described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) consult the heads of other Federal agencies and, as practicable, State attorneys general; and

(2) review any reports required to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m and 78o(d)), including Form 10–Q and Form 10–K.

(c) CONSULTATION REGARDING PRESENTATION.—To ensure that the information required under subsection (a) is presented in the most useful and effective way possible for servicemembers, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of Education, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and servicemember and consumer advocates.

SA 1705. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense should carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) EXCHANGES DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) FOCUS OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) CIVIL-MILITARY AFFAIRS.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include activities and exercises focused on civil-military relations, including parliamentary relations.

(e) LOCATION OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall be conducted in both the United States and Taiwan.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''senior military officer'', with respect to the Armed Forces, means a general or flag officer of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(2) The term ''senior official'', with respect to the Department of Defense, means a civilian official of the Department of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or above.

SA 1706. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 645, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(4) At the 2006 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Riga, North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries committed to endeavor to spend a minimum of two per cent of their national income or Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to spending on defense.

(5) At the 2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Wales, North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries agreed that ''allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense will aim to continue to do so'' and that ''allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defense is below this level will: halt any decline in defense expenditure; aim to increase defense expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the two percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfalls''.

(6) In 2015, four out of the 28 North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries, including the United States, meet the two percent target.

On page 646, strike line 16 and insert the following:

spending; and

(5) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries are strongly urged to meet their commitment under the Wales Summit Declaration to spend two percent of their Gross Domestic Product on defense.

SA 1707. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CIVILIAN AVIATION ASSET MILITARY PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, may participate in a Civilian Aviation Asset Military Partnership Pilot Program (in this section referred to as the ''Program'') in accordance with this section.

(b) GRANT AUTHORITY.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, may make a grant under the Program, on a competitive basis, to an eligible airport to assist a project—

(1) to improve aviation infrastructure; or

(2) to repair, replace, or otherwise improve an eligible tower facility at that airport.

(c) NUMBER.—Not more than three eligible airports may receive a grant under the Program for a fiscal year.

(d) AMOUNT.—The amount provided to each eligible airport that receives a grant under the Program may not exceed $2,500,000.

(e) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, an eligible airport shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, determines is appropriate. An application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the proposed project with respect to which a grant is requested, including estimated costs;

(2) the need for the project at the eligible airport, including how the project will assist both civil aircraft and military aircraft; and

(3) the non-Federal funding available for the project.

(f) SELECTION AND TERMS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly—

(1) select eligible airports to receive grants under the Program; and

(2) establish the terms of each grant made under the Program.

(g) FUNDING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program may not exceed 70 percent. Prioritization shall be given to projects with the lowest Federal share.

(2) COORDINATION.—With respect to the Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program, 50 percent of that Federal share shall be paid by the Administrator and 50 percent shall be paid by the Secretary.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Program shall terminate at the end of the third fiscal year in which a grant is made under the Program.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AVIATION INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''aviation infrastructure'' means any activity defined under the term ''airport development'' in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) ELIGIBLE AIRPORT.—The term ''eligible airport'' means an airport at which—

(A) military aircraft conduct operations; and

(B) civil aircraft operations are conducted.

(3) ELIGIBLE TOWER FACILITY.—The term ''eligible tower facility'' means a tower facility that—

(A) is located at an eligible airport;

(B) is greater than 30 years of age; and

(C) has demonstrated failings.

SA 1708. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:

(1) The national security strategy of the United States for 2015 set forth in the national security strategy report required under section 108(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 5043(a)(3)), as such strategy relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(4) The strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as contained in the report required by section 1251(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3570).

(5) The integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76)).

(b) PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government that contains the strategy developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.

(c) RELATION TO AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGET.—

(1) AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each appropriate department and agency of the United States Government, the head of such department or agency, or as otherwise determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

(2) ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

SA 1709. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE-GROUSE.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to allow States—

(A) to determine the appropriate management of sage-grouse species according to State-created conservation and management plans that address the key threats to sage-grouse species and the habitat of sage-grouse species within the States; and

(B) to demonstrate that those Statewide plans can protect and recover sage-grouse species within the States; and

(2) to require the Secretary to implement recommendations contained in Statewide plans for the management of sage-grouse species and the habitat of sage-grouse species on Federal land .

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED WESTERN STATE.—The term ''covered Western State'' means each of the States of California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

(2) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term ''National Forest System land'' means the Federal land within the National Forest System, as described in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(3) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(4) SAGE-GROUSE SPECIES.—The term ''sage-grouse species'' means—

(A) the greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) (including all distinct population segments); and

(B) the Gunnison sage-grouse (*Centrocercus minimus*).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public land.

(6) STATEWIDE PLAN.—The term ''Statewide plan'' means a conservation and management plan or plans developed and submitted to the Secretary by a covered Western State for the protection and recovery of any sage-grouse species and the habitat of the sage-grouse species within the covered Western State in response to invitations from the Secretary of the Interior in December 2011 to submit to the Secretary those plans.

(c) PARTICIPATION IN STATE PLANNING PROCESS.—

(1) LIST OF DESIGNEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after that date of receipt from a covered Western State of a notice described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall provide to the Governor of the covered Western State a list of designees of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, as applicable, who will represent the Secretary in assisting in the development and implementation of the Statewide plan.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF NOTICE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A notice referred to in subparagraph (A) is a notice that a covered Western State—

(I) is initiating, or has previously initiated, development of a Statewide plan in accordance with clause (ii); or

(II) has previously submitted to the Secretary a Statewide plan in accordance with clause (ii).

(ii) CONTENTS.—A notice under this subparagraph shall include—

(I) an invitation to the Secretary to participate in the development or implementation of the Statewide plan of the applicable covered Western State; and

(II) a statement that the covered Western State—

(aa) has prepared or will prepare, by not later than 1 year after the date of submission of the notice, a Statewide plan that will protect and manage sage-grouse species and the habitat of sage-grouse species to the point that designation of sage-grouse species as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is no longer necessary in the covered Western State; and

(bb) will—

(AA) collect monitoring data such as sage-grouse species population trends, fuel reduction, predator control, invasive species control, the condition of sage-grouse species habitat, or other parameters that address the primary threats to sage-grouse species in the covered Western State to address how the threats identified in the Statewide plan are being reduced and how the objectives identified in the Statewide plan are being met; and

(BB) provide to the Secretary relevant data regarding the health of sage-grouse species populations, the condition of sage-grouse species habitat, and activities relating to the implementation of the Statewide plan on an annual basis under this section.

(iii) TIMING.—To be eligible to participate in a planning process under this section, not

later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a covered Western State shall submit to the Secretary a notice described in subparagraph (B).

(2) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt from a covered Western State of a notice described in paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall provide to the covered Western State all relevant scientific data, research, and information regarding sage-grouse species and habitat within the covered Western State for use by appropriate State personnel to assist the covered Western State in the development and implementation of the Statewide plan.

(d) RECOGNITION OF STATEWIDE PLAN.—If the Secretary receives from a covered Western State a Statewide plan by the date that is 1 year after the date of receipt of a notice under subsection (c)(1) from the covered Western State, the Secretary shall—

(1) when taking any action that could impact the sage grouse species or the habitat of the species, manage all public land and National Forest System land within the covered Western State in accordance with the Statewide plan for a period of not less than 6 years, beginning on the date of submission to the Secretary of the Statewide plan in accordance with this section;

(2) annually—

(A) review the Statewide plan using the best available science and data, using the objectives and goals contained in the Statewide plan as a measure of success; and

(B) provide to the Governor of the covered Western State recommendations regarding improvement of the Statewide plan;

(3) use the Statewide plan as the basis for all relevant determinations under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(4) permit and assist the covered Western State to implement adaptive management, if required by the Statewide plan, to respond to sage-grouse species conditions as indicated by monitoring data, meteorological conditions, or fire or other events necessitating adaptation of the Statewide plan;

(5) require the covered Western State to submit to the Secretary annual reports regarding the implementation of the Statewide plan, including relevant data regarding—

(A) actions carried out pursuant to the Statewide plan; and

(B) population trends, fuel reductions, predator control, invasive species control, the condition of sage-grouse habitat, and other parameters that address the primary threats to sage-grouse species in the covered Western State;

(6) require the covered Western State—

(A) to monitor appropriate sage-grouse species and habitat data for a period of not less than 5 years, beginning on the date of submission of the Statewide plan; and

(B) to submit to the Secretary, not later than 6 years after the date of submission of the Statewide plan and in accordance with applicable scientific protocols, a report that includes—

(i) a description of the status of implementation of the Statewide plan and progress made in achieving the objectives and goals of the Statewide plan, including relevant data regarding sage-grouse species population trends, fuel reductions, predator control, invasive species control, the condition of sage-grouse species habitat, and other parameters that address the primary threats to sage-grouse in the covered Western State;

(ii) an estimate of additional time needed, if any, for implementation of the Statewide plan; and

(iii) necessary modifications to the Statewide plan to enhance the achievement of the objectives and goals of the Statewide plan; and

(7) assist the covered Western State in monitoring and collecting relevant data on Federal land to assess sage-grouse species population trends, fuel reductions, predator control, invasive species control, the condition of sage-grouse species habitat, and other parameters that address the primary threats to sage-grouse in the covered Western State.

(e) SECRETARIAL ACTIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a Statewide plan under this section, and annually thereafter during the period in which the Secretary determines that the applicable covered Western State is implementing the Statewide plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) take necessary steps to maintain or restore the candidate species status for any sage-grouse species in the covered Western State under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), for a period of not less than 6 years—

(A) to allow for appropriate monitoring and collection of data; and

(B) to assess the achievement of the objectives of the Statewide plan;

(2) stay any land use planning activities relating to Federal management of sage-grouse species on public land or National Forest System land within the covered Western State;

(3) take immediate action to amend all Federal land use plans under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) to comply with the Statewide plan with respect to that covered Western State;

(4) manage all public land and National Forest System land with habitat for any sage-grouse species in the covered Western State in a manner consistent with sections 102(a)(12) and 103(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(12), 1702(c)) and section 4 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1602);

(5) immediately reverse any withdrawals or land use restrictions carried out for purposes of protecting or conserving sage-grouse on public land or National Forest System land that are not consistent with a Statewide plan; and

(6) use State annual reports regarding the implementation of the Statewide plans submitted to the Secretary under subsection (d)(5) to prepare the annual Candidate Notice of Review of the Secretary pursuant to section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

(f) EXISTING STATE PLANS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) give effect to a Statewide conservation and management plan for the protection and recovery of sage-grouse species within a covered Western State that is submitted by the covered Western State and approved or endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) for purposes of subsections (d) and (e), treat such a plan as a Statewide plan in accordance with that subsection.

(g) ACTIONS PURSUANT TO NEPA.—An action proposed to be carried out pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) in a covered Western State may not be denied or restricted solely on the basis of the presence or protection of sage-grouse species in the covered Western State, if the action is consistent with the Statewide plan of the covered Western State.

(h) AUTHORITY TO EXTEND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.—On review of the report of a covered Western State under subsection (d)(6)(B), the Secretary may extend the provisions of this Act for a period not to exceed an additional 6 years with the consent of the covered Western State.

SA 1710. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1242. EXTENSION OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2016'' and inserting ''December 31, 2026''.

SA 1711. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12___. SOUTHEAST ASIA STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP.

The Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260, chapter 2907; 81 Stat. 584), is amended—

(1) in section 1(w), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 6, by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by repealing section 25.

SA 1712. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 213.

SA 1713. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE FUEL AWARDS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ALTERNATIVE FUEL CONTRACTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—In this section, the term ''alternative fuel'' has

the meaning given the term in 301 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13211).

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for research and development alternative fuel awards or Department of Defense alternative fuel contracts.

SA 1714. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part I of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 584. CONSOLIDATION OF FINANCIAL LITERACY PROGRAMS AND TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for the consolidation of the current financial training programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments for members of the Armed Forces into a single program of financial training for members that—

(1) eliminates duplication and costs in the provision of financial training to members; and

(2) ensures that members receive effective training in financial literacy in as few training sessions as is necessary for the receipt of effective training.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall commence implementation of the plan required by subsection (a) 90 days after the date of the submittal of the plan as required by that subsection.

SA 1715. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. RESTRICTIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

Section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) RESTRICTIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN MILITARY OPERATIONS AREAS.—The President shall not establish a national monument under this section on land that is located under the lateral boundaries of a military operations area (as the term is defined in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)), unless—

''(1) the proclamation includes language that ensures that the establishment of the national monument would not place any new limits on—

''(A) low-level overflights of military aircraft;

''(B) the designation of a new unit of special use airspace;

''(C) the use or establishment of a military flight training route;

''(D) any flight operations of military aircraft; or

''(E) any ground-based operations in support of military flight operations; and

''(2) the Secretary of Defense certifies that the establishment of the national monument—

''(A) would not negatively impact any military flight operations in airspace above the national monument; and

''(B) would not reduce the ability of any ground-based operations in support of military flight operations.''.

SA 1716. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1523. REPROGRAMMING OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a reprogramming or transfer request in the amount of $464,017,143 from unobligated funds in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, account and available for the Office of Economic Adjustment, or for transfer to the Secretary of Education, to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in order to address capacity or facility condition deficiencies at such schools, to the Operation and Maintenance, Overseas Contingency Operations, account.

(b) TREATMENT OF REPROGRAMMING.—The transfer of an amount pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be deemed to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations by section 1505.

SA 1717. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) LIMITATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a searchable database to uniformly report information regarding installation renewable energy projects undertaken since 2010.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The database established under subsection (a) shall include, for each installation energy project—

(1) the estimated project costs;

(2) estimated power generation;

(3) estimated total cost savings;

(4) estimated payback period;

(5) total project costs;

(6) actual power generation;

(7) actual cost savings to date;

(8) current operational status; and

(9) access to relevant business case documents, including the economic viability assessment.

(c) NON-DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, withhold from inclusion in the database established under subsection (a) information pertaining to individual projects if the Secretary determines that the disclosure of such information would jeopardize operational security.

(2) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.—In the event the Secretary withholds information related to one or more renewable energy projects under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include in the database—

(A) a statement that information has been withheld; and

(B) an aggregate amount for each of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (b) that includes amounts for all renewable energy projects described under subsection (a), including those with respect to which information has been withheld under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) UPDATES.—The database established under subsection (a) shall be updated not less than quarterly.

SA 1718. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2807. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN AREAS OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2804 the following new section:

''§ 2804a. Certification requirement for military construction projects in areas of contingency operations

''(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not obligate or expend funds to carry out a military construction project overseas in connection with a contingency operation (as defined in section 101(a)(13) of this title) unless the combatant commander of the area of operations in which such project is to be constructed has certified to the Secretary of Defense that the project is needed for direct support of a contingency operation within that combatant command.

''(2) The restriction under paragraph (1) does not apply to planning and design activities or activities carried out under the authority of section 2805 of this title.

''(b) CERTIFICATION GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide guidance regarding the certification required under subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2804 the following new item:

''2804a. Certification requirement for military construction projects in areas of contingency operations.''.

SA 1719. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2807. USE OF PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS IN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2852 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments awarding a construction contract on behalf of the Government, in any solicitations, bid specifications, project agreements, or other controlling documents, shall not—

''(A) require or prohibit bidders, offerors, contractors, or subcontractors to enter into or adhere to agreements with one or more labor organizations; and

''(B) discriminate against or give preference to bidders, offerors, contractors, or subcontractors based on their entering or refusing to enter into such an agreement.

''(2) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a contractor or subcontractor from voluntarily entering into such an agreement, as is protected by the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).''.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to construction contracts awarded before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1720. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. TRANSPORTATION TO TRANSFER CEREMONIES FOR FAMILY AND NEXT OF KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS DURING HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS.

Section 481f(e)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(including during a humanitarian relief operation)'' after ''located or serving overseas''.

SA 1721. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1116. MATTERS RELATING TO BIENNIAL STRATEGIC WORKFORCE PLANS.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF INTENDED USE OF SPECIAL HIRING AUTHORITIES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES TO SUPPORT THE WORFORCE.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 115b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the use of special hiring authorities to be made by such Secretary or head of agency in addressing the matters described in this section and of any other authorities that would support the enhancement of the quality of the workforce.''.

(b) TRANSMITTAL OF REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting ''and to Congress'' after ''to the Secretary.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act

---

SA 1722. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. ENERGY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURCHASE OF ENERGY.—In purchasing energy commodities, including electricity and fuel, the Department of Defense shall take into account—

(1) the reliability of the energy source, with a preference afforded to sources that offer a constant, non-intermittent supply of power; and

(2) the cost of the energy source in comparison with other available and reliable energy sources, with a preference afforded to energy sources that are demonstrated to be more cost-effective in the near term.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) GOALS ON USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY TO MEET ELECTRICITY NEEDS.—Section 2911 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e).

(2) FEDERAL PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from the Federal purchase requirement established under section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

(3) STRENGTHENING FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY, AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from Executive Order 13423 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to strengthening Federal environmental, energy, and transportation management).

(4) FEDERAL FLEET CONSERVATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from Federal fleet conservation requirements established under section 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374e).

(5) FEDERAL LEADERSHIP ON ENERGY MANAGEMENT.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from the renewable energy consumption target established by the document entitled ''Federal Leadership on Energy Management: Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies'' and published December 10, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 75209).

(6) PLANNING FOR FEDERAL SUSTAINABILITY IN THE NEXT DECADE.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from Executive Order No. 13693 dated March 19, 2015.

SA 1723. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. EQUAL BENEFITS UNDER SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN FOR SURVIVORS OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS WHO DIE IN THE LINE OF DUTY DURING INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING.

(a) TREATMENT OF INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING IN SAME MANNER AS ACTIVE DUTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1451(c)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by inserting ''or 1448(f)'' after ''section 1448(d)''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or (iii)'' after ''clause (ii)''; and

(B) in clause (iii)—

(i) by striking ''section 1448(f) of this title'' and inserting ''section 1448(f)(1)(A) of this title by reason of the death of a member or former member not in line of duty''; and

(ii) by striking ''active''.

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—No annuity benefit under the Survivor Benefit Plan shall accrue to any person by reason of the amendments made by paragraph (1) for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act. With respect to an annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan for a death occurring on or after September 10, 2001, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall recompute the benefit amount to reflect such amendments, effective for months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Section 1448(f) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) DEPENDENT CHILDREN ANNUITY.—

''(A) ANNUITY WHEN NO ELIGIBLE SURVIVING SPOUSE.—In the case of a person described in paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the dependent children of that person under section 1450(a)(2) of this title as applicable.

''(B) OPTIONAL ANNUITY WHEN THERE IS AN ELIGIBLE SURVIVING SPOUSE.—The Secretary may pay an annuity under this subchapter to the dependent children of a person described in paragraph (1) under section 1450(a)(3) of this title, if applicable, instead of paying an annuity to the surviving spouse under paragraph (1), if the Secretary concerned, in consultation with the surviving spouse, determines it appropriate to provide an annuity for the dependent children under this paragraph instead of an annuity for the surviving spouse under paragraph (1).''.

(c) DEEMED ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1448(f) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) DEEMED ELECTION TO PROVIDE AN ANNUITY FOR DEPENDENT.—In the case of a person described in paragraph (1) who dies after November 23, 2003, the Secretary concerned may, if no other annuity is payable on behalf of that person under this subchapter, pay an

annuity to a natural person who has an insurable interest in such person as if the annuity were elected by the person under subsection (b)(1). The Secretary concerned may pay such an annuity under this paragraph only in the case of a person who is a dependent of that deceased person (as defined in section 1072(2) of this title). An annuity under this paragraph shall be computed in the same manner as provided under subparagraph (B) of subsection (d)(6) for an annuity under that subsection.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—No annuity payment under paragraph (6) of section 1448(f) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection, may be made for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF SPECIAL SURVIVOR INDEMNITY ALLOWANCE.—

(1) AVAILABILITY.—Section 1450(m)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or (f)'' after ''subsection (d)''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—No payment under section 1450(m) of title 10, United States Code, by reason of the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be made for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1724. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1040. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO COUNTRIES COVERED BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE TRAVEL WARNINGS.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of State issues travel warnings regarding travel to foreign countries for reasons that include ''unstable government, civil war, ongoing intense crime or violence, or frequent terrorist attacks''.

(2) These travel warnings are issued to highlight the ''risks of traveling'' to particular countries and are left in place until the situation in the country concerned improves.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) countries that pose such a significant travel threat to United States citizens that the Department of State feels obliged to issue a travel warning should not be considered an appropriate recipient of any detainee transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and

(2) if a country is subject to a Department of State travel warning, it is highly unlikely that the government of the country can provide the United States Government appropriate security and assurances regarding the prevention of the recidivism of any detainee so transferred.

(c) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for the Department of Defense may be used, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay to the custody or control of any country subject to a Department of State travel warning at the time the transfer or release would otherwise occur.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any country subject to a travel warning described in that paragraph that is issued solely on the basis of one or more of the following:

(A) Medical deficiencies, infectious disease outbreaks, or other health-related concerns.

(B) A natural disaster.

(C) Criminal activity.

SA 1725. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 315, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(9) A plan to incorporate into pediatric care from the Department telehealth services that provide real-time audio and video communication between a pediatric patient and a health care provider to ensure continuity of care and affordable access by patients to health care providers who are leading providers in their field, including those patients with rare diseases or complex cases.

SA 1726. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 315, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(9) A plan to incorporate into pediatric care from the Department telehealth services that provide real-time audio and video communication between a pediatric patient and a health care provider to ensure continuity of care and affordable access by patients to health care providers who are leading providers in their field, including those patients with rare diseases or complex cases.

SA 1727. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON OPERATION ATLANTIC RESOLVE AND THE EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) continued United States commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and our allies in Europe is critical to peace and stability in the region and critical to United States national security;

(2) actions by Russia, including the invasion and occupation of territories of Georgia, the invasion of Ukraine and annexation of Crimea, continued violations of allied airspace by Russian military aircraft, and continued unprofessional and potentially dangerous close passes with civilian and military aircraft and vessels by Russia threaten that peace and stability;

(3) Operation Atlantic Resolve, launched in April 2014, demonstrates the steadfast commitment of the United States to our allies in the region against any threat to territorial integrity or sovereignty;

(4) the European Reassurance Initiative, signed into law in December 2014, has improved United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization capability and readiness in Central and Eastern Europe;

(5) pre-positioning ammunition, fuel, and equipment for use in regional training and exercises, as well as improving infrastructure, will enhance North Atlantic Treaty Organization operations and enable Eastern European allies to rapidly receive reinforcements;

(6) increasing the presence of United States forces in the region, including naval forces in the Black Sea, Baltic Sea, and Barents Seas, through stepped-up rotations, training, and exercises will enhance and improve United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization interoperability and cooperation; and

(7) it is in the United States national interest to continue to these efforts while the threat to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of our allies persists.

SA 1728. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 652 and insert the following:

SEC. 652. REPORT AND ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMISSARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commissary system. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any plans or pilot program to privatize defense commissaries or the defense commissary system.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A methodology for defining the total number and locations of commissaries.

(2) An evaluation of commissary use by location in the following beneficiary categories:

(A) Pay grades E–1 through E–4.

(B) Pay grades E–5 through E–7.

(C) Pay grades E–8 and E–9.

(D) Pay grades O–1 through O–3.

(E) Pay grades O–4 through O–6.

(F) Pay grades O–7 through O–10.

(G) Military retirees.

(3) An evaluation of commissary use in locations outside the continental United States and in remote and isolated locations in the continental United States when compared with other locations.

(4) An evaluation of the cost of commissary operations during fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(5) An assessment of potential savings and efficiencies to be achieved through implementation of some or all of recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(6) A description and evaluation of the strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for pricing products sold at commissaries.

(7) A description and evaluation of the transportation strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for products sold at commissaries.

(8) A description and evaluation of the formula of the Defense Commissary Agency for calculating savings for its customers as a result of its pricing strategy.

(9) An evaluation of the average savings per household garnered by commissary use.

(10) A description and evaluation of the use of private contractors and vendors as part of the defense commissary system.

(11) An assessment of costs or savings, and potential impacts to patrons and the Government, of privatizing the defense commissary system, including potential increased use of Government assistance programs.

(12) A description and assessment of potential barriers to privatization of the defense commissary system.

(13) An assessment of the extent to which patron savings would remain after the privatization of the defense commissary system.

(14) An assessment of the impact of any recommended changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on commissary patrons, including morale and retention.

(15) An assessment of the actual interest of major grocery retailers in the management and operations of all, or part, of the existing defense commissary system.

(16) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on off-installation prices of similar products available in the system.

(17) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system, and conversion of the Defense Commissary Agency workforce to non-appropriated fund status, on employment of military family members, particularly with respect to pay, benefits, and job security.

(18) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on Exchanges and Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) quality-of-life programs.

(c) USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.—The Secretary shall consult previous studies and surveys on matters appropriate to the report required by subsection (a), including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The January 2015 Final Report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

(2) The 2014 Military Family Lifestyle Survey Comprehensive Report.

(3) The 2013 Living Patterns Survey.

(4) The report required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) on the management, food, and pricing options for the defense commissary system.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the report required by subsection (a).

SA 1729. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 152. ADDITIONAL SENSOR SUITES FOR F–22 AND F–35 AIRCRAFT RADAR CROSS-SECTION FACILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY OF INCLUSION OF SENSORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the feasibility of the inclusion of additional sensor suites to the current radar cross-section facilities for the F–22 aircraft and the F–35 aircraft in order to obtain a prognostic facility capability, benefitting life cycle logistics and sustainment, for low observable aircraft.

(2) DISCHARGE OF ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct the assessment through the F–22 Program Office and the Joint Strike Fighter Program Office.

(b) NATURE OF SENSORS ASSESSED.—The additional sensors assessed for purposes of subsection (a) shall be sensors that use the electromagnetic spectrum to automatically capture sustainment and maintenance data related to system and subsystem health, structural integrity, and signature performance of an aircraft, including structural (surface and subsurface) changes effecting the radar signature to enable precise repairs to its coatings and shape.

(c) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF ASSESSMENT.—The assessment conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall also include an assessment of the incorporation of prognostic health management, autonomic logistics, and sustainment functions for the additional sensor suite facility capability described in subsection (a).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a plan for the inclusion of additional sensor suites to the current radar cross-section facilities as described in subsection (a). The plan shall take into account the results of the assessment conducted pursuant to this section.

SA 1730. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFINITION OF AND POLICY REGARDING SOFTWARE SUSTAINMENT.

(a) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the definition used by the Department of Defense for and the policy of the Department regarding software maintenance, particularly with respect to the totality of the term ''software sustainment'' in the definition of ''depot-level maintenance and repair'' under section 2460 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The review required by subsection (a) shall address, with respect to software and weapon systems of the Department of Defense (including space systems), each of the following:

(A) Fiscal ramifications of current programs with regard to the size, scope, and cost of software to the program's overall budget, including embedded and support software, percentage of weapon systems' functionality controlled by software, and reliance on proprietary data, processes, and components.

(B) Legal status of the Department in regards to adhering to section 2464(a)(1) of such title with respect to ensuring a ready and controlled source of maintenance (sustainment) on software for its weapon systems.

(C) Operational risks and reduction to materiel readiness of current Department weapon systems related to software costs, delays, re-work, integration and functional testing, defects, and documentation errors.

(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS.—For each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the review required by subsection (a) shall include review and analysis regarding sole-source contracts, range of competition, rights in technical data, public and private capabilities, integration lab initial costs and sustaining operations, and total obligation authority costs of software, disaggregated by armed service, for the Department.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 15, 2016, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report on the policy reviewed under subsection (a) and the findings of the Comptroller General with respect to such review.

SA 1731. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

Subtitle F—Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement

SEC. 891. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subtitle may be cited as the ''Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 892. DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) CRITERIA FOR USE.—

''(1) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE OF AT LEAST $750,000.—Two-phase selection procedures shall be used for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when a contracting officer determines that the contract has a value of $750,000 or greater, as adjusted for inflation in accordance with section 1908 of this title.

''(2) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE LESS THAN $750,000.—For projects that a contracting officer determines have a value of less than

$750,000, the contracting officer shall make a determination whether two-phase selection procedures are appropriate for use for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when—

''(A) the contracting officer anticipates that 3 or more offers will be received for the contract;

''(B) design work must be performed before an offeror can develop a price or cost proposal for the contract;

''(C) the offeror will incur a substantial amount of expense in preparing the offer; and

''(D) the contracting officer has considered information such as—

''(i) the extent to which the project requirements have been adequately defined;

''(ii) the time constraints for delivery of the project;

''(iii) the capability and experience of potential contractors;

''(iv) the suitability of the project for use of the two-phase selection procedures;

''(v) the capability of the agency to manage the two-phase selection process; and

''(vi) other criteria established by the agency.''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the agency determines with respect to'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity, delegable to a level no lower than the senior contracting official within the contracting activity, approves the contracting officer's justification that an individual solicitation must have greater than 5 finalists to be in the Federal Government's interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number of offerors exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process.''.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30 of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the head of each agency shall compile an annual report of each instance in which the agency awarded a design-build contract pursuant to section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending in such calendar year, in which—

(i) more than 5 finalists were selected for phase-two requests for proposals; or

(ii) the contract was awarded without using two-phase selection procedures.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall facilitate public access to the reports, including by posting them on a publicly available Internet website. A notice of the availability of each report shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) CRITERIA FOR USE.—

''(1) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE OF AT LEAST $750,000.—Two-phase selection procedures shall be used for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when a contracting officer determines that the contract has a value of $750,000 or greater, as adjusted for inflation in accordance with section 1908 of title 41, United States Code.

''(2) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE LESS THAN $750,000.—For projects that a contracting officer determines have a value of less than $750,000, the contracting officer shall make a determination whether two-phase selection procedures are appropriate for use for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when—

''(A) the contracting officer anticipates that 3 or more offers will be received for the contract;

''(B) design work must be performed before an offeror can develop a price or cost proposal for the contract;

''(C) the offeror will incur a substantial amount of expense in preparing the offer; and

''(D) the contracting officer has considered information such as—

''(i) the extent to which the project requirements have been adequately defined;

''(ii) the time constraints for delivery of the project;

''(iii) the capability and experience of potential contractors;

''(iv) the suitability of the project for use of the two-phase selection procedures;

''(v) the capability of the agency to manage the two-phase selection process; and

''(vi) other criteria established by the Department of Defense.''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the agency determines with respect to'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity approves the contracting officer's justification that an individual solicitation must have greater than 5 finalists to be in the Federal Government's interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number of offerors exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process.''.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30 of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall compile an annual report of each instance in which the Department awarded a design-build contract pursuant to section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending in such calendar year, in which—

(i) more than 5 finalists were selected for phase-two requests for proposals; or

(ii) the contract was awarded without using two-phase selection procedures.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall facilitate public access to the reports, including by posting them on a publicly available Internet website. A notice of the availability of each report shall be published in the Federal Register.

(c) GAO REPORTS.—

(1) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—Not later than 270 days after the deadline for the final reports required under subsection (f) of section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the compliance of the various Federal agencies with the requirements of such section.

(2) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Not later than 270 days after the deadline for the final reports required under subsection (f) of section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the compliance of the Department of Defense with the requirements of such section.

SEC. 893. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF A REVERSE AUCTION FOR THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council, in consultation with the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for awarding contracts for construction and design services.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''design and construction services'' means—

(A) site planning and landscape design;

(B) architectural and engineering services (including surveying and mapping defined in section 1101 of title 40, United States Code);

(C) interior design;

(D) performance of construction work for facility, infrastructure, and environmental restoration projects;

(E) delivery and supply of construction materials to construction sites; and

(F) construction or substantial alteration or repair of public buildings or public works; and

(2) the term ''reverse auction'' means, with respect to procurement by an agency—

(A) a real-time auction conducted through an electronic medium between a group of offerors who compete against each other by submitting bids for a contract or task order with the ability to submit revised bids throughout the course of the auction; and

(B) the award of the contract or task order to the offeror who submits the lowest bid.

SEC. 894. ASSURING PAYMENT PROTECTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION SUBCONTRACTORS AND SUPPLIERS UNDER AN ALTERNATIVE TO A MILLER ACT PAYMENT BOND.

Chapter 93 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 9310. Individual sureties

''If another applicable law or regulation permits the acceptance of a bond from a surety that is not subject to sections 9305 and 9306 and is based on a pledge of assets by the surety, the assets pledged by such surety shall—

''(1) consist of eligible obligations described under section 9303(a); and

''(2) be submitted to the official of the Government required to approve or accept the bond, who shall deposit the assets with a depository described under section 9303(b).''; and

(2) in the table of sections for such chapter, by adding at the end the following new item:

''9310. Individual sureties.''.

SEC. 895. SBA SURETY BOND GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''70'' and inserting ''90''.

SA 1732. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON THE LOCATION OF C–130 MODULAR AIRBORNE FIREFIGHTING SYSTEM UNITS.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the locations of C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS) units. The report shall include the following:

(1) A list of the C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units of the Air Force.

(2) The utilization rates of the units listed under paragraph (1).

(3) A future force allocation determination with respect to such units in order to achieve the most efficient use of such units

(4) An assessment of opportunities to expand coverage of C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units in States most prone to wildfires.

SA 1733. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE USE OF DOMESTIC AIRFIELDS FOR HOMELAND DEFENSE AND DISASTER RESPONSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Transportation, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the plans for airfields in the United States that are required to support homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The report shall include the following items:

(1) The criteria used to determine the capabilities and locations of airfields in the United States needed to support safe operations of military aircraft in the execution of homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(2) A description of the processes and procedures in place to ensure that contingency plans for the use of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations are coordinated among the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over those airfields.

(3) An assessment of the impact, if any, to logistics and resource planning as a result of the reduction of certain capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(4) A review of the existing agreements and authorities between the Commander of the United States Northern Command and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration that allow for consultation on decisions that impact the capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

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

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(2) CAPABILITIES OF AIRFIELDS.—The term ''capabilities of airfields'' means the length and width of runways, taxiways, and aprons, the operation of navigation aids and lighting, the operation of fuel storage, distribution, and refueling systems, and the availability of air traffic control services.

(3) AIRFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SUPPORT BOTH MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AIR OPERATIONS.—The term ''airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations'' means the following:

(A) Airports that are designated as joint use facilities pursuant to section 47175 of title 49, United States Code, in which both the military and civil aviation have shared use of the airfield.

(B) Airports used by the military that have a permanent military aviation presence at the airport pursuant to a memorandum of agreement or tenant lease with the airport owner that is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1734. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON COUNTER-DRUG EFFORTS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a report to Congress that outlines—

(1) the counter-narcotics goals of the Department of Defense in Afghanistan; and

(2) how the Secretary of Defense will coordinate the counter-drug efforts of the Department of Defense with other Federal agencies to ensure an integrated, effective counter-narcotics strategy is implemented in Afghanistan.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include information as to how the Secretary of Defense will evaluate the counter-drug efforts of the Department of Defense for success in Afghanistan; and

(2) outline the process by which the Secretary of Defense will determine whether to continue each of the counter-drug initiatives of the Department of Defense in Afghanistan.

SA 1735. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. STUDY ON REDUCING STIGMA AND IMPROVING TREATMENT OF POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a study on reducing the stigma and improving the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall consult with individuals with relevant experience relating to post-traumatic stress disorder, the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder, and the impact of post-traumatic stress disorder on members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families, including the following:

(A) Representatives of military service organizations.

(B) Representatives of veterans service organizations.

(C) Health professionals with experience in treating members of the Armed Forces and veterans with mental illness, including those health professionals who work for the Federal Government and those who do not.

(3) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall assess the following:

(A) The feasibility and advisability of strategies to improve the treatment of the full spectrum of post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(B) The feasibility and advisability of strategies to diminish the stigma attached to post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and the public in general.

(C) The impact of the term ''disorder'' on the stigma attached to post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including the impact of dropping the term ''disorder'', when medically appropriate, when referring to post-traumatic stress.

(D) Whether using the term ''disorder'' is the most accurate way to describe post-traumatic stress disorder in instances in which members of the Armed Forces and veterans have experienced traumatic events but have not been formally diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder.

(E) Whether there is a need to update the next version of the VA/DOD Clinical Practice Guideline for Management of Post-Traumatic Stress published by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(F) Whether there is a need to update information provided to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including information on Internet websites of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs, on post-traumatic stress disorder to reduce the stigma and more accurately describe the medical conditions for which members of the Armed Forces and veterans are receiving treatment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study required by subsection (a), including recommendations for any actions that the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs can take to reduce the stigma and improve the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''veterans service organization'' means an organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1736. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. VOLUNTARY NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF VETERANS.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to facilitate outreach to veterans by covered entities.

(2) COVERED ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, a covered entity is any of the following:

(A) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) The agency or department of a State that is the primary agency or department of the State for the administration of benefits and services for veterans in the State.

(C) A political subdivision of a State.

(D) An Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

(3) NATIONAL DIRECTORY.—To carry out the program required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) establish a national directory of veterans as described in subsection (b); and

(B) share information in the directory in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) NATIONAL DIRECTORY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish the national directory required by subsection (a)(3) using information received from the Secretary of Defense under subsection (d)(4).

(2) UPDATES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the national directory includes a mechanism by which a participating individual can update the information in the national directory that pertains to the participating individual.

(3) DISENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a mechanism by which a participating individual can indicate to the Secretary that the individual would no longer like to receive information from participating entities under the program.

(4) REENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a mechanism for the inclusion of information in the national directory of individuals who were previously participating individuals but who had made an indication under paragraph (3) and subsequently indicate that they would like to receive information from participating entities under the program.

(5) PRIVACY AND SECURITY.—The Secretary shall take such actions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect—

(A) the privacy of individuals participating in the program; and

(B) the security of the information stored in the national directory.

(6) EBENEFITS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may use the system and architecture of the eBenefits Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs to support and operate the national directory as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) OUTREACH.—

(1) SHARING OF DIRECTORY INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in order to connect participating individuals with information about the programs they could be eligible for or services, support, and information they may be interested in receiving, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may share, under the program established under subsection (a)(1), information in the national directory concerning such individuals with entities applicable to participating individuals.

(B) ENTITIES APPLICABLE TO PARTICIPATING INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this subsection, an entity that is applicable to a participating individual is a covered entity from whom a participating individual has expressed interest in receiving information under the program.

(C) UPDATED INFORMATION.—In a case in which a participating individual updates the information pertaining to the participating individual under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall transmit such information to each entity applicable to the participating individual.

(D) NOTIFICATION OF DISENROLLMENT.—In a case in which a participating individual indicates to the Secretary under subsection (b)(3) that the individual would no longer like to receive information from participating entities under the program, the Secretary shall inform each entity applicable to the participating individual that the individual would no longer like to receive information from the entity under the program.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) LIMITATIONS ON THE SECRETARY.—

(i) INFORMATION SHARED.—Under the program, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may only share from the national directory the following:

(I) The name of a participating individual.

(II) The e-mail address of a participating individual.

(III) The postal address of a participating individual.

(IV) The phone number of a participating individual.

(ii) PROHIBITION ON SALE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary may not sell any information collected under this section.

(iii) ENTITIES.—The Secretary may not share any information collected under the program with any entity that is not a participating entity.

(B) LIMITATIONS ON PARTICIPATING ENTITIES.—

(i) SHARING WITH THIRD-PARTY AND FOR-PROFIT ENTITIES.—As a condition of participation in the program, a participating entity shall agree not to share any information the participating entity receives under the program with any third-party or for-profit entities.

(ii) PURCHASES OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES.—As a condition of participation in the program, a participating entity shall agree not to include in any information sent by the participating entity to a participating individual a requirement that the participating individual or the family of the participating individual purchase a product or service.

(iii) POLITICAL COMMUNICATION.—As a condition of participation in the program, a participating entity shall agree not to use any information received under the program for any political communication.

(3) DISENROLLMENT BY PARTICIPATING ENTITIES.—The Secretary shall establish a mechanism by which a participating entity may indicate to the Secretary that the participating entity would no longer like to receive information about participating individuals from the national directory.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(A) CONSOLIDATION OF REQUESTS.—It is the sense of Congress that covered entities described in subsection (a)(2)(C) who are located in the same region should work together in a manner such that only one of them requests receipt of information under the program.

(B) COLLABORATION.—It is the sense of Congress that covered entities described in subsection (a)(2)(C) should work with third parties, such as veterans service organizations, military community groups, and other entities with an interest in assisting veterans, to develop the information the covered entities send to participating individuals under the program.

(5) PUBLICITY.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to publicize the program and inform covered entities of the benefits of participating in the program.

(d) COLLECTION OF CONTACT INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To each member of the Armed Forces separating from service in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a form for the collection of information to be included in the national directory established under subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—

(A) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, develop the form provided under paragraph (1).

(B) ELEMENTS.—The form developed under subparagraph (A) shall allow a member of the Armed Forces who is in the process of separating from service in the Armed Forces to indicate the following:

(i) Where the member intends to reside after separation.

(ii) How the individual can best be contacted, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, or a postal address.

(iii) For which types of benefits and services the member would like to receive communication and outreach, such as health care, education, employment, and housing.

(iv) From which of the following the member would like to receive the communication and outreach specified under clause (iii):

(I) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(II) The agency or department of the State in which the member intends to reside after separation that is the primary agency or department of the State for the administration of benefits and services for veterans in the State.

(III) A political subdivision of a State.

(C) NOTICE.—The form developed under subparagraph (A) shall include notice of the following:

(i) Information provided to agencies and departments described in subparagraph (B)(iv)(III) will only be provided as authorized and upon request by such agencies and departments.

(ii) Political subdivisions of States that receive information under the program established under subsection (a) may—

(I) share such information with such nonprofit organizations as the political subdivisions consider appropriate; and

(II) work with such organizations to provide the veterans with relevant information about benefits and services offered by such organizations.

(iii) Information provided on the form developed under subparagraph (A) will never be sold, provided to a for-profit entity, or used to send any sort of political communication.

(D) MANNER.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the form provided under paragraph (1) is not primarily electronic in nature.

(3) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that completion of the form provided under paragraph (1) is voluntary and submittal of such form to the Secretary by a member of the Armed Forces shall be considered an indication to the Secretary that the member would like to receive information from participating entities under the program.

(4) TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a member of the Armed Forces who submitted information to the Secretary of Defense under this subsection separates from service in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit such information to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(5) PRIVACY AND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Defense shall take such actions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect—

(A) the privacy of individuals who submit information under this subsection; and

(B) the security of such information—

(i) while it is in the possession of the Secretary; and

(ii) while it is in transit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(6) INTEGRATION WITH TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly take such actions as the secretaries consider appropriate to integrate the collection of information under this subsection into the Transition Assistance Program.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the program established under subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an examination and assessment of the following:

(A) The signup process and the effectiveness of the forms developed and provided under subsection (d).

(B) The ways in which contact information is transferred from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the program and the plans of the secretaries to overcome challenges encountered by the secretaries in transferring such information.

(C) The number of covered entities described in subsection (a)(2)(C) participating in the program and any challenges they report in receiving the contact information from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the program.

(D) The effectiveness of efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to protect the personal information of participating individuals.

(E) The effectiveness of efforts of covered entities described in subsection (a)(2)(C) to protect the personal information of participating individuals.

(F) Whether additional limitations on the use of information collected under the program are necessary to protect participating individuals from unwanted contact, or contact that is inconsistent with the program.

(G) Whether participating individuals are benefitting by participating in the program and whether changing the program would improve such benefits.

(H) The overall participation in the program, utilization of the program, and how such participation and utilization could be improved.

(I) Such other matters as the secretaries consider appropriate.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the following:

(A) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(B) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PARTICIPATING ENTITY.—The term ''participating entity'' means a covered entity that has indicated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the covered entity would like to receive information about participating individuals from the national directory and has made no subsequent indication that the covered entity would like to stop receiving such information.

(2) PARTICIPATING INDIVIDUAL.—The term ''participating individual'' means an individual with respect to whom information is stored in the national directory and who has indicated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of Defense that the individual would like to receive information from participating entities under the program and has made no subsequent indication that the individual would like to stop receiving such information.

SA 1737. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NOTICE OF STATUS AS AN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMER.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 605, by adding at the end the following:

''(i) NOTICE OF STATUS AS AN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an item of adverse information about a consumer, if the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred while the consumer was an active duty military consumer, the consumer may provide appropriate proof, including official orders, to a consumer reporting agency that the consumer was an active duty military consumer at the time such action or inaction occurred, and any consumer report provided by the consumer reporting agency that includes the item shall clearly and conspicuously disclose that the consumer was an active duty military consumer when the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred.

''(2) MODEL FORM.—The Bureau shall prepare a model form, which shall be made publicly available, including in an electronic format, by which a consumer may—

''(A) notify, and provide appropriate proof to, a consumer reporting agency in a simple and easy manner, including electronically, that the consumer is or was an active duty military consumer; and

''(B) provide contact information of the consumer for the purpose of communicating with the consumer while the consumer is an active duty military consumer.

''(3) NO ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES.—A notice, pursuant to a model form or otherwise, that a consumer is or was an active duty military consumer shall not itself (without regard to other considerations) provide the basis for any of the following:

''(A) With respect to a credit transaction between a creditor and the consumer—

''(i) a denial or revocation of credit by the creditor;

''(ii) a change by the creditor in the terms of an existing credit arrangement; or

''(iii) a refusal by the creditor to grant credit to the consumer in substantially the amount or on substantially the terms requested.

''(B) An adverse report relating to the creditworthiness of the consumer by or to a person engaged in the practice of assembling or evaluating consumer credit information.

''(C) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, an annotation in a consumer's record by a creditor or a person engaged in the practice of assembling or evaluating consumer credit information, identifying the consumer as an active duty military consumer.'';

(2) in section 605A—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking ''Upon'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) NEGATIVE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—If a consumer reporting agency receives an item of adverse information about a consumer who has provided appropriate proof that the consumer is an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall notify the consumer, according to a frequency, manner, and timeliness determined by the Bureau or specified by the consumer—

''(A) that the consumer reporting agency has received the item of adverse information, along with a description of the item; and

''(B) the method by which the consumer may dispute the validity of the item.

''(3) CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a consumer who has provided appropriate proof to a consumer reporting agency that the consumer is an active duty military consumer provides the consumer reporting agency with contact information for the purpose of communicating with the consumer while the consumer is an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall use such contact information for all communications while the consumer is an active duty military consumer.

''(B) DIRECT REQUEST.—Unless the consumer opts out, the provision of appropriate proof that a consumer is an active duty military consumer shall be treated as a direct request for an active duty alert under paragraph (1).

''(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any person making use of a consumer report that contains an item of adverse information should, if the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred while the consumer was an active duty military consumer, take such fact into account when evaluating the creditworthiness of the consumer.''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(1), in the case of a referral under subsection (c)(1)(C).''; and

(3) in section 611(a)(1), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) NOTICE OF DISPUTE RELATED TO ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—With respect to an item of information described under subparagraph (A) that is under dispute, if the consumer to whom the item relates has notified the consumer reporting agency, and has provided appropriate proof, that the consumer was an active duty military consumer at the time the action or inaction that gave rise to the disputed item occurred, the consumer reporting agency shall—

''(i) include such fact in the file of the consumer; and

''(ii) indicate such fact in each consumer report that includes the disputed item.''.

SA 1738. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 419, line 22, insert '', or that the item no longer meets the definition of a commercial item'' after ''based on inadequate information''.

SA 1739. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION FOR INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term ''covered employee'' means a whistleblower who is an employee of the Department of Defense or a military department, or an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee thereof;

(2) the term ''covered investigation'' means an investigation carried out by an Inspector General of a military department or the Inspector General of the Department of Defense relating to—

(A) a retaliatory personnel action taken against a member of the Armed Forces under section 1034 of title 10, United States Code; or

(B) any retaliatory action taken against a covered employee; and

(3) the term ''military department'' means each of the departments described in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each investigator involved in a covered investigation shall submit to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or the Inspector General of the military department, as applicable, a certification that there was no conflict of interest between the investigator, any witness involved in the covered investigation, and the covered employee or member of the Armed Forces, as applicable, during the conduct of the covered investigation.

(2) STANDARDIZED FORM.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall develop a standardized form to be used by each investigator to submit the certification required under paragraph (1).

(3) INVESTIGATIVE FILE.—Each certification submitted under paragraph (1) shall be included in the file of the applicable covered investigation.

SA 1740. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 564, after line 25, add the following:

(d) REPORT.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''covered employee'' has the meaning given that term in section 1599e of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONTENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding covered employees hired into a probationary status during the 10-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act, which shall include the number of covered employees—

(A) hired during the period;

(B) whose appointment became final after the probationary period;

(C) who were subject to disciplinary action or termination during the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the appointment of the covered employee became final;

(D) who were subject to disciplinary action during the probationary period;

(E) who were terminated before the appointment of the covered employee became final; and

(F) who, after being subject to disciplinary action or terminated, raised a claim that the disciplinary action or termination was taken because of a disclosure of information by the covered employee that the covered employee reasonably believed evidenced—

(i) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

SA 1741. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 354, beginning on line 11, strike ''policy.'' and all that follows through line 20 and insert the following: ''policy, with at least one member representing the interests of the taxpayer. In making appointments to the advisory panel, the Under Secretary shall ensure that the members of the panel reflect diverse experiences in the public and private sectors.

(c) DUTIES.—The panel shall—

(1) review the acquisition regulations applicable to the Department of Defense with a view toward streamlining and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the defense acquisition process, maintaining defense technology advantage, and protecting the best interests of the taxpayer; and

---

SA 1742. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. PROTECTION FOR CONTRACTORS AND GRANTEES FROM REPRISAL FOR DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.

(a) ELIMINATION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 4712 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (i).

(b) EXTENSION OF PROTECTIONS TO GRANTEES.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by striking ''subcontractor, or grantee'' each place it appears and inserting ''subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking '', and grantees'' and inserting '', grantees, and subgrantees''.

SA 1743. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. EXTENSION OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR DEFENSE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES TO EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) CONTRACTORS OF DOD AND RELATED AGENCIES.—Subsection (e) of section 2409 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) DISCLOSURES WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—(1) Any disclosure under this section by an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, or grantee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) with respect to an element of the intelligence community or an activity of an element of the intelligence community shall comply with applicable provisions of section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) and section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)

''(2) Any disclosure described in paragraph (1) of information required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interests of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that is made to a court shall be treated by the court in a manner consistent with the interests of the national security of the United States, including through the use of summaries or ex parte submissions if the element of the intelligence community awarding the contract or grant concerned advises

the court that the national security interests of the United States warrant the use of such summaries or submissions.''.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM ON OTHER CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—Subsection (f) of section 4712 of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(f) DISCLOSURES WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) MANNER OF DISCLOSURES.—Any disclosure under this section by an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, or grantee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) with respect to an element of the intelligence community or an activity of an element of the intelligence community shall comply with applicable provisions of section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) and section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)

''(2) TREATMENT BY COURTS.—Any disclosure described in paragraph (1) of information required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interests of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that is made to a court shall be treated by the court in a manner consistent with the interests of the national security of the United States, including through the use of summaries or ex parte submissions if the element of the intelligence community awarding the contract or grant concerned advises the court that the national security interests of the United States warrant the use of such summaries or submissions.''.

SA 1744. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR WHICH AMOUNTS HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATED.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) $35,000,000 to make seismic corrections to Building 205 in the West Los Angeles Medical Center of the Department in Los Angeles, California, which, according to the Department, is a building that is designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(B) $101,900,000 to replace the community living center and mental health facilities of the Department in Long Beach, California, which, according to the Department, are designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(C) $187,500,000 to replace the existing spinal cord injury clinic of the Department in San Diego, California, which, according to the Department, is designated as having an extremely high risk of sustaining major damage during an earthquake; and

(D) $122,400,000 to make renovations to address substantial safety and compliance issues at the medical center of the Department in Canandaigua, New York, and for the construction of a new clinic and community living center at such medical center.

(2) The Department is unable to obligate or expend the amounts described in paragraph (1) because it lacks an explicit authorization by an Act of Congress pursuant to section 8104(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, to carry out the major medical facility projects described in such paragraph.

(3) Among the major medical facility projects described in paragraph (1), three are critical seismic safety projects in California.

(4) Every day that the critical seismic safety projects described in paragraph (3) are delayed puts the lives of veterans and employees of the Department at risk.

(5) According to the United States Geological Survey—

(A) California has a 99 percent chance or greater of experiencing an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater in the next 30 years;

(B) even earthquakes of less severity than magnitude 6.7 can cause life threatening damage to seismically unsafe buildings; and

(C) in California, earthquakes of magnitude 6.0 or greater occur on average once every 1.2 years.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specified in the explanatory statement accompanying the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) at the locations and in the amounts specified in such explanatory statement, including by obligating and expending such amounts.

SA 1745. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ALTERNATIVE FUELED VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the ''Department of Defense Alternative Fuel Vehicle Infrastructure Fund''.

(b) DEPOSITS.—The Fund shall consist of the following:

(1) Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

(2) Amounts earned through investment under subsection (c).

(3) Any other amounts made available to the Fund by law.

(c) INVESTMENTS.—The Secretary shall invest any part of the Fund that the Secretary decides is not required to meet current expenses. Each investment shall be made in an interest-bearing obligation of the United States Government, or an obligation that has its principal and interest guaranteed by the Government, that the Secretary decides has a maturity suitable for the Fund.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to install, operate, and maintain alternative fuel dispensing stations for use by alternative fueled vehicles of the Department of Defense and other infrastructure necessary to fuel alternative fueled vehicles of the Department.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—The term ''alternative fuel'' has the meaning given such term in section 32901 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) ALTERNATIVE FUELED VEHICLE.—The term ''alternative fueled vehicle'' means a vehicle that operates on alternative fuel.

(3) FUND.—The term ''Fund'' means the fund established under subsection (a).

SA 1746. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. AUTHORIZATION FOR RESEARCH TO IMPROVE MILITARY VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY TO INCREASE FUEL ECONOMY OR REDUCE FUEL CONSUMPTION OF MILITARY VEHICLES USED IN COMBAT.

(a) RESEARCH AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and in collaboration with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy, may carry out research to improve military vehicle technology to increase fuel economy or reduce fuel consumption of military vehicles used in combat.

(b) PREVIOUS SUCCESSES.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that research carried out under subsection (a) takes into account the successes of, and lessons learned during, the development of the Fuel Efficient Ground Vehicle Alpha and Bravo programs to identify, assess, develop, demonstrate, and prototype technologies that support increasing fuel economy and decreasing fuel consumption of light tactical vehicles, while balancing survivability.

SA 1747. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT FOR SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND GIRLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Through the sacrifice and dedication of members of the Armed Forces, civilian personnel, and our Afghan partners as well as the American people's generous investment, oppressive Taliban rule has given way to a nascent democracy in Afghanistan. It is in our national security interest to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism and to solidify and preserve the gains our men and women in uniform fought so hard to establish.

(2) The United States through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security has made firm commitments to support the

human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that ''the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to United States efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies''.

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the Department of Defense and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) ''maintain a robust program dedicated to improving the recruitment, retention, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and to improving the status of Afghan women in general''.

(4) According to the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the ''Afghan MoI showed significant support for women in the MoI and is taking steps to protect and empower female police and female MoI staff''. Although some positive steps have been made, progress remains slow to reach the MoI's goal of recruiting 10,000 women in the Afghan National Police (ANP) in the next 10 years.

(5) According to Inclusive Security, women only make up approximately 1 percent of the Afghan National Police. There are about 2,200 women serving in the police force, fewer than the goal of 5,000 women set by the Government of Afghanistan.

(6) According to the International Crisis Group, there are not enough female police officers to staff all provincial Family Response Units (FRUs). United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees found that ''in the absence of Family Response Units or visible women police officers, women victims almost never approach police stations willingly, fearing they will be arrested, their reputations stained or worse''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMOTION OF SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism;

(2) as an important part of a strategy to achieve this objective and to help Afghanistan achieve its full potential, the United States Government should continue to regularly press the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to commit to the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process and to ensure that women's concerns are fully reflected in relevant negotiations;

(3) the United States Government and the Government of Afghanistan should reaffirm their commitment to supporting Afghan civil society, including women's organizations, as agreed to during the meeting between the International Community and the Government of Afghanistan on the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) in July 2013;

(4) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts to recruit and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces, who are critical to the success of NATO's Resolute Support Mission and future Enduring Partnership mission; and

(5) the United States should bid on no less than one gender advisor billet within the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit and continue to work with other countries to ensure that the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit billets are fully staffed.

(c) PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3550)—

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF; and

(B) an assessment of the implementation of the plans for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, treatment, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including ensuring the Afghan National Police's Family Response Units (FRUs) have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan;

(iii) mechanisms to enhance the capacity for units of National Police's Family Response Units to fulfill their mandate as well as indicators measuring the operational effectiveness of these units;

(iv) a plan to address the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the human rights of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF; and

(v) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development and implementation of a plan to increase the number of female members of the ANA and ANP and to promote their equal treatment, including through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for recruits.

(D) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghan Security Forces Fund for Fiscal Year 2016, no less than $10,000,000 should be used for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF as well as the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections.

(ii) TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Such programs and activities may include—

(I) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(II) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights and Gender Integration and the Afghan Ministry of Interior Office of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(III) development and dissemination of gender and human rights educational and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(IV) efforts to address harassment and violence against women within the ANSF;

(V) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including appropriate equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station

(VI) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(VII) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

SA 1748. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REVIEW OF CHARACTERIZATION OR TERMS OF DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DISORDERS ALLEGED TO AFFECT TERMS OF DISCHARGE.

Section 1553(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3)(A) In addition to the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2), in the case of a former member described in subparagraph (B), the board shall—

''(i) review medical evidence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or a civilian health care provider that is presented by the former member; and

''(ii) review the case with a presumption of administrative irregularity and place the burden on the Secretary concerned to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that no error or injustice occurred.

''(B) A former member described in this subparagraph is a former member described in paragraph (1) or a former member whose application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as supporting rationale or as justification for priority consideration whose post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is related to combat or military sexual trauma, as determined by the Secretary concerned.''.

SA 1749. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF SENATE ON MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT TRAVEL CHARGE CARDS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a finding in a May 2015 report of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense that personnel charged nearly $1,000,000 to government travel charge cards for personal use at casinos and adult entertainment establishments over a one year period demonstrates serious misuse of government travel charge cards, does not comport with the values of the Department, and requires additional oversight to prevent future misuse;

(2) the Director of the Defense Travel Management Office should work with the Armed Forces, the Defense Agencies, and representatives of financial institutions to determine how to prevent and identify the inappropriate personal use of the government travel charge cards under those and similar circumstances; and

(3) the Department of Defense should work to expeditiously address any outstanding recommendations in the report of the Inspector General described in paragraph (1).

SA 1750. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP AND DEPLOY UAS TECHNOLOGIES.—The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall work in conjunction with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the heads of other Federal agencies, existing UAS test sites designated by the Federal Aviation Administration, the private sector, and academia on the research and development of technologies to safely detect, identify, classify, and deconflict UAS in the national air space, integrate UAS, and deploy proven UAS mitigation technologies—

(1) to ensure that UAS operate safely in the national air space;

(2) to ensure that, as the commercial use of UAS technologies increase and are safely integrated into the national air space, the United States is taking full advantage of existing and developmental technologies to detect, identify, classify, track, and counteract UAS in and around restricted and controlled air space, such as airports, military training areas, National Special Security Events, and sensitive national security locations;

(3) to yield important insights for the Department of Defense, intelligence community, Department of Homeland Security, and civilian and private sector applications;

(4) to provide intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance capabilities over widely dispersed and expansive territories; and

(5) to improve methods for protecting privacy and civil liberties related to the use of UAS.

(b) UAS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''UAS'' means unmanned aerial systems.

SA 1751. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PROHIBITION ON TERMINATION OF VETS4WARRIORS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may not terminate the peer support program of the Department of Defense known as the Vets4Warriors program unless the Secretary determines, through a public process established by the Secretary, that members of the Armed Forces will receive adequate mental health care and resources in the absence of such program.

(b) EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of peer-to-peer counseling in assisting members of the Armed Forces and their families.

SA 1752. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 355. STARBASE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 requested no funding for the Department of Defense STARBASE program.

(2) The purpose of the STARBASE program is to improve the knowledge and skills of students in kindergarten through 12th grade in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects, to connect them to the military, and to motivate them to explore science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and possible military careers as they continue their education.

(3) The STARBASE program currently operates at 76 locations in 40 States and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, primarily on military installations.

(4) To date, nearly 750,000 students have participated in the STARBASE program.

(5) The STARBASE program is a highly effective program run by dedicated members of the Armed Forces and strengthens the relationships between the military, communities, and local school districts.

(6) The budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 seeks to eliminate funding for the STARBASE program for that fiscal year due to a reorganization of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs throughout the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the STARBASE program should continue to be funded by the Department of Defense.

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4301—

(1) the amount available for the STARBASE program is hereby increased by $25,000,000; and

(2) the amount available by reason of increased bulk fuel cost savings is hereby decreased by $25,000,000.

SA 1753. Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. HONORING AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In recent years, commemorative chairs honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action have been placed in prominent locations across the United States.

(2) The United States Capitol is an appropriate location to place a commemorative chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

(b) PLACEMENT OF A CHAIR IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL HONORING AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION.—

(1) OBTAINING CHAIR.—The Architect of the Capitol shall enter into an agreement to obtain a chair featuring the logo of the National League of POW/MIA Families under such terms and conditions as the Architect considers appropriate and consistent with applicable law.

(2) PLACEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Architect shall place the chair obtained under paragraph (1) in a suitable permanent location in the United States Capitol.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) DONATIONS.—The Architect of the Capitol may—

(A) enter into an agreement with any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code to solicit private donations to carry out the purposes of this section; and

(B) accept donations of funds, property, and services to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) COSTS.—All costs incurred in carrying out the purposes of this section shall be paid for with private donations received under paragraph (1).

SA 1754. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT.—

(1) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—Section 503 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to the direction and approval of the Director, the Deputy Director for Management or designee shall—

''(A) adopt governmentwide standards, policies, and guidelines for program and project management for executive agencies;

''(B) oversee program and project management for the standards, policies, and guidelines established under subparagraph (A);

''(C) chair the Program Management Policy Council established under section 1126(b);

''(D) issue regulations and establish standards and policies for executive agencies, in accordance with nationally accredited standards for program and project management planning and delivery issues;

''(E) engage with the private sector;

''(F) conduct portfolio reviews to address programs identified as high risk by the Government Accountability Office;

''(G) not less than annually, conduct portfolio reviews of agency programs in coordination with Project Management Improvement Officers designated under section 1126(a)(1); and

''(H) establish a 5-year strategic plan for program and project management.

''(2) APPLICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense to the extent that the provisions of that paragraph are substantially similar to or duplicative of the provisions under section 810 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.''.

(2) DEADLINE FOR STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue the standards, policies, and guidelines required under section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Program Management Policy Council established under section 1126(b) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall issue any regulations as are necessary to implement the requirements of section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(b) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1126. Program Management Improvement Officers and Program Management Policy Council

''(a) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The head of each agency described in section 901(b) shall designate a senior executive of the agency as the Program Management Improvement Officer of the agency. The Program Management Improvement Officer shall report directly to the head of the agency.

''(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Program Management Improvement Officer of an agency designated under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) implement program management policies established by the agency under section 503(c); and

''(B) develop a written strategy for enhancing the role of program managers within the agency that includes the following:

''(i) Enhanced training and educational opportunities for program managers.

''(ii) Mentoring of current and future program managers by experienced senior executives and program managers within the agency.

''(iii) Improved career paths and career opportunities for program managers.

''(iv) Incentives for the recruitment and retention of highly qualified individuals to serve as program managers.

''(v) Improved resources and support, including relevant competencies encompassed with program and project management within the private sector for program managers.

''(vi) Improved means of collecting and disseminating best practices and lessons learned to enhance program management across the agency.

''(vii) Common templates and tools to support improved data gathering and analysis for program management and oversight purposes.

''(3) APPLICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—This subsection shall not apply to the Department of Defense to the extent that the provisions of this subsection are substantially similar to or duplicative of the provisions under section 810 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

''(b) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of Management and Budget a council to be known as the 'Program Management Policy Council' (in this section referred to as the 'Council').

''(2) PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall act as the principal interagency forum for improving agency practices related to program and project management. The Council shall—

''(A) advise and assist the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget;

''(B) review programs identified as high risk by the General Accountability Office and make recommendations for actions to be taken by the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget or designee;

''(C) discuss topics of importance to the workforce, including—

''(i) career development and workforce development needs;

''(ii) policy to support continuous improvement in program and project management; and

''(iii) major challenges across agencies in managing programs;

''(D) advise on the development and applicability of standards governmentwide for program management transparency; and

''(E) review the information published on the website of the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to section 1122.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of the following members:

''(i) Five members from the Office of Management and Budget as follows:

''(I) The Deputy Director for Management.

''(II) The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

''(III) The Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

''(IV) The Controller of the Office of Federal Financial Management.

''(V) The Director of the Office of Performance and Personnel Management.

''(ii) The Program Management Improvement Officer from each agency described in section 901(b).

''(iii) Other individuals as determined appropriate by the Chairperson.

''(B) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget shall be the Chairperson of the Council. A Vice Chairperson shall be elected by the members and shall serve a term of not more than 1 year.

''(ii) DUTIES.—The Chairperson shall preside at the meetings of the Council, determine the agenda of the Council, direct the work of the Council, and establish and direct subgroups of the Council as appropriate.

''(4) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet not less than twice per fiscal year and may meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Council.

''(5) SUPPORT.—The head of each agency with a Project Management Improvement Officer serving on the Council shall provide administrative support to the Council, as appropriate, at the request of the Chairperson.

''(6) COMMITTEE DURATION.—Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Council.''.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each agency described in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall submit to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget a report containing the strategy developed under section 1126(a)(2)(B) of such title, as added by paragraph (1).

(c) PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''agency'' means each agency described in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall issue regulations that—

(A) identify key skills and competencies needed for a program and project manager in an agency;

(B) establish a new job series for program and project management within an agency; and

(C) establish a new career path for program and project managers within an agency.

SA 1755. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall designate at least one city in the United States each year as an ''American World War II City''.

(b) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—After the designation made under subsection (c), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall make each designation under subsection (a) based on the following criteria:

(1) Contributions by a city to the war effort during World War II, including those related to defense manufacturing, bond drives, service in the Armed Forces, and the presence of military facilities within the city.

(2) Efforts by a city to preserve the history of the city's contributions during World War II, including through the establishment of preservation organizations or museums, restoration of World War II facilities, and recognition of World War II veterans.

(c) FIRST AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITY.—The city of Wilmington, North Carolina, is designated as an ''American World War II City''.

(d) SUNSET.—The requirements of this section shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1756. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Gambling addiction, or problem gambling, is a public health disorder characterized by increasing preoccupation with gambling, loss of control, restlessness, or irritability when attempting to stop gambling, and continuation of the gambling behavior in spite of mounting serious, negative consequences.

(2) Over 6,000,000 adults met criteria for a gambling problem in 2013.

(3) According to the National Council on Problem Gambling, it is estimated that between 36,000 and 48,000 members of the Armed Forces on active duty meet criteria for a gambling problem.

(4) The Department of Defense operates an estimated 3,000 slot machines at military installations overseas that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their families.

(5) It is estimated that these slot machines generate more than $100,000,000 in revenue for the Department of Defense, which is used for further recreational activities for members of the Armed Forces.

(6) The United States Army operates bingo games on military installations in the United States, which generate millions of dollars per year.

(7) The Department of Defense does not currently have treatment programs for members of the Armed Forces with problem gambling behaviors, although it does operate treatment programs for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction.

(8) The Department of Veterans Affairs provides behavioral addiction treatment to veterans but has limited programs directed at problem gambling.

(9) Individuals with problem gambling behavior have higher incidences of bankruptcy, domestic abuse, and suicide.

(10) People who engage in problem gambling have high rates of co-occurring substance abuse and mental health disorders.

(11) Because many veterans are often at high risk for co-occuring substance abuse and mental health disorders, it is critical that they receive adequate treatment for such disorders.

(12) The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Fifth Edition, published in May 2013) includes problem gambling as a behavioral addiction. This reflects research findings that gambling disorders are similar to substance-related disorders in clinical expression, brain origin, comorbidity, physiology, and treatment.

(b) POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO PREVENT AND TREAT GAMBLING PROBLEMS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop policies on prevention, education, and treatment of problem gambling, including the following elements:

(A) Prevention programs for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

(B) Responsible gaming education for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

(C) Establishment of a center of excellence for the residential treatment of the most severe cases of problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(D) Policy and programs to integrate problem gambling into existing mental health and substance abuse programs of the Department of Defense in order to—

(i) prevent problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and their families;

(ii) provide responsible gaming educational materials to members of the Armed Forces and their family members who gamble; and

(iii) train existing substance abuse and mental health counselors to provide treatment for problem gambling within current mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for members of the Armed Forces.

(E) Assessment of gambling problems among members of the Armed Forces, factors related to the development of such problems (including co-occurring disorders such as substance use, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, stress, and sensation seeking), and the social, health, and financial impacts of gambling on members of the Armed Forces by incorporating questions on problem gambling behavior into ongoing research efforts as appropriate, including restoring such questions into the Survey of Health Related Behaviors Among Active Duty Military Personnel conducted by the Department of Defense.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop policies on prevention, education, and treatment of problem gambling, including the following elements:

(A) Prevention programs for veterans and their dependents.

(B) Responsible gaming education for veterans and their dependents.

(C) Establishment of a center of excellence for the residential treatment of the most severe cases of problem gambling among veterans.

(D) Policy and programs to integrate problem gambling into existing mental health and substance abuse programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to—

(i) prevent problem gambling among veterans and their families;

(ii) provide responsible gaming educational materials to veterans and their family members who gamble; and

(iii) train existing substance abuse and mental health counselors to provide treatment for problem gambling within current mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for veterans.

(E) Financial counseling and related services for veterans impacted by problem gambling.

(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop the policies described in paragraph (1) and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop the policies described in paragraph (2) in coordination with the Interagency Task Force on Military and Veterans Mental Health.

(4) REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on efforts undertaken pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on efforts undertaken pursuant to paragraph (2).

(c) USE OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Of the aggregate amount collected each fiscal year by morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) facilities of the Department of Defense from the operation of slot machines and bingo games, an amount equal to one percent of such amount shall be available to the Secretary of Defense carry out the policy and programs described in subsection (b)(1)(D).

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) With respect to gambling installations (including bingo) operated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(i) the number, type, and location of such gambling installations;

(ii) the total amount of cash flow through such gambling installations;

(iii) the amount of revenue generated by such gambling installations; and

(iv) how such revenue is spent.

(B) An assessment of the prevalence of problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to address problem gambling.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1757. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Gambling addiction, or problem gambling, is a public health disorder characterized by increasing preoccupation with gambling, loss of control, restlessness, or irritability when attempting to stop gambling, and continuation of the gambling behavior in spite of mounting serious, negative consequences.

(2) Over 6,000,000 adults met criteria for a gambling problem in 2013.

(3) According to the National Council on Problem Gambling, it is estimated that between 36,000 and 48,000 members of the Armed Forces on active duty meet criteria for a gambling problem.

(4) The Department of Defense operates an estimated 3,000 slot machines at military installations overseas that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their families.

(5) It is estimated that these slot machines generate more than $100,000,000 in revenue for the Department of Defense, which is used for further recreational activities for members of the Armed Forces.

(6) The United States Army operates bingo games on military installations in the United States, which generate millions of dollars per year.

(7) The Department of Defense does not currently have treatment programs for members of the Armed Forces with problem gambling behaviors, although it does operate treatment programs for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction.

(8) Individuals with problem gambling behavior have higher incidences of bankruptcy, domestic abuse, and suicide.

(9) People who engage in problem gambling have high rates of co-occurring substance abuse and mental health disorders.

(10) Because many members of the Armed Forces and veterans are often at high risk for co-occuring substance abuse and mental health disorders, it is critical that they receive adequate treatment for such disorders.

(11) The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Fifth Edition, published in May 2013) includes problem gambling as a behavioral addiction. This reflects research findings that gambling disorders are similar to substance-related disorders in clinical expression, brain origin, comorbidity, physiology, and treatment.

(b) POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO PREVENT AND TREAT GAMBLING PROBLEMS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop policies on prevention, education, and treatment of problem gambling, including the following elements:

(A) Prevention programs for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

(B) Responsible gaming education for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

(C) Establishment of a center of excellence for the residential treatment of the most severe cases of problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(D) Policy and programs to integrate problem gambling into existing mental health and substance abuse programs of the Department of Defense in order to—

(i) prevent problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and their families;

(ii) provide responsible gaming educational materials to members of the Armed Forces and their family members who gamble; and

(iii) train existing substance abuse and mental health counselors to provide treatment for problem gambling within current mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for members of the Armed Forces.

(E) Assessment of gambling problems among members of the Armed Forces, factors related to the development of such problems (including co-occurring disorders such as substance use, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, stress, and sensation seeking), and the social, health, and financial impacts of gambling on members of the Armed Forces by incorporating questions on problem gambling behavior into ongoing research efforts as appropriate, including restoring such questions into the Survey of Health Related Behaviors Among Active Duty Military Personnel conducted by the Department of Defense.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop the policies described in paragraph (1) in coordination with the Interagency Task Force on Military and Veterans Mental Health.

(3) REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on efforts undertaken pursuant to paragraph (1).

(c) USE OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Of the aggregate amount collected each fiscal year by morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) facilities of the Department of Defense from the operation of slot machines and bingo games, an amount equal to one percent of such amount shall be available to the Secretary of Defense carry out the policy and programs described in subsection (b)(1)(D).

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) With respect to gambling installations (including bingo) operated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(i) the number, type, and location of such gambling installations;

(ii) the total amount of cash flow through such gambling installations;

(iii) the amount of revenue generated by such gambling installations; and

(iv) how such revenue is spent.

(B) An assessment of the prevalence of problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces, including recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department of Defense to address problem gambling.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1758. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1649 and insert the following:

SEC. 1649. LIMITATION ON PROVIDING CERTAIN MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF LIMITATION ON PROVIDING CERTAIN SENSITIVE MISSILE DEFENSE INFORMATION.—Section 1246(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 923), as amended by section 1243(2)(A) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3564), is further amended—

(1) by striking ''INFORMATION.—No funds'' and inserting the following: ''INFORMATION.—''(A) IN GENERAL.—No funds'';

(2) by striking ''for fiscal year 2014 or 2015'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for any fiscal year for the Department of Defense may be used to provide the Russian Federation with sensitive missile defense information or information relating to velocity at burnout of, or telemetry information on, United States missile interceptors or targets.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Russia Federation—

''(i) is complying with the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the 'Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty' or 'INF Treaty');

''(ii) has verifiably pulled its regular and irregular military forces out of Ukrainian territory, including Crimea; and

''(iii) has terminated its contract to sell the S–300 air defense system to the Islamic Republic of Iran.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to integrate in any way United States missile defense systems, including those of NATO, with missile defense systems of the Russian Federation.

SA 1759. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1242. REPORT ON USE BY IRAN OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH SANCTIONS RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the following:

(1) The monetary value of any direct or indirect forms of sanctions relief that Iran has received since the Joint Plan of Action first entered into effect.

(2) How Iran has used funds made available through sanctions relief, including the extent to which any such funds have facilitated the ability of Iran—

(A) to provide support for—

(i) any individual or entity designated for the imposition of sanctions for activities relating to international terrorism pursuant to an Executive order or by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury on or before the enactment of this Act;

(ii) any organization designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)) on or before the enactment of this Act; or

(iii) any other terrorist organization, including Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria;

(B) to advance the efforts of Iran or any other country to develop nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles overtly or covertly; or

(C) to commit any violation of the human rights of the people of Iran.

(3) The extent to which any senior officials of the Government of Iran have diverted any funds from sanctions relief into their personal accounts.

(b) FORM OF REPORTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term ''Joint Plan of Action'' means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, and the extension thereto agreed to on November 24, 2014.

SA 1760. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO DISESTABLISH SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAMS.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to—

(1) disestablish, or prepare to disestablish, a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; or

(2) close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place on probation a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with the information paper of the Department of the Army titled ''Army Senior Reserve Officers Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria'' and dated January 27, 2014, or any successor information paper or policy of the Department of the Army.

SA 1761. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of carrying out the duties described in paragraph (2), such officer shall have the title of ''Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator''.

(2) DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph (1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Coordinator shall be limited to countries that are state sponsors of terrorism and areas designated as hazardous for which hostile fire and imminent danger pay are payable to members of the Armed Forces for duty performed in such area.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in subsection (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.

(2) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DESCRIBED.—The members of Congress described in this paragraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where a hostage described in subjection (a)(1) resides.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate with a state sponsor of terrorism or an organization that the Secretary of State has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator designated under subsection (a).

(2) HOSTILE GROUP.—The term ''hostile group'' means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(3) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term ''state sponsor of terrorism''—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) includes North Korea.

SA 1762. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1664. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE ATTACKS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) An attack on the United States using an electromagnetic pulse weapon could have devastating effects on critical infrastructure and, over time, could lead to the death of millions of people of the United States.

(2) The threat of an electromagnetic pulse attack on United States non-military infrastructure remains a serious vulnerability for the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should ensure that all relevant Federal agencies have a full understanding of the electromagnetic pulse threat and are prepared for such a contingency;

(2) the United States Government should formulate and maintain a strategy to prepare and protect United States infrastructure against electromagnetic pulse events, especially attacks by hostile foreign governments, foreign terrorist organizations, or transnational criminal organizations; and

(3) relevant Federal agencies should conduct outreach to educate owners and operators of critical infrastructure, emergency planners, and emergency responders at all levels of government about the threat of electromagnetic pulse attack.

SA 1763. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FOR THE PROVISION OF RELOCATION SERVICES.

The Secretary of Defense may authorize the commander of a military base to enter into a contract with an appropriate entity for the provision of relocation services to members of the Armed Forces.

SA 1764. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FUNDING FOR THE COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF PALAU.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there are hereby authorized such sums as necessary, for fiscal years 2016 through 2023, to fully fund the compact of free association between the United States and the Republic of Palau.

SA 1765. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM FUNDING.

There is authorized to be appropriated for expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, $300,000,000.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE FROM THE ISLAND OF KAHOOLAWE.

The Secretary of Defense shall work with the appropriate officials of the State of Hawaii and the Kahoolawe Island Reserve Commission to explore options to restore funding for the removal and remediation of unexploded ordnance on the island of Kahoolawe to ensure safety on Kahoolawe. Such options may include training through the Innovative Readiness Training Program for the removal of unexploded ordnance.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PAYMENT FOR MARITIME SECURITY FLEET VESSELS.

(a) PER-VESSEL AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding section 53106(a)(1)(C) of title 46, United States Code, and subject to the availability of appropriations, there is authorized to be paid to each contractor for an operating agreement (as those terms are used in that section) for fiscal year 2016, $5,000,000 for each vessel that is covered by the operating agreement.

(b) REPEAL OF OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—Section 53111(3) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2016,''.

(c) FUNDING.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, is hereby increased by $114,000,000.

SA 1768. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COORDINATED COMMUNITY RESPONSE.

For each State or local community in which military families comprise at least 10 percent of the total population, the Secretary of Defense shall work to provide a military-civilian coordinated community response, that includes coordination with State and local law enforcement, the Family Advocacy Program of the Department of Defense, and non-profit civilian service providers, to ensure that military families experiencing domestic violence receive appropriate services from either military or civilian service providers.

SA 1769. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Excess or unutilized or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate;

(2) the property is not suitable for public access; and

(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) SUNSET.—The authority under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2017.

SA 1770. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ANNUAL REPORT ON DEFENSE CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an annual study on defense contracting fraud and submit a report containing the findings of such study to the congressional defense committees.

(b) REPORT CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include with respect to the most recent reporting period the following elements:

(1) An assessment of the total value of Department of Defense contracts entered into to with contractors that have been indicted for, settled charges of, been fined by any Federal department or agency for, or been convicted of fraud in connection with any contract or other transaction entered into with the Federal Government.

(2) Recommendations by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or other appropriate Department of Defense official regarding how to penalize contractors repeatedly involved in fraud in connection with contracts or other transactions entered into with the Federal Government, including an update on implementation by the Department of any previous such recommendations.

SA 1771. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REINSTATEMENT OF OVERNIGHT SERVICE STANDARDS.

During the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service shall apply the service standards for first-class mail and periodicals under part 121 of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, that were in effect on July 1, 2012.

SA 1772. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 844. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BERRY-COMPLIANT FOOTWEAR.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, expedite the purchase of and availability to enlisted initial entrants of the United States Armed Forces, either as an in-kind issue or by cash allowance, such Berry Amendment-compliant athletic footwear as has been qualified for use during initial entrant training to the exclusion of similar non-Berry-compliant footwear.

SA 1773. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT OF REDUCTION OF SURVIVOR BENEFITS PLAN SURVIVOR ANNUITIES BY DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) In section 1450, by striking subsection (c).

(B) In section 1451(c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such subchapter is further amended as follows:

(A) In section 1450—

(i) by striking subsection (e);

(ii) by striking subsection (k); and

(iii) by striking subsection (m).

(B) In section 1451(g)(1), by striking subparagraph (C).

(C) In section 1452—

(i) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''does not apply—'' and all that follows and inserting ''does not apply in the case of a deduction made through administrative error.''; and

(ii) by striking subsection (g).

(D) In section 1455(c), by striking '', 1450(k)(2),''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON RETROACTIVE BENEFITS.—No benefits may be paid to any person for any period before the effective date provided under subsection (f) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a).

(c) PROHIBITION ON RECOUPMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS PREVIOUSLY REFUNDED TO SBP RECIPIENTS.—A surviving spouse who is or has been in receipt of an annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan under subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, that is in effect before the effective date provided under subsection (f) and that is adjusted by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) and who has received a refund of retired pay under section 1450(e) of title 10, United States Code, shall not be required to repay such refund to the United States.

(d) REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR OPTIONAL ANNUITY FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Section 1448(d) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Except as provided in paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary concerned'' and inserting ''The Secretary concerned''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—'' and all that follows through ''In the case of a member described in paragraph (1),'' and inserting ''DEPENDENT CHILDREN ANNUITY WHEN NO ELIGIBLE SURVIVING SPOUSE.—In the case of a member described in paragraph (1),''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(e) RESTORATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PREVIOUSLY ELIGIBLE SPOUSES.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall restore annuity eligibility to any eligible surviving spouse who, in consultation with the Secretary, previously elected to transfer payment of such annuity to a surviving child or children under the provisions of section 1448(d)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the effective date provided under subsection (f). Such eligibility shall be restored whether or not payment to such child or children subsequently was terminated due to loss of dependent status or death. For the purposes of this subsection, an eligible spouse includes a spouse who was previously eligible for payment of such annuity and is not remarried, or remarried after having attained age 55, or whose second or subsequent marriage has been terminated by death, divorce or annulment.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The sections and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the later of—

(1) the first day of the first month that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the first day of the fiscal year that begins in the calendar year in which this Act is enacted.

SA 1774. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO LOSE THEIR RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY FOR REASONS OTHER THAN DEPENDENT ABUSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Families Serve, Too, Military Justice Reform Act of 2015''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (j), (k), and (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

''(i) BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS LOSING RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY FOR MISCONDUCT OTHER THAN DEPENDENT ABUSE.—(1)(A) If, in the case of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), a court order provides (in the manner applicable to a division of property) for the payment of an amount from the disposable retired pay of that member or former member (as certified under paragraph (4)) to an eligible spouse or former spouse of that member or former member, the Secretary concerned, beginning upon effective service of such court order, shall pay that amount in accordance with this subsection to such spouse or former spouse.

''(B) If, in the case of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), a court order provides for the payment as child support of an amount from the disposable retired pay of that member or former member (as certified under paragraph (4)) to an eligible dependent child of the member or former member, the Secretary concerned, beginning upon effective service of such court order, shall pay that amount in accordance with this subsection to such dependent child.

''(2) A spouse or former spouse, or a dependent child, of a member or former member of the armed forces is eligible to receive payment under this subsection if—

''(A) the member or former member, while a member of the armed forces and after becoming eligible to be retired from the armed forces on the basis of years of service, has eligibility to receive retired pay terminated as a result of misconduct while a member (other than misconduct described in subsection (h)(2)(A));

''(B) in the case of eligibility of a spouse or former spouse under paragraph (1)(A), the spouse or former spouse—

''(i) either—

''(I) was married to the member or former member at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(II) was is receipt of marital support, alimony, or child support from the member or former member as of the time of the misconduct pursuant to a court order; and

''(ii) was not, based on the evidence adduced at trial, an aider, abettor, accomplice, or co-conspirator in the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay, as certified in writing to the convening authority by—

''(I) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(II) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority; and

''(C) in the case of eligibility of a dependent child under paragraph (1)(B), the dependent child—

''(i) had not reached the age of 16 years at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(ii) had reached the age of 16 years at the time of the misconduct and was not, based on the evidence adduced at trial, an aider, abettor, accomplice, or co-conspirator in the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay, as certified in writing to the convening authority by—

''(I) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(II) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority.

''(3) The amount certified by the Secretary concerned under paragraph (4) with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A) shall be deemed to be the disposable retired pay of that member or former member for the purposes of this subsection.

''(4) Upon the request of a court or an eligible spouse or former spouse, or an eligible dependent child, of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A) in connection with a civil action for the issuance of a court order in the case of that member or former member, the Secretary concerned shall determine and certify the amount of the monthly retired

pay that the member or former member would have been entitled to receive as of the date of the certification—

''(A) if the member or former member's eligibility for retired pay had not been terminated as described in paragraph (2)(A); and

''(B) if, in the case of a member or former member not in receipt of retired pay immediately before that termination of eligibility for retired pay, the member or former member had retired on the effective date of that termination of eligibility.

''(5)(A) Paragraphs (5) through (8) and (10) of subsection (h) shall apply to eligibility of former spouses to payments under this subsection, court orders for the payment of disposable retired pay under this subsection, amounts payable under this subsection, and payments under this subsection in the same manner as such paragraphs apply to such matters under subsection (h).

''(B) If a spouse or former spouse or a dependent child eligible or entitled to receive payments under this subsection is eligible or entitled to receive benefits under subsection (h), the eligibility or entitlement of that spouse or former spouse or dependent child to such benefits shall be determined under subsection (h) instead of this subsection.

''(6)(A) A spouse or former spouse of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), while receiving payments in accordance with this subsection, shall be entitled to receive medical and dental care, to use commissary and exchange stores, and to receive any other benefit that a spouse or a former spouse of a retired member of the armed forces is entitled to receive on the basis of being a spouse or former spouse, as the case may be, of a retired member of the armed forces in the same manner as if the member or former member referred to in paragraph (2)(A) was entitled to retired pay.

''(B) A dependent child of a member or former member referred to in paragraph (2)(A) who was a member of the household of the member or former member at the time of the misconduct described in paragraph (2)(A) shall be entitled to receive medical and dental care, to use commissary and exchange stores, and to have other benefits provided to dependents of retired members of the armed forces in the same manner as if the member or former member referred to in paragraph (2)(A) was entitled to retired pay.

''(C) If a spouse or former spouse or a dependent child eligible or entitled to receive a particular benefit under this paragraph is eligible or entitled to receive that benefit under another provision of law, the eligibility or entitlement of that spouse or former spouse or dependent child to such benefit shall be determined under such other provision of law instead of this paragraph.

''(7) In this subsection, the term 'dependent child', with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), has the meaning given that term in subsection (h)(11).''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking ''subsection (i)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (j)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to a spouse or former spouse, or a dependent child of a member or former member of the Armed Forces whose eligibility to receive retired pay is terminated on or after that date as a result of misconduct while a member.

SA 1775. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REQUIREMENT THAT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS POST REPORTS ON THE INTERNET WEBSITE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Section 312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) Whenever the Inspector General submits to the Secretary a report or audit (or any portion of any report or audit) in final form, the Inspector General shall, not later than 3 days after such submittal, post such report or audit (or portion of report or audit), as the case may be, on the Internet website of the Inspector General.

''(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information that is prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law.''.

SA 1776. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. QUALIFICATIONS FOR ENLISTMENT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ADDITIONAL QUALIFIED PERSONS.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 504 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) A person who, at the time of enlistment in an armed force, has resided continuously in a lawful status in the United States for at least two years.

''(D) A person who, at the time of enlistment in an armed force, possesses an employment authorization document issued by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services under the requirements of the Department of Homeland Security policy entitled 'Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals' (DACA).''.

(b) ADMISSION TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF CERTAIN ENLISTEES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) ADMISSION TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF CERTAIN ENLISTEES.—(1) A person described in subsection (b) who, at the time of enlistment in an armed force, is not a citizen or other national of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be adjusted to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under the provisions of section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1259), except that the alien need not—

''(A) establish that he or she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1972; and

''(B) comply with section 212(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(e)).

''(2) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall rescind the lawful permanent resident status of a person whose status was adjusted under paragraph (1) if the person is separated from the armed forces under other than honorable conditions before the person served for a period or periods aggregating five years. Such grounds for rescission are in addition to any other provided by law. The fact that the person was separated from the armed forces under other than honorable conditions shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the armed force in which the person last served. The service of the person in the armed forces shall be proved by duly authenticated copies of the service records of the person.

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter the process prescribed by sections 328, 329, and 329A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439, 1440, 1440–1) by which a person may naturalize through service in the armed forces.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 504. Persons not qualified; citizenship or residency requirements; exceptions''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 504 and inserting the following new item:

''504. Persons not qualified; citizenship or residency requirements; exceptions.''.

SEC. 525. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS HAVING SATISFIED ENGLISH AND CIVICS, GOOD MORAL CHARACTER, AND HONORABLE SERVICE AND DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURALIZATION.

(a) IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—The Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 329A (8 U.S.C. 1440–1) the following:

''SEC. 329B. PERSONS WHO HAVE RECEIVED AN AWARD FOR ENGAGEMENT IN ACTIVE COMBAT OR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN COMBAT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of naturalization and continuing citizenship under the following provisions of law, a person who has received an award described in subsection (b) shall be treated—

''(A) as having satisfied the requirements under sections 312(a) and 316(a)(3), and subsections (b)(3), (c), and (e) of section 328; and

''(B) except as provided in paragraph (2), under sections 328 and 329—

''(i) as having served honorably in the Armed Forces for (in the case of section 328) a period or periods aggregating 1 year; and

''(ii) if separated from such service, as having been separated under honorable conditions.

''(2) REVOCATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), any person who separated from the Armed Forces under other than honorable conditions may be subject to revocation of citizenship under section 328(f) or 329(c) if the other requirements under such section are met.

''(b) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply with respect to the following awards from the Armed Forces of the United States:

''(1) The Combat Infantryman Badge from the Army.

''(2) The Combat Medical Badge from the Army.

''(3) The Combat Action Badge from the Army.

''(4) The Combat Action Ribbon from the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard.

''(5) The Air Force Combat Action Medal.

''(6) Any other award that the Secretary of Defense determines to be an equivalent award for engagement in active combat or active participation in combat.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 329A the following:

''Sec. 329B. Persons who have received an award for engagement in active combat or active participation in combat.''.

SA 1777. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 213, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(3) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless—

(A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station;

(B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing; or

(C) the member and the member's spouse change residence from the residence as of that date.

SA 1778. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 607, strike ''submit to the congressional defense committees'' and insert '', in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, submit to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives''.

SA 1779. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 682, beginning on line 8, strike ''Committees'' and all that follows through line 11 and insert the following: ''Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the policy developed pursuant to subsection (a).''.

SA 1780. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of bill, add the following:

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016''.

SEC. 5002. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of State.

(3) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.—The term ''peacekeeping credits'' means the amounts by which United States assessed peacekeeping contributions exceed actual expenditures, apportioned to the United States, of peacekeeping operations by the United Nations during a United Nations peacekeeping fiscal year.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5101. ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

SEC. 5102. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

SEC. 5103. CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Basic Authorities and Activities

SEC. 5201. AMERICAN SPACES REVIEW.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) the full costs incurred by the Department to provide American Spaces, including—

(A) American Centers, American Corners, Binational Centers, Information Resource Centers, and Science Centers; and

(B) the total costs of all associated—

(i) employee salaries, including foreign service, American civilian, and locally employed staff;

(ii) programming expenses;

(iii) operating expenses;

(iv) contracting expenses; and

(v) security expenses;

(2) a breakdown of the total costs described in paragraph (1) by each space and type of space;

(3) the total fees collected for entry to, or the use of, American Spaces and related resources, including a breakdown by the type of fee for each space and type of space; and

(4) the total usage rates, including by type of service, for each space and type of space.

SEC. 5202. IDENTIFYING BILATERAL INVESTMENT TREATY OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a detailed description of—

(1) the status of all ongoing investment treaty negotiations, including a strategy and timetable for concluding each such negotiation;

(2) a strategy to expand the investment treaty agenda, including through—

(A) launching new investment treaty negotiations with foreign partners that are currently capable of entering in such negotiations; and

(B) building the capacity of foreign partners to enter into such negotiations, including by encouraging the adoption of best practices with respect to investment; and

(3) any resources that will be needed, including anticipated staffing levels—

(A) to conclude all ongoing negotiations described in paragraph (1);

(B) to launch new investment treaty negotiations, as described in paragraph (2)(A); and

(C) to build the capacity of foreign partners, as described in paragraph (2)(B).

SEC. 5203. REINSTATEMENT OF HONG KONG REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2020, the Secretary shall submit the report required under section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731) to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—The report submitted under subsection (a) should be unclassified and made publicly available, including through the Department's public website.

SEC. 5204. UNITED STATES-CHINA STRATEGIC AND ECONOMIC DIALOGUE REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, and in consultation with other appropriate departments and agencies, shall—

(1) conduct a review of the United States-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (referred to in this section as the ''Dialogue''); and

(2) and submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the findings of such review.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report described in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all commitments agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings;

(2) an assessment of the status of each commitment agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings, including a detailed description of—

(A) any actions that have been taken with respect to such commitments;

(B) any aspects of such commitments that remain unfulfilled; and

(C) any actions that remain necessary to fulfill any unfulfilled commitments described in subparagraph (B);

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities in the bilateral relationship including—

(A) the security situation in the East and South China Seas, including a peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the region;

(B) denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula;

(C) cyber theft of United States intellectual property;

(D) the treatment of political dissidents, media representatives, and ethnic and religious minorities;

(E) reciprocal treatment of United States journalists and academics in China, including issuance of visas;

(F) expanding investment and trade opportunities for United States businesses;

(G) repatriation of North Korean refugees from China to North Korea; and

(H) promoting and protecting rule of law and democratic institutions in Hong Kong; and

(4) recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities described in paragraph (3), including consideration of the use of pre-determined benchmarks for assessing whether the commitments achieved are significantly furthering such priorities.

SEC. 5205. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN BURMA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(1) describes in detail all known widespread or systematic civil or political rights violations, including violations that may constitute crimes against humanity against ethnic, racial, or religious minorities in Burma, including the Rohingya people; and

(2) provides recommendations for holding perpetrators of the violations described in paragraph (1) accountable for their actions.

SEC. 5206. COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, $500,000 shall be made available to the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor to support efforts by American and European Jewish and other civil society organizations, focusing on youth, to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of religious, ethnic, or racial intolerance in Europe.

SEC. 5207. BIOTECHNOLOGY GRANTS.

Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 63. BIOTECHNOLOGY GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State is authorized to support, through grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, outreach, and public diplomacy activities, activities promoting the benefits of agricultural biotechnology, biofuels, science-based regulatory systems, and the application of such technologies for trade and development.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The total amount of grants and other assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed $500,000 in any fiscal year.''.

SEC. 5208. DEFINITION OF "USE" IN PASSPORT AND VISA OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 1541 the following:

"SEC. 1540. DEFINITION OF 'USE' AND 'USES'.

''In this chapter, the terms 'use' and 'uses' shall be given their plain meaning, which shall include use for identification purposes.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 1541 the following:

''1540. Definition of 'use' and 'uses'.''.

SEC. 5209. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIPS.

Section 504 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1979 (22 U.S.C. 2656d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS RELATED TO SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements for science and technology fellowship programs of the Department of State.

''(2) RECRUITMENT; STIPENDS.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) may be used—

''(A) to recruit fellows; and

''(B) to pay stipends, travel, and other appropriate expenses to fellows.

''(3) CLASSIFICATION OF STIPENDS.—Stipends paid under paragraph (2)(B) shall not be considered compensation for purposes of section 209 of title 18, United States Code.

''(4) LIMITATION.—The total amount of assistance provided under this subsection may not exceed $500,000 in any fiscal year.''.

SEC. 5210. NAME CHANGES.

(a) PUBLIC LAW 87–195.—Section 607(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357(d)) is amended by striking ''Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs'' and inserting ''Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science''.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 88–206.—Section 617(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671p(a)) is amended by striking ''Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs'' and inserting ''Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science''.

(c) PUBLIC LAW 93–126.—Section 9(a) of the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2655a) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs'' and inserting ''Bureau of Oceans, Environment, and Science''; and

(2) by striking ''Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs'' and inserting ''Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science''.

(d) PUBLIC LAW 106–113.—Section 1112(a) of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2652c(a)) is amended by striking ''Verification and Compliance.'' and inserting ''Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance (referred to in this section as the 'Assistant Secretary').''.

SEC. 5211. ANTI-PIRACY INFORMATION SHARING.

The Secretary is authorized to provide for the participation of the United States in the Information Sharing Centre located in Singapore, as established by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships in Asia, done at Singapore November 11, 2004.

SEC. 5212. REPORT REFORM.

(a) HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.—Section 549 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347h) is repealed.

(b) ROUGH DIAMONDS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 12 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 3911) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. REPORTS.

''For each country that, during the preceding 12-month period, exported rough diamonds to the United States and was exporting rough diamonds not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, if the failure to do so has significantly increased the likelihood that those diamonds not so controlled are being imported into the United States, the President shall submit a semi-annual report to Congress that explains what actions have been taken by the United States or such country since the previous report to ensure that diamonds, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, are not being imported from that country into the United States. A country shall be included in the report required under this section until the country is controlling the importation and exportation of rough diamonds through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme.''.

Subtitle B—Additional Matters

SEC. 5221. ATROCITIES PREVENTION BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President is authorized to establish, within the Executive Office of the President, an Interagency Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this section as the ''Board'').

(b) DUTIES.—The Board is authorized—

(1) to coordinate an interagency approach to preventing mass atrocities;

(2)(A) to propose policies to integrate the early warning systems of national security agencies, including intelligence agencies, with respect to incidents of mass atrocities; and

(B) to coordinate the policy response to such incidents;

(3) to identify relevant Federal agencies, which shall track and report on Federal funding spent on atrocity prevention efforts;

(4) to oversee the development and implementation of comprehensive atrocities prevention and response strategies;

(5) to identify available resources and policy options necessary to prevent the emergence or escalation of mass atrocities;

(6) to identify and propose policies to close gaps in expertise, readiness, and planning for atrocities prevention and early action across Federal agencies, including training for employees at relevant Federal agencies;

(7) to engage relevant civil society and nongovernmental organization stakeholders in regular consultations to solicit current information on countries of concern; and

(8) to conduct an atrocity-specific expert review of policy and programming of all countries at risk for mass atrocities.

(c) LEADERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be headed by a Senior Director, who—

(A) shall be appointed by the President; and

(B) shall report to the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Senior Director shall have primary responsibility for—

(A) recommending and promoting United States Government policies on preventing mass atrocities; and

(B) carrying out the duties described in subsection (b).

(d) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of—

(1) representatives from—

(A) the Department of State;

(B) the United States Agency for International Development;

(C) the Department of Defense;

(D) the Department of Justice;

(E) the Department of the Treasury;

(F) the Department of Homeland Security;

(G) the Central Intelligence Agency;

(H) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;

(I) the United States Mission to the United Nations; and

(J) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) such other individuals as the President may appoint.

(e) COORDINATION.—The Board is authorized to coordinate with relevant officials and government agencies responsible for foreign policy with respect to particular regions and countries to help provide a cohesive, whole of government response and policy direction to emerging and ongoing atrocities.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a classified report, with an unclassified annex, which shall include—

(1) an update on the interagency review mandated by Presidential Study Directive 10 that includes—

(A) an evaluation of current mechanisms and capacities for government-wide detection, early warning, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination of efforts to prevent and respond to situations of genocide, mass atrocities, and other mass violence, including such mass gender- and ethnicity-based violence;

(B) an assessment of the funding spent by relevant Federal agencies on atrocity prevention activities;

(C) current annual global assessments of sources of conflict and instability;

(D) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities to improve the mechanisms described in subparagraph (A); and

(E) evaluations of the various approaches to enhancing capabilities and improving the mechanisms described in subparagraph (A);

(2) recommendations to ensure burden sharing by—

(A) improving international cooperation and coordination to enhance multilateral mechanisms for preventing genocide and atrocities, including improving the role of regional and international organizations in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening regional organizations; and

(3) the implementation status of the recommendations contained in the interagency review described in paragraph (1).

(g) MATERIALS AND BRIEFINGS.—The Senior Director and the members of the Board shall brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives at least annually.

(h) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective on June 30, 2017.

SEC. 5222. UNITED STATES ENGAGEMENT IN THE INDO-PACIFIC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a comprehensive assessment to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States engagement in the Indo-Pacific, including with partners across the Indo-Pacific region.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of current and emerging United States diplomatic, national security, and economic interests and trends in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) a review of resources devoted to United States diplomatic, economic, trade, development, and cultural engagement and plans in the Indo-Pacific region during the 10-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) options for the realignment of United States engagement in the Indo-Pacific region to respond to new opportunities and challenges, including linking United States strategy more broadly across the Indo-Pacific region; and

(4) the views of noted policy leaders and regional experts, including leaders and experts in the Indo-Pacific region, on the opportunities and challenges to United States engagement across the Indo-Pacific region.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary, as appropriate, shall consult with—

(1) other United States Government agencies; and

(2) independent, nongovernmental organizations with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and international economic affairs that have access to policy experts throughout the United States and from the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 5223. JOINT ACTION PLAN TO COMBAT PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION AND TO FOSTER INCLUSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to enter into a bilateral joint action plan with the European Union to combat prejudice and discrimination and to foster inclusion (referred to in this section as the ''Joint Action Plan'').

(b) CONTENTS OF JOINT ACTION PLAN.—The Joint Action Plan shall—

(1) address anti-Semitism;

(2) address prejudice against, and the discriminatory treatment of, racial, ethnic, and religious minorities;

(3) promote equality of opportunity for access to quality education and economic opportunities; and

(4) promote equal treatment by the justice system.

(c) COOPERATION.—In developing the Joint Action Plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) leverage interagency policy expertise in the United States and Europe;

(2) develop partnerships among civil society and private sector stakeholders; and

(3) draw upon the extensive work done by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe to address anti-Semitism.

(d) INITIATIVES.—The Joint Action Plan may include initiatives for promoting equality of opportunity and methods of eliminating prejudice and discrimination based on religion, race, or ethnicity, including—

(1) training programs;

(2) regional initiatives to promote equality of opportunity through the strengthening of democratic institutions;

(3) public-private partnerships with enterprises and nongovernmental organizations;

(4) exchanges of technical experts;

(5) scholarships and fellowships; and

(6) political empowerment and leadership initiatives.

(e) DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall delegate, to a Deputy Assistant Secretary, the responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the Joint Action Plan with his or her European Union counterpart.

(f) LEGAL EFFECTS.—Any Joint Action Plan adopted under this section—

(1) shall not be legally binding; and

(2) shall create no rights or obligations under international or United States law.

(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize—

(1) the Secretary to enter into a legally binding agreement or Joint Action Plan with the European Union; or

(2) any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives described in this section.

(h) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a progress report on the development of the Joint Action Plan to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5224. REPORT ON DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEBT SUSTAINABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Treasury, shall submit a report containing an assessment of the current external debt environment for developing countries and identifying particular short-term risks to debt sustainability to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees;

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENT.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall assess—

(1) the impact of new lending relationships, including the role of new creditors;

(2) the adequacy of current multilateral surveillance mechanisms in guarding against debt distress in developing countries;

(3) the ability of developing countries to borrow on global capital markets; and

(4) the interaction between debt sustainability objectives of the developing world and the development-oriented investment agenda of the G–20, including the impact of—

(A) current debt sustainability objectives on investment in developing countries; and

(B) investment objectives proposed by the G–20 on the ability to meet the goals of—

(i) the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative; and

(ii) the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.

TITLE III—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Subtitle A—Organizational Matters

SEC. 5301. RIGHTSIZING ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 60 days of receipt of rightsizing recommendations pursuant to a review conducted by the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation relating to overseas staffing levels at United States overseas posts, the relevant chief of mission, in coordination with the relevant regional bureau, shall provide to the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation, a response describing—

(1) any rightsizing recommendations that are accepted by such chief of mission and regional bureau;

(2) a detailed schedule for implementation of any such recommendations;

(3) any recommendations that are rejected; and

(4) a detailed justification providing the basis for the rejection of any such recommendations.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall report annually to the appropriate congressional committees, at the time of submission of the President's annual budget request to Congress, on the status of all rightsizing recommendations and responses described in subsection (a) from the preceding five years, to include the following:

(1) A list of all such rightsizing recommendations made, including whether each such recommendation was accepted or rejected by the relevant chief of mission and regional bureau.

(2) For any accepted recommendations, a detailed description of the current status of its implementation according to the schedule provided pursuant to subsection (a)(2), including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, such schedule.

(3) For any rejected recommendations, the justification provided pursuant to subsection (a)(4).

(c) REPORT ON REGIONAL BUREAU STAFFING.—The Secretary shall provide an annual report accompanying the report required by subsection (b) that provides—

(1) an enumeration of the domestic staff positions in each regional bureau of the Department;

(2) a detailed explanation of the extent to which the staffing of each regional bureau reflects the overseas requirements of the United States within each such region;

(3) if the Secretary determines there are any significant imbalances in staffing among regional bureaus or between any regional bureau and the overseas requirements of the United States within such region such that staffing does not reflect the foreign policy priorities of the United States or the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States, a detailed plan for how the Department will seek to rectify any such imbalances, including a schedule for implementation; and

(4) a detailed description of the current status of implementation of any plan provided pursuant to paragraph (3) according to the schedule provided pursuant to such paragraph, including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, such schedule.

SEC. 5302. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, with the assistance of the Undersecretary of Economic Growth, Energy and the Environment, shall establish foreign economic policy priorities for each regional bureau, including for individual countries as appropriate, and shall establish policies and guidance for the purpose of integrating such foreign economic policy priorities throughout the Department.

(b) TASKING OF DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Within each regional bureau of the Department, the Secretary shall task a Deputy Assistant Secretary, having appropriate training and background in economic and commercial affairs, with responsibility for consideration of economic matters and interests within the responsibilities of such regional bureau, including the integration of the foreign economic policy priorities established pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COORDINATION.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary tasked with responsibility for economic matters and interests pursuant to subsection (b) within each bureau shall—

(1) at the direction of the relevant Assistant Secretary, review and report to the Assistant Secretary of such bureau on all economic matters and interests; and

(2) serve as liaison with the office of the Undersecretary for Economic Growth.

SEC. 5303. REVIEW OF BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS JURISDICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, conduct a review of jurisdictional responsibility of the Bureau of African Affairs and that of the Bureau for Near Eastern Affairs as it specifically relates to the North African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya, and report the findings of the review to the appropriate congressional committees, including recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility among such bureaus should be adjusted.

(b) REVIEW.—The review required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify regional strategic priorities;

(2) assess regional dynamics between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions, including the degree to which the priorities identified pursuant to paragraph (1) are distinct between each such region, or have similar application across such regions;

(3) identify current priorities and effectiveness of United States Government regional engagement in North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa, including through security assistance, economic assistance, humanitarian assistance, and trade,

(4) assess the degree to which such engagement is inefficient, duplicative, or uncoordinated between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions, or is otherwise harmed or limited as a result of the current division of jurisdictional responsibilities;

(5) assess the overall coherence and effectiveness of the current division of jurisdictional responsibilities in Africa between the Bureau of African Affairs and the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, including with regard to coordination with other United States departments or agencies; and

(6) assess any opportunities and costs in transferring jurisdictional responsibility of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya from the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to the Bureau of African Affairs.

SEC. 5304. SPECIAL ENVOYS, REPRESENTATIVES, ADVISORS, AND COORDINATORS.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on special envoys, representatives, advisors, and coordinators of the Department, which shall include at minimum the following elements:

(1) A tabulation of the current names, ranks, positions, and responsibilities of all special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, including with a category for all such positions at the level of assistant secretary equivalent or above.

(2) For each position identified pursuant to the requirements of this section—

(A) the date the position was created;

(B) the mechanism by which the position was created, including the authority pursuant to which the position was created;

(C) the positions identified as authorized pursuant to section 1(d) of the Basic Authorities Act (22 U.S.C. 2651a(d));

(D) a description of whether and the extent to which the responsibilities assigned the position duplicate the responsibilities of other current officials within the Department, including of other special envoys, representatives and advisors;

(E) which current official within the Department would be assigned the responsibilities of the position in the absence of the position;

(F) to which current official within the Department the position directly reports;

(G) the total number of staff assigned to support the position; and

(H) with the exception of those created by statute, a detailed explanation of the necessity of the position to the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States.

SEC. 5305. CONFLICT PREVENTION, MITIGATION AND RESOLUTION, AND THE INCLUSION AND PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN.

Section 704 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4024) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall ensure that all appropriate personnel responsible for, or deploying to, countries or regions considered to be at risk of, undergoing, or emerging from violent conflict, including special envoys, members of mediation or negotiation teams, relevant members of the Civil Service or Foreign Service and contractors, obtain training, as appropriate, in the following areas, each of which shall include a focus on women and ensuring women's meaningful inclusion and participation—

''(1) conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution;

''(2) protecting civilians from violence, exploitation, and trafficking in persons; and

''(3) international human rights law and international humanitarian law.''.

SEC. 5306. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall regularly consult the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate regarding the security of United States government and non-government information technology systems and networks owned, operated, managed, or utilized by the Department, including any such systems or networks facilitating the use of sensitive or classified information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In performing the consultations required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make all such systems and networks available to the Director of the National Security Agency and any other such departments or agencies to carry out such tests and procedures as are necessary to ensure adequate policies and protections are in place to prevent penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or other entity.

(c) SECURITY BREACH REPORTING.—Beginning not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall provide a report, in consultation with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate, to the appropriate committees of Congress describing in detail all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of the systems and networks described in subsection (a) facilitating the use of classified information and all known or suspected significant penetrations or compromises of any other such systems and networks that occurred since the time of such prior report.

(d) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (c) shall include—

(1) a description of the relevant information technology system or network penetrated or compromised;

(2) an assessment of the date and time such penetration or compromise occurred;

(3) an assessment of the duration for which such system or network was penetrated or compromised, including whether such penetration or compromise is ongoing;

(4) an assessment of the amount and sensitivity of information accessed and available to have been accessed by such penetration or compromise, including any such information contained on systems and networks owned, operated, managed, or utilized by any other United States Government department or agency;

(5) an assessment of whether such system or network was penetrated by a malicious intrusion, including an assessment of—

(A) the known or suspected perpetrators, including state actors;

(B) the methods used to conduct such penetration or compromise; and

(6) a description of the actions the Department has taken or plans to take to prevent future, similar penetrations, or compromises of such systems and networks.

SEC. 5307. ANALYSIS OF EMBASSY COST SHARING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that assesses the cost-effectiveness and performance of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system (referred to in this section as the ''ICASS system''), including by assessing—

(1) the general performance of the ICASS system in providing cost-effective, timely, efficient, appropriate, and reliable services that meet the needs of all departments and agencies served;

(2) the extent to which additional cost savings and greater performance can be

achieved under the current ICASS system and rules;

(3) the standards applied in the selection of the ICASS provider and the extent to which such standards are consistently applied;

(4) potential reforms to the ICASS system, including—

(A) the selection of more than one service provider under certain circumstances;

(B) options for all departments or agencies to opt out of ICASS entirely or to opt out of individual services, including by debundling service packages;

(C) increasing the reliance on locally employed staff or outsourcing to local firms where appropriate; and

(D) other modifications to the current ICASS system and rules that would incentivize greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

SEC. 5308. PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

Section 433(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 241(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION..—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction.

''(A) COMPOSITION.—The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

''(i) the Department of State;

''(ii) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(iii) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(B) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall convene an advisory committee to the interagency working group established pursuant to subparagraph (A) for the duration of the working group's existence, which shall be composed of not less than three left-behind parents selected by the Secretary, serving for two-year terms, and which shall periodically consult with such advisory committee on all activities of the interagency working group, as appropriate.''.

SEC. 5309. IMPROVING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct regular research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities of the Department including through the routine use of audience research, digital analytics, and impact evaluations to plan and execute such programs and activities, and shall make available to Congress the research and evaluations conducted pursuant to this section.

(b) DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint a Director of Research and Evaluation in the Office of Policy, Planning and Resources for the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of a Director of Research and Evaluation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not result in an increase in the overall full-time equivalent positions within the Department.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director of Research and Evaluation, as appointed in accordance with this subsection, shall—

(A) coordinate and oversee the research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs of the Department in order to improve public diplomacy strategies and tactics and ensure programs are increasing the knowledge, understanding, and trust of the United States by relevant target audiences;

(B) report to the Director of Policy and Planning;

(C) routinely organize and oversee audience research, digital analytics and impact evaluations across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department;

(D) support embassy public affairs sections;

(E) share appropriate public diplomacy research and evaluation information within the State Department and with other departments and agencies;

(F) regularly design and coordinate standardized research questions, methodologies, and procedures to ensure that public diplomacy activities across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices are designed to meet appropriate foreign policy objectives; and

(G) report quarterly to the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, through the Commission's Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation established pursuant to subsection (c), regarding the research and evaluation of all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(4) [NEED HEADER].—Not later than 180 days after appointment pursuant to paragraph (1), the Director of Research and Evaluation shall create guidance and training for all public diplomacy officers regarding the reading and interpretation of public diplomacy program evaluation findings to ensure that such findings and lessons learned are implemented in the planning and evaluation of all public diplomacy programs and activities throughout the Department.

(c) PRIORITIZING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of Policy, Planning, and Resources shall ensure that research and evaluation, as coordinated and overseen by the Director of Research and Evaluation, supports strategic planning and resource allocation across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(2) ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.—Funds allocated for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities pursuant to the requirements of subsection (a) shall be made available to be disbursed at the direction of the Director of Research and Evaluation among the research and evaluation staff across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department should allocate, for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy activities and programs pursuant to the requirements of subsection (a), three to five percent of program funds made available for Educational and Cultural Exchange programs and three to five percent of program funds allocated for public diplomacy programs within Diplomatic and Consular Programs. (e) Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.

(4) SUBCOMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—The Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy shall establish a Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation to monitor and advise on the research and evaluation activities of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(5) REPORT.—The Subcommittee established under paragraph (1) shall report annually to Congress in the Commission's Comprehensive Annual Report on the performance of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors in carrying out research and evaluations of their respective public diplomacy programming.

(6) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking ''October 1, 2015'' and inserting ''October 1, 2020''.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AUDIENCE RESEARCH.—The term ''audience research'' means research conducted at the outset of public diplomacy program or campaign planning and design on specific audience segments to understand the attitudes, interests, knowledge and behaviors of such audience segments.

(2) DIGITAL ANALYTICS.—The term ''digital analytics'' means the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, accumulated in digital format, to indicate the outputs and outcomes of a public diplomacy program or campaign.

(3) IMPACT EVALUATION.—The term ''impact evaluation'' means an assessment of the changes in the audience targeted by a public diplomacy program or campaign that can be attributed to such program or campaign.

Subtitle B—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5321. REVIEW OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall commission an independent assessment of Foreign Service Officer compensation to ensure that such compensation is achieving its purposes and the goals of the Department, including to recruit, retain, and maintain the world's premier diplomatic corps.

(b) REPORT.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall be completed and submitted as a report to the appropriate congressional committees, accompanied by the views of the Secretary, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

(c) CONTENT.—The report required by subsection (b) shall include at minimum the following elements:

(1) A list of all compensation received by Foreign Service Officers assigned domestically or overseas, including base salary and benefits, allowances, differentials, or incentives.

(2) For each such form of compensation described in paragraph (1)—

(A) an explanation of its stated purpose;

(B) a description of all relevant authorities, including statutory authority; and

(C) an assessment of the degree to which its use matches its stated purpose.

(3) An assessment of the effectiveness of each such form of compensation in—

(A) achieving its stated purpose;

(B) achieving the recruiting and retention goals of the Department; and

(C) achieving the assignment placement needs of the Department.

SEC. 5322. REPEAL OF RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE.

Section 305(d) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3945(d)) is hereby repealed.

SEC. _5323. COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR TRAVEL.

Section 5550b of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) The maximum amount of compensatory time off earned under this section may not exceed 104 hours during any leave year (as defined by regulations of the Office of Personnel Management).''.

SEC. 5324. CERTIFICATES OF DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE.

The President shall make the report required in Sec. 304(a)(4) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3944) available to the public, including by posting it on the Internet website of the Department in a conspicuous manner and location within 7 days after having been submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 5325. FOREIGN SERVICE ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTIONS.

(a) APPEAL OF ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTION.—The Secretary shall establish a right and

process for employees to appeal any assignment restriction or preclusion.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide a certification to the appropriate congressional committees upon full implementation of a right and process to appeal an assignment restriction or preclusion accompanied by a written report that provides a detailed description of such process.

(c) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall publish the right and process established pursuant to subsection (a) in the Foreign Affairs Manual, and shall include a reference to such publication in the report required under subsection (b).

(d) PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION.—Section 502(a)(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3982(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) In making assignments under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assure that a member of the Service is not assigned to, or restricted from, a position at a post in a particular geographic area, or domestically in a position working on issues relating to a particular geographic area, exclusively on the basis of the race, ethnicity, or religion of that member.''.

SEC. 5326. SECURITY CLEARANCE SUSPENSIONS.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) In order to promote the efficiency of the Service, the Secretary may suspend a member of the Foreign Service without pay when the member's security clearance is suspended or when there is reasonable cause to believe that the member has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment may be imposed.

''(2) Any member of the Foreign Service for whom a suspension is proposed shall be entitled to—

''(A) written notice stating the specific reasons for the proposed suspension;

''(B) a reasonable time to respond orally and in writing to the proposed suspension;

''(C) representation by an attorney or other representative; and

''(D) a final written decision, including the specific reasons for such decision, as soon as practicable.

''(3) Any member suspended under this section may file a grievance in accordance with the procedures applicable to grievances under chapter 11 of this title.

''(4) In the case of a grievance filed under paragraph (3)—

''(A) the review by the Foreign Service Grievance Board shall be limited to a determination of whether the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) have been fulfilled; and

''(B) the Foreign Service Grievance Board may not exercise the authority provided under section 1106(8) of the Act (22 U.S.C. 4136(8)).

''(5) In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'reasonable time' means—

''(i) with respect to a member of the Foreign Service assigned to duty in the United States, 15 days after receiving notice of the proposed suspension; and

''(ii) with respect to a member of the Foreign Service assigned to duty outside the United States, 30 days after receiving notice of the proposed suspension.

''(B) The term 'suspend' or 'suspension' means the placing of a member of the Foreign Service in a temporary status without duties and pay.''.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENT OF SECTION HEADING.—Such section, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended in the section heading by inserting ''**; SUSPENSION**'' before the period at the end.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to such section in the table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''Section 610. Separation for cause; suspension.''.

SEC. 5327. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish curriculum at the Foreign Services Institute to develop the practical foreign economic policy expertise and skill sets of Foreign Service officers, including by making available distance-learning courses in commercial, economic, and business affairs, specifically including in—

(1) the global business environment;

(2) the economics of development;

(3) development and infrastructure finance;

(4) current trade and investment agreements negotiations;

(5) implementing existing multilateral and World Trade Organization agreements, and United States trade and investment agreements;

(6) best practices for customs and export procedures; and

(7) market analysis and global supply chain management.

SEC. 5328. REPORT ON DIVERSITY RECRUITMENT, EMPLOYMENT, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quadrennially thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a comprehensive report to Congress that—

(1) describes the efforts, consistent with existing law, including procedures, effects, and results of the Department of State since the time of the prior such report, to promote equal opportunity and inclusion for all American employees in direct hire and personal service contractors status, particularly employees of the Foreign Service, to include equal opportunity for all races, ethnicities, ages, genders, and service-disabled veterans, with a focus on traditionally underrepresented minority groups;

(2) includes a section on—

(A) the diversity of selection boards;

(B) the employment of minority and service-disabled veterans during the most recent 10-year period, including—

(i) the number hired through direct hires, internships, and fellowship programs;

(ii) the number promoted to senior positions, including FS–01, GS–15, Senior Executive Service, and Senior Foreign Service; and

(iii) attrition rates by grade, civil and foreign services, and the senior level ranks listed in clause (ii); and

(C) mentorship and retention programs; and

(3) is organized in terms of real numbers and percentages at all levels.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall describe the efforts of the Department of State—

(1) to propagate fairness, impartiality, and inclusion in the work environment domestically and abroad;

(2) to eradicate harassment, intolerance, and discrimination;

(3) to refrain from engaging in unlawful discrimination in any phase of the employment process, including recruitment, hiring, evaluation, assignments, promotion, retention, and training;

(4) to eliminate illegal retaliation against employees for participating in a protected equal employment opportunity activity;

(5) to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified employees and applicants with disabilities;

(6) to resolve workplace conflicts, confrontations, and complaints in a prompt, impartial, constructive, and timely manner;

(7) to improve demographic data availability and analysis regarding recruitment, hiring, promotion, training, length in service, assignment restrictions, and pass-through programs;

(8) to recruit a diverse staff by—

(A) recruiting women, minorities, veterans, and undergraduate and graduate students;

(B) recruiting at historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic serving institutions, women's colleges, and colleges that typically serve majority minority populations;

(C) sponsoring and recruiting at job fairs in urban communities;

(D) placing job advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and job sites oriented toward women and people of color;

(E) providing opportunities through the Foreign Service Internship Program and other hiring initiatives; and

(F) recruiting mid- and senior-level professionals through programs such as—

(i) the International Career Advancement Program;

(ii) the Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(iii) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program;

(iv) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies; and

(v) other similar highly respected international leadership programs; and

(9) to provide opportunities through—

(A) the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Fellowship Program;

(B) the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(C) the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.

(c) SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORT.—The first report submitted to Congress under this section shall include the information described in subsection (b) for the 3 fiscal years immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

SEC. 5329. EXPANSION OF THE CHARLES B. RANGEL INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS PROGRAM, THE THOMAS R. PICKERING FOREIGN AFFAIRS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, AND THE DONALD M. PAYNE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED.—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of State shall—

(1) increase by 10 the number of fellows selected for the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Program;

(2) increase by 10 the number of fellows selected for the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(3) increase by 5 the number of fellows selected for the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.

(b) PAYNE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Undergraduate and graduate components of the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program are authorized to conduct outreach to attract outstanding students who represent diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds with an interest in pursuing a Foreign Service career.

SEC. 5330. RETENTION OF MID- AND SENIOR-LEVEL PROFESSIONALS THAT COME FROM UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS.

(a) RETENTION.—Attention and oversight should also be applied to the retention and promotion of underrepresented groups to promote a diverse ethnic representation among mid- and senior-level career professionals through programs such as—

(1) the International Career Advancement Program;

(2) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies; and

(3) other highly respected international leadership programs.

(b) REVIEW OF PAST PROGRAMS.—Past programs designed to increase minority representation in international affairs positions should be reviewed, including—

(1) the USAID Undergraduate Cooperative and Graduate Economics Program;

(2) the Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program; and

(3) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program.

TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Subtitle A—United States Contributions to International Organizations

SEC. 5401. REPORT ON ALL UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended by inserting before paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(1) CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—A detailed description of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind contributions, of the United States Government to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies during the preceding fiscal year, estimated for such current fiscal year, and requested in the President's budget request for such following fiscal year.

''(A) CONTENT.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall, for each such fiscal year, include—

''(i) the total amount or value of all such contributions to the United Nations and to each such agency or body;

''(ii) the approximate percentage of all such contributions to the United Nations and to each such agency or body when compared with all contributions to the United Nations and to each such agency or body from any source; and

''(iii) for each such United States Government contribution to the United Nations and to each such agency or body—

''(I) the amount or value of the contribution;

''(II) a description of the contribution, including whether it is assessed or voluntary;

''(III) the purpose of the contribution;

''(IV) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution; and

''(V) the United Nations or United Nations affiliated agency or related body receiving the contribution.

''(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a text-based, searchable version of the report on a publicly available Internet website.''.

SEC. 5402. AMENDING THE REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 405(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (U.S.C. 287b(b)) is amended by striking ''in which the United States participates as a member.'', and by inserting at the end the following: '', including a tabulation of assessed contributions, voluntary contributions, and the ratio of United States contributions to total contributions received among the following categories: the United Nations, Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and Other United Nations Funds, Programs, and Organizations; Peacekeeping; Inter-American Organizations; Regional Organizations; and Other International Organizations.''.

SEC. 5403. REPORTING ON PEACEKEEPING ARREARS AND CREDITS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended by inserting between paragraphs (2) and (3) the following new paragraph:

''(3) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.—A complete and full accounting of United States peacekeeping assessments and contributions for United Nations peacekeeping operations, to include the following elements:

''(A) A tabulation of annual United Nations peacekeeping assessment rates, the related authorized United States peacekeeping contribution rate, and the relevant United States public law that determines each such contribution rate for the United Nations peacekeeping budget for each fiscal year beginning in 1995 through the current and next fiscal year.

''(B) A tabulation of current United States accrued shortfalls and arrears in each respective ongoing or closed United Nations peacekeeping mission.

''(C) A tabulation of all peacekeeping credits, including in the categories of—

''(i) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States;

''(ii) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States;

''(iii) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States from each open and closed mission;

''(iv) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States from each open and closed mission;

''(v) total peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward prior year shortfalls apportioned to the United States;

''(vi) total peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward offsetting future contributions of the United States; and

''(vii) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States, which could be applied toward offsetting United States contributions in the following fiscal year.

''(D) An explanation of any claim of unavailability by the United Nations of any peacekeeping credits described in subparagraph (C)(iv).

''(E) A description of any efforts by the United States to obtain reimbursement in accordance with the requirements of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.), including but not limited to Department of Defense materiel and services, including an explanation of any failure to obtain any such reimbursement.''.

SEC. 5404. ASSESSMENT RATE TRANSPARENCY.

The Secretary of State, through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, shall urge the United Nations—

(1) to share the raw data used to calculate member state peacekeeping assessment rates; and

(2) to make available the formula for determining peacekeeping assessments.

Subtitle B—Accountability at International Organizations

SEC. 5411. PREVENTING ABUSE IN PEACEKEEPING.

At least 15 days prior to the anticipated date of the vote on a resolution for a new, or to reauthorize an existing, peacekeeping mission under the auspices of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or any other multilateral organization in which the United States participates, or, in exigent circumstances, as far in advance of any such vote as is practicable, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that shall include the following:

(1) A description of the specific measures taken and planned to be taken by such organization related to such peacekeeping mission to—

(A) prevent the organization's employees, contractor personnel, and forces serving in such peacekeeping mission from engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse; and

(B) hold accountable any such individuals who engages in any such acts while participating in such peacekeeping mission.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of each of the measures described in paragraph (1).

(3) An accounting and assessment of all cases whereby such organization has taken action to investigate allegations of its employees, contractor personnel, or peacekeeping forces serving in such peacekeeping mission engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse, including a description of the current status of all such cases.

SEC. 5412. ADDING PEACEKEEPING ABUSES TO COUNTRY REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

Subsection (d) of section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) for each country that contributes personnel to United Nations peacekeeping missions, a description of—

''(A) any allegations of such personnel engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation and abuse while participating in such a peacekeeping mission;

''(B) any repatriations of such personnel resulting from an allegation described in paragraph (A);

''(C) any actions taken by such country toward personnel repatriated as a result of allegations described in paragraph (A), including whether such personnel faced prosecution related to such allegations; and

''(D) the extent to which any actions taken as described in paragraph (C) have been communicated by such country to the United Nations.''.

Subtitle C—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5421. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 181 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 276c–4) is amended to read as follows: ''Not less than 180 days after enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Congress that provides—

''(1) for each international organization which had a geographic distribution formula in effect on January 1, 1991, an assessment of whether each such organization—

''(A) is taking good faith steps to increase the staffing of United States citizens, including, as appropriate, as assessment of any additional steps such organization could be taking;

''(B) has met the requirements of its geographic distribution formula; and

''(2) a specific assessment of American representation among professional and senior-level positions at the United Nations, including—

''(A) a description of the proportion of all such United States citizen employment at the United Nations Secretariat and all United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programs;

''(B) as assessment of compliance by the United Nations Secretariat and United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programs with any required geographic distribution formula; and

''(C) a description of any steps taken and planned to be taken by the United States to increase such staffing of United States citizens at the United Nations Secretariat and United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programs.''.

SEC. 5422. ENSURING APPROPRIATE UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL SALARIES.

(a) COMPENSATION OF UNITED NATIONS PERSONNEL.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to—

(1) establish appropriate policies, procedures, and assumptions for—

(A) determining comparable positions between officials in the Professional and higher categories of the United Nations in New York and that of the United States Federal civil service;

(B) calculating the margin between the compensation of such comparable officials and positions; and

(C) determining the appropriate margin for adoption by the United Nations to govern compensation for such United Nations officials;

(2) make all policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1) available to the public; and

(3) limit the growth of United Nations officials compensation to ensure they remain within the margin range established in United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for such United Nations officials.

(b) REPORT ON SALARY MARGINS.—The Secretary shall submit a report annually to the appropriate congressional committees at the time of submission of the first President's budget to Congress—

(1) describing the policies, procedures, and assumptions established or used by the United Nations to—

(A) determine comparable positions between officials in the Professional and higher categories of the United Nations in New York and that of the United States Federal civil service;

(B) calculate the percentage difference, or margin, between the compensation of such comparable officials and positions; and

(C) determine the margin range established in United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for such United Nations officials;

(2) assessing, in conformance with the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1), the percentage difference, or margin, between net salaries of officials in the Professional and higher categories of the United Nations in New York and that of comparable positions in the United States Federal civil service;

(3) assessing any changes in the margins described in paragraph (2) from the previous year;

(4) assessing the extent to which any such changes described in paragraph (3) resulted from modifications to the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1); and

(5) providing the views of the Secretary on any such changes described in paragraph (3) and any such modifications described in paragraph (4).

TITLE V—CONSULAR AUTHORITIES

SEC. 5501. VISA INELIGIBILITY FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS.

Section 212(a)(10)(C)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by adding ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (III).

SEC. 5502. PRESUMPTION OF IMMIGRANT INTENT FOR H AND L VISA CLASSIFICATIONS.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(other than a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (L) or (V) of section 101(a)(15), and other than a nonimmigrant described in any provision of section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) except subclause (b1) of such section)'';

(2) by striking ''under section 101(a)(15)'' and inserting in its place ''under the immigration laws.''; and

(3) by striking ''he'' each place such term appears and inserting ''the alien''.

SEC. 5503. VISA INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)(2)) is amended:

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''issuance or refusal'' and inserting ''issuance, refusal, or revocation''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''and on the basis of reciprocity'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''illicit weapons; or'' and inserting ''illicit weapons, or in determining the removability or eligibility for a visa, admission, or another immigration benefit of persons who would be inadmissible to, or removable from, the United States;'';

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''for the purposes'' and inserting ''for 1 of the purposes''; and

(ii) by striking ''or to deny visas to persons who would be inadmissible to the United States.'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) with regard to any or all aliens in the database, specified data elements from each record, if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interest to provide such information to a foreign government.''.

TITLE VI—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

TITLE VII—EMBASSY SECURITY

SA 1781. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 528, line 14, insert after ''Arctic region'' the following: '', as well as among the Armed Forces''.

On page 528, line 23, insert after ''ture,'' the following: ''communications and domain awareness,''.

On page 529, line 5, insert before the period at the end the following: '', including by exploring opportunities for sharing installations and maintenance facilities''.

SA 1782. MR. MCCONNELL (for Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

SA 1783. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1273 and insert the following:

SEC. 1273. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON QATAR FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SAFETY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should consider, in a timely manner, the July 2013 Letter of Request from the Government of Qatar for fighter aircraft;

(2) the approval of such a sale would contribute to the self-defense of Qatar, deter the regional ambitions of Iran, reassure partners and allies of the United States commitment to regional security, and enhance the strike capability of fighter aircraft of the Qatar air force;

(3) the ability of our regional partners to respond to threatening Iranian military actions in the Gulf, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching a ballistic missile attack, is a critical element of deterring Iranian aggression and to maintaining security and stability in the region;

(4) the maintenance by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge (QME) is vital, and due diligence is essential in thoroughly evaluating the impact of such a sale as it relates to the military capabilities of Israel; and

(5) the Department of State should prioritize its consideration of whether to issue a Letter of Offer and Acceptance, to advance the sale of fighter aircraft to the Government of Qatar so that key decisions can be taken regarding the way forward for capabilities that are critical for security and stability in the Middle East.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the risks and benefits of the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar as described in subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the followings:

(A) A description of the assumptions regarding the increase to Qatar air force capabilities as a result of the sale.

(B) A description of the assumptions regarding items described in subparagraph (A) as they may impact the preservation by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge.

(C) An estimated timeline for final adjudication of the decision to approve the sale.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1784. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title V, insert after section 552 the following:

SEC. 552A. AUTHORITY FOR SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL TO PROVIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ALLEGED SEX-RELATED OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1044e the following new section:

''§ 1044f. Legal assistance for civilian individuals who are victims of alleged sex-related offenses: Special Victims' Counsel; civilian counsel

''(a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.—Special Victims' Counsel designated under section 1044e of this title may provide such legal assistance to a civilian individual who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense in connection with such offense as may be provided under subsection (a) of section 1044 of this title to individuals eligible for legal assistance under that subsection.

''(b) ASSISTANCE THROUGH CIVILIAN COUNSEL.—The Secretary concerned may provide legal assistance, including representation in legal proceedings, to a civilian individual who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense in connection with such offense, including as follows:

''(1) Through the provision of such assistance through civilian counsel of the military department concerned.

''(2) Through payment or reimbursement of civilian counsel obtained by the civilian individual in connection with such offense.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

''(d) ALLEGED SEX-RELATED OFFENSE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'alleged sex-related offense' has the meaning given that term in section 1044e(g) of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 53 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1044e the following new item:

''1044f. Legal assistance for civilian individuals who are victims of alleged sex-related offenses: Special Victims' Counsel; civilian counsel.''.

SA 1785. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. AVOIDANCE OF COMMERCIAL AND SUBSISTENCE FISHERIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) endeavor to conduct training exercises in a manner that minimizes impact on subsistence and commercial fisheries and the long term health of fish species and stocks; and

(2) endeavor to schedule and locate training exercises outside of fishing grounds during fishing seasons.

(b) CONSULTATION.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 6 months prior to the commencement of a training exercise subject to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service, State and tribal fish and wildlife managers, fishery user groups, and Regional Fishery Management Councils established under section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852) with respect to the scheduling and location of the training exercise.

(2) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—A consultation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not be subject to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(c) EXCEPTION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines that application of such subsection is not in the national security interest of the Untied States.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to create any legal right or provide a private right of action for any person.

SA 1786. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ENHANCED PENALTIES AND OTHER TOOLS RELATED TO MARITIME OFFENSES AND ACTS OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM.

(a) PENALTIES FOR MARITIME OFFENSES.—

(1) PENALTIES FOR VIOLENCE AGAINST MARITIME NAVIGATION.—Section 2280a(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (E), by inserting ''punished by death or'' before ''imprisoned for any term''.

(2) PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES AGAINST MARITIME FIXED PLATFORMS.—Section 2281a(a)(1) of such title is amended, in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (C), by inserting ''punished by death or'' before ''imprisoned for any term''.

(b) PENALTIES FOR ACTS OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM.—Section 2332i(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates this section shall be punished as provided under section 2332a(a).''.

(c) PROVIDING MATERIAL SUPPORT TO TERRORISTS PREDICATES.—

(1) MARITIME OFFENSES.—Section 2339A(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''2280a,'' after ''2280,''; and

(B) by inserting ''2281a,'' after ''2281,''.

(2) ACTS OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM.—Section 2339A(a) of such title, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by inserting ''2332i,'' after ''2332f,''.

(d) WIRETAP AUTHORIZATION PREDICATES.—

(1) MARITIME OFFENSES.—Section 2516(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (p), by striking ''or'' at the end; and

(B) in paragraph (q), by inserting '', section 2280, 2280a, 2281, or 2281a (relating to maritime safety),'' after ''weapons)''.

(2) ACTS OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM.—Section 2516(1)(q) of such title, as amended by subsection (a)(2), is further amended by inserting '', 2332i,'' after ''2332h''.

SA 1787. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1242. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAN NEGOTIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) President Obama has routinely spoken about a hard line when dealing with Iran on the subject of their nuclear program and related sanctions.

(2) March 5, 2012, in remarks after meeting with Benjamin Netanyahu, President Obama stated: ''. . . I reserve all options, and my policy here is not going to be one of containment. My policy is prevention of Iran obtaining nuclear weapons. And as I indicated yesterday in my speech, when I say all options are at the table, I mean it.''

(3) On September 25, 2012, in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly, President Obama stated: ''Make no mistake: A nuclear-armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained. . .the United States will do what we must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.''

(4) On April 2, 2015, in an address in the Rose Garden, President Obama stated that ''Iran has also agreed to the most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime'' and, ''This deal was not based on trust. It's based on unprecedented verification.''

(5) Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, has routinely spoken out openly against the United States and any sanctions against Iran's nuclear program and related sanctions.

(6) April 9, 2015, in response to the nuclear agreement, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said: ''Iran's government and security forces wouldn't permit outside inspections of the country's military sites, which are officially nonnuclear but where United Nations investigators suspect Tehran conducted tests related to atomic weapons development.''

(7) On May 20, 2015, in a graduation speech at the Imam Hussein Military University in Tehran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei ruled out ''allowing international inspectors to interview Iranian nuclear scientists as part of any potential deal on its nuclear program'', and reiterated that the country ''would not allow the inspection of military sites''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that no negotiations should be allowed to continue with respect to a nuclear agreement with Iran that does not include robust inspections and proper verification of all Iran's nuclear programs, military installations, and access to scientists and their respective progress.

SA 1788. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 474, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(I) Future design and requirements of the replacement for the Ticonderoga class cruiser.

SA 1789. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10___. LIMITATION OF THE TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No portion of the land or water listed by Article I of the United States-Cuba Agreements and Treaty of 1934 shall be transferred to the Government of Cuba, unless—

(1) a democratically-elected Government of Cuba and the United States Government mutually agree to new lease terms for such land or water;

(2) the elections of the Government of Cuba were—

(A) free and fair;

(B) conducted under internationally recognized observers; and

(C) carried out so that opposition parties had ample time to organize and campaign using full access media available to every candidate;

(3) the Government of Cuba has committed itself to constitutional change that would ensure regular free and fair elections;

(4) the Government of Cuba has made a public commitment to respect, and is respecting, internationally recognized human rights and basic democratic freedoms;

(5) the President certifies to Congress that Cuba is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism and no longer harbors members of recognized foreign terrorist organizations; and

(6) the Secretary of Defense certifies that the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is inconsequential to United States national security or to the operation of the Navy and the Coast Guard in the Caribbean Sea.

(b) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT LEASE.—It shall be the policy of the United States to continue to lease the land or waterways that encompass the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless the criteria set out in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) are met.

SEC. 10___. PROHIBITION ON RELOCATION OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT AND CAPABILITIES FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES OR OTHER COUNTRY IN THE CARIBBEAN REGION.

(a) LIMITATION.—No military equipment may be moved to any other United States military facility to complete the same tasks conducted on, or from, the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PRESERVATION OF OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States may not reduce the operational capabilities provided by assets operating aboard, or from, the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in support of meaningful defense activity.

(2) INCLUDED CAPABILITIES.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(A) the United States Coast Guard personnel and equipment supporting maritime operations in the vicinity of the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as for the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) civilian personnel who support military activities directly or otherwise, unless Congress enacts a law agreeing to move resources to a more suitable location which allows for comparable defense activity in the region.

SEC. 10___. REQUIREMENT TO TEMPORARILY HOUSE MIGRANTS INTERCEPTED IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CARIBBEAN AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

The United States may not use appropriated funds to move migrants intercepted in the waters between the United States and any foreign country in the Caribbean region to a location other than the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless—

(1) the migrant may reasonably be returned to their country of origin; or

(2) uncontrollable circumstances do not allow for a safe transfer of migrants to the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 10___. LIMITATION IN THE REDUCTION OF MILITARY ACTIVITY ON OR IN THE WATERS NEAR UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

The United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba shall continue to perform as the logistical port for the Navy and Coast Guard operating in the Caribbean Sea at operational levels equal to or greater than such level on the date of the enactment of this Act, unless—

(1) the Government of Cuba displays a legitimate capacity to interdict narcotics trafficking throughout the international waterways surrounding Cuba;

(2) the Government of Cuba has an established maritime authority capable of inspecting cargo and safeguarding ships traversing the international waterways near the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and

(3) the Government of Cuba displays the capacity to interdict human traffickers operating throughout the waterways surrounding Cuba.

SEC. 10___. LIMITATION ON MODIFICATION OR ABANDONMENT OF LEASED LAND AND WATER CONTAINING UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) LIMITATION.—The United States may not modify the 45 square mile lease of land or waterways that encompass the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, unless—

(1) the President notifies Congress not later than 90 days prior to the proposed modification of such lease; and

(2) after such notification, Congress enacts a law authorizing a modification of such lease.

(b) RETENTION.—The United States may not abandon any portion of the land or water that contains the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless—

(1) the President notifies Congress not less than 90 days prior to the proposed abandonment of such land or water; and

(2) after such notification, Congress enacts a law authorizing such abandonment.

(c) NO NEW GRANT OF AUTHORITY.—This section may not be construed to grant the President any authority not already provided by the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6021 et seq.).

SA 1790. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1040. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS WHOSE PRIMARY FOCUS IS CLOSURE OF THE TERRORIST DETENTION FACILITY ABOARD NAVAL STATION GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the purpose of funding personnel or programs whose primary focus is facilitating the closure of the terrorist detention facility aboard Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SA 1791. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2822. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVY OUTLYING LANDING FIELD, NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLORIDA.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to Escambia County, Florida (in this section referred to as the ''County''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, containing Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County associated with Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Milton, Florida.

(b) LAND TO BE ACQUIRED.—In exchange for the property described in subsection (a), the County shall convey to the Secretary of the

Navy land and improvements thereon in Santa Rosa County, Florida, that is acceptable to the Secretary and suitable for use as a Navy outlying landing field to replace Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the County to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the land exchange under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, other administrative costs related to the land exchange, and all costs associated with relocation of activities and facilities from Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 to the replacement location. If amounts are collected from the County in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the land exchange, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the County.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the land exchange. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The exchange of real property under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy and the County, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SA 1792. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3124. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROVISION OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, and none of the funds authorized to be appropriated for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities for any fiscal year before fiscal year 2016 that are available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act, may be obligated or expended to enter into a contract with, or otherwise provide assistance to, the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Russian Federation is in compliance with—

(1) the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the ''Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty'' or ''INF Treaty'');

(2) the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011 (commonly referred to as the ''New START Treaty'');

(3) its obligations under the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives agreed to by President George H.W. Bush and President Boris Yeltsin; and

(4) its obligations (as the United States defines those obligations) under the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on September 10, 1996.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1793. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) THIRTY-YEAR LIMIT ON NUCLEAR EXPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be used to implement any aspect of an agreement for civil nuclear cooperation pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) after the date that is 30 years after the date of entry into force of such agreement unless—

(A) the President, within the final five years of the agreement, has certified to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the party to such agreement has continued to fulfill the terms and conditions of the agreement and that the agreement continues to be in the interest of the United States; and

(B) Congress enacts a joint resolution permitting the continuation of the agreement for an additional period of not more than 30 years.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The restriction in paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) any agreement that had entered into force as of August 1, 2015;

(B) any agreement with the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO), or the International Atomic Energy Agency; or

(C) any amendment to an agreement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Each proposed export pursuant to an agreement described under this section shall be subject to United States laws and regulations in effect at the time of each such export.

SA 1794. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle H—Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age Act of 2015''.

SEC. 1092. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Today, technology that did not exist 30 years ago pervades every aspect of life in the United States.

(2) Nearly ⅔ of adults in the United States own a smartphone, and 43 percent of adults in the United States rely solely on their cell phone for telephone use.

(3) 84 percent of households in the United States own a computer and 73 percent of households in the United States have a computer with an Internet broadband connection.

(4) Federal policies on privacy protection have not kept pace with the rapid expansion of technology.

(5) Innovations in technology have led to the exponential expansion of data collection by both the public and private sectors.

(6) Consumers are often unaware of the collection of their data and how their information can be collected, bought, and sold by private companies.

SEC. 1093. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to establish, for a 2-year period, a Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age to—

(1) examine—

(A) the ways in which public agencies and private companies gather data on the people of the United States; and

(B) the ways in which that data is utilized, either internally or externally; and

(2) make recommendations concerning potential policy changes needed to safeguard the privacy of the people of the United States.

SEC. 1094. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—To carry out the purpose of this subtitle, there is established in the legislative branch a Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age (in this subtitle referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the President, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed from the executive branch of the Government; and

(B) 2 shall be appointed from private life.

(2) Two members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(3) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(4) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the House; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(5) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the House; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from among its members.

(d) MEETINGS; QUORUM; VACANCIES.—

(1) MEETINGS.—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(2) QUORUM.—Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS; INITIAL MEETING.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INITIAL MEETING.—On or after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, and not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall hold its initial meeting.

SEC. 1095. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(1) conduct an investigation of relevant facts and circumstances relating to the expansion of data collection practices in the public, private, and national security sectors, including implications for—

(A) surveillance;

(B) political, civil, and commercial rights of individuals and corporate entities;

(C) employment practices, including hiring and firing; and

(D) credit availability and reporting; and

(2) submit to the President and Congress reports containing findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures relating to the facts and circumstances investigated under paragraph (1), in accordance with section 1099B.

SEC. 1096. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, at its direction, any subcommittee or member of the Commission, may, for the purpose of carrying out this subtitle—

(A) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission or such subcommittee or member determines advisable; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2)(A), require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, tapes, and materials as the Commission or such subcommittee or member determines advisable.

(2) SUBPOENAS.—

(A) ISSUANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued under paragraph (1) only—

(I) by the agreement of the Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson; or

(II) by the affirmative vote of 8 members of the Commission.

(ii) SIGNATURE.—Subject to clause (i), a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) may—

(I) be issued under the signature of—

(aa) the Chairperson; or

(bb) a member designated by a majority of the Commission; and

(II) be served by—

(aa) any person designated by the Chairperson; or

(bb) a member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1), the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found, or where the subpoena is returnable, may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence.

(ii) CONTEMPT OF COURT.—Any failure to obey the order of the court under clause (i) may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(3) WITNESS ALLOWANCES AND FEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply to witnesses requested or subpoenaed to appear at any hearing of the Commission.

(B) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The per diem and mileage allowances for witnesses shall be paid from funds available to pay the expenses of the Commission.

(b) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this subtitle.

(c) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this subtitle.

(2) FURNISHING OF INFORMATION.—If the Chairperson, the chairperson of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission submits to a Federal department or agency a request for information under paragraph (1), the head of the department or agency shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish the information directly to the Commission.

(3) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information furnished under paragraph (2) shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and executive orders.

(d) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(2) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—In addition to the assistance provided under paragraph (1), departments and agencies of the United States may provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as the departments and agencies may determine advisable and as authorized by law.

(e) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as a department or agency of the United States.

SEC. 1097. NONAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(b) PUBLIC MEETINGS AND RELEASE OF PUBLIC VERSIONS OF REPORTS.—The Commission shall—

(1) hold public hearings and meetings to the extent appropriate; and

(2) release public versions of the reports required under subsections (a) and (b) of section 1099B.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Any public hearing of the Commission shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the protection of information provided to or developed for or by the Commission as required by any applicable statute, regulation, or executive order.

SEC. 1098. STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The Chairperson, in consultation with the Vice Chairperson and in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this paragraph may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The executive director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 89A, 89B, and 90 of that title.

(B) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(b) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(c) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of that title.

SEC. 1099. COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government may be compensated at not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 1099A. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.

The appropriate departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall cooperate with the Commission in expeditiously providing to the members and staff of the Commission appropriate security clearances to the extent possible under applicable procedures and requirements, and no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this subtitle without the appropriate security clearances.

SEC. 1099B. REPORTS OF COMMISSION; TERMINATION.

(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the President and Congress interim reports containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a final report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(c) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) or (b) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities under this subtitle, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which Commission submits the final report under subsection (b).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the final report.

SEC. 1099C. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subtitle.

(b) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available to the Commission under subsection (a) shall remain available until the termination of the Commission.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room S–240 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room S–216 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Security Assistance in Africa.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights, and Federal Courts be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Rewriting the Law: Examining the Process That Led to the ObamaCare Subsidy Rule.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 1:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Examining Practical Solutions to Improve the Federal Regulatory Process.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that MAJ Justin Gorkowski, a U.S. Army fellow for the office of Senator ROY BLUNT, be granted floor privileges throughout the duration of consideration of H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my national security fellow, Robert Palladino, be given floor privileges through the end of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my interns, Jasper MacNaughton and Holly O'Brien, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2146 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Toomey amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1782) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To change the effective date)

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2146), as amended, was passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 8; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there will be no rollcall votes during Monday's session of the Senate. Senators should expect votes around lunchtime on Tuesday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the

previous order, following the remarks of Senator COLLINS and Senator SULLIVAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise this evening in support of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, which provides our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with the critical resources they require to meet our critical national security missions.

Let me begin by expressing my sincere gratitude to both the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, for tackling many of the complex and challenging issues facing our Nation and our military.

During my time in the Senate, I have never been more concerned about global instability and the threats posed to our country by radical Islamic extremists. We must work together to ensure our collective defense and this bill puts us on the path to doing so.

The legislation affirms the strategic importance of our Navy and shipbuilding programs by fully funding the DDG 1000 Program and authorizing $400 million in incremental funding authority toward an additional DDG 51 beyond those included in the current multiyear procurement contract. This additional ship is very much needed by our Navy and it would fulfill the terms of a 2002 swap agreement between the two major shipbuilders regarding the construction of large surface combatants. Both my colleague Senator ANGUS KING and I advocated for these critical provisions.

I am so proud of the highly skilled and hard-working men and women of Bath Iron Works in my State who construct these ships for the Navy. The DDG 1000 is the lead ship of its class. It will bolster our ability to project power. It promises to deliver a wide array of cutting-edge innovations such as stealth technology, electric propulsion, and a smaller crew size.

Our destroyers are the workhorses of the Navy. Recently, the Bath-built USS *Farragut*, which I was honored to christen almost 10 years ago, was dispatched to the Strait of Hormuz after Iranian naval forces harassed commercial vessels transiting the area. The USS *Farragut* escorted U.S.-flagged ships through the Strait, projecting American power and sending a strong signal to enemies and allies alike that the U.S. Navy is prepared and ready to respond to acts of aggression.

Our Navy fleet provides the robust forward presence our Nation requires to respond not only to acts of aggression but to humanitarian disasters as well as to protect critical trade groups that facilitate global commerce and security. The power of presence cannot be taken for granted or ignored, which is why the investments in our Navy that are authorized by this bill are so critical. We simply need more ships to be where we want to be in the world when we want to be and need to be there. The Navy's plan shows that unless we make the investments that are needed, our fleet will continue to shrink and, thus, jeopardize our national security.

This bill also maintains investments in our public shipyards, which are another set of strategic facilities in our national security arsenal.

Recently, I had the honor of hosting our Secretary of Labor, Thomas Perez, in Maine. We visited and were so impressed by the very successful apprenticeship program at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME. The shipyard in Kittery is one of only four remaining public naval shipyards, and it is renowned for its skilled and dedicated workforce that is helping our Nation transition from the *Los Angeles* Class to the *Virginia* Class submarines.

This bill also provides the resources necessary to help our allies and partners around the world. When Hamas fired more than 3,000 rockets into Israel last summer, the value of U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs became crystal clear.

During those countless attacks, it was the Iron Dome missile defense system developed in Israel, with cooperation and assistance from the United States, that saved countless civilian lives.

In addition, this bill continues to improve and strengthen the military's response to sexual assault. How well I remember at an Armed Services subcommittee hearing a decade ago when I first raised the issue of sexual assault in the military, and how dismissive the reply was of GEN George Casey. Fortunately, that attitude has changed, and in the last 2 years, significant reforms have been implemented to help combat these crimes and improve services and care for the survivors of sexual assault.

Still, the work of translating the military's stated policy of zero tolerance into reality remains unfinished business. Key provisions in this year's bill build upon the past reforms we have made by improving the protections for victims of sexual assault, enhancing confidential reporting options, and expanding the authority of special victims' counsel to assist the survivors of sexual assault. The Department of Defense must, however, do more to eliminate, once and for all, retaliation against the victims of sexual assault who come forward to report these crimes.

To further support our men and women in uniform, this bill rejects a provision proposed by the administration that would consolidate TRICARE and limit care options for servicemembers and their families. This bill preserves the U.S. Family Health Plan, which serves as a model of high-quality and cost-effective care. This program has been extremely successful and popular among enrollees in Maine. I have been impressed with the work I have seen them do in case management of chronic diseases such as diabetes.

This bill also directs the Pentagon to rein in or eliminate unnecessary, wasteful spending. It cuts headquarters and administrative costs by 7.5 percent in the year 2016. In this time of budget constraints, we owe it to taxpayers to assess every efficiency and use every cost-saving measure, while also continuing to ensure the security of our Nation.

Finally, I wish to thank the committee for making the right decision in rejecting the President's proposal to authorize a new base realignment and closure round in 2016. I have been through BRAC rounds, and they have required significant costs and have failed to deliver on the promised savings, as has been documented by the Government Accountability Office—GAO.

This bill would also better tailor the HUBZone Program to meet the needs of communities affected by the closure of U.S. military installations through the previous BRAC process. The provisions included in the bill are drawn from the HUBZone Expansion Act that I authored with my colleague Senator KING.

I urge support of this highly significant legislation. I am pleased to have worked with the members of the committee on which I have served for so many years. Again, I congratulate the leaders of the committee and the members of the committee for their excellent work.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act. This is a bipartisan bill that will provide our servicemembers with the funding they need to continue to keep our country safe.

Over the last 5 months, we have had numerous senior military officials, senior military officers, and foreign policy experts talk to the Senate Armed Services Committee on which I serve about the significant challenges that our country faces. The senior Senator from Arizona talked about this very eloquently today on the floor about ISIL, a resurgent Russia, North Korea with nuclear weapons, and this NDAA bill that we are now debating on the floor focuses on addressing these challenges. It also makes important modernizations to our investments with regard to military weapons, cuts bureaucratic redtape at the Pentagon, and ensures that our Armed Forces remain the most agile and lethal in the world. It upholds our commitments to our servicemembers, to their families, to military retirees, and to their families.

It is remarkable that right now, as we debate this bill—this critically important bill on the Senate floor—the

President of the United States has already come out and said he is going to likely veto it if it is in its current form. He is going to veto the NDAA. Think about that. One of the most important things we are doing to take care of our troops, and the President is threatening a veto. Now, during the markup of this bill, many Members on the other side of the aisle—our colleagues—also threatened to work on the amendments but to not vote for the bill. They were all going to vote against the bill. But we stood firm—the chairman and other members of the committee—and said: This is not the kind of bill we play politics with. This is not the kind of bill we try to make political points on. This is a bill that funds our troops, that funds the defense of our Nation. Guess what happened. They got the message. Only four members of the Senate Armed Services Committee voted against this bill. It was a very bipartisan bill coming out of the committee, and I certainly hope, when this bill passes the U.S. Senate and moves to conference with the House and then moves to the President's desk, that he does not play politics with our troops; that he removes his threat to veto one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will work on this year.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for his critical leadership in ushering this bill out of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I had the distinct honor of traveling with Senator MCCAIN recently to Asia, including to Vietnam, where his service has inspired countless millions of Americans as well as the people of Vietnam. I saw that firsthand. It was humbling. It was an honor to be there with him, Senator REED, and Senator ERNST on a trip I will certainly remember for a lifetime.

Now, we all took an oath a few months ago to pledge solemnly to ''defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.'' We took that oath right here on this floor. That is what the NDAA does. It gives our servicemembers what they need to fight and defend our great Nation. That is why 53 NDAAs have consecutively passed the Congress.

It hasn't been about partisanship. This bill has moved through the Congress every year for over half a century because it is so important. So again, I would say it would be remarkable if the President of the United States would veto this, particularly given the threats that we see to our Nation.

I want to talk about those rising threats and one of the biggest ones that doesn't get enough attention. We have heard from the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and from both sides of the aisle about what those threats are facing our Nation: ISIS, Iran, Russia, China. These are rising threats, no doubt. But there is a rising threat to our national security that almost never gets talked about, and in some ways it is the biggest threat that our Nation faces.

I am talking about our economy. I am talking about the need for a strong economy. Our economy is one of the most critical elements of our national security. A strong robust economy is our best defense. We have the greatest military in the world, no doubt—the most professional military force in the world, no doubt. We have built this up over decades. But we built this up and we have it because for decades we have had a strong economy. For decades we have had the most innovative, robust economy in the world.

A strong economy is our best weapon against those who would do us harm. A strong economy means more peace, more security, and more prosperity. When America is strong, when it is working, when it is producing, when our economy is robust, the world is safer. Our strength sends a signal to the world. It allows us to set the narrative, to set the rules. It allows us to become the beacon that this country has been for generations.

Right now, we don't have this critical component of our national security, a strong economy. We do not have this. As a matter of fact, our economy is getting weaker, not stronger. The verdict is in. Economists from all across the country, of all political persuasions, agree that the recovery from the last recession has been one of the slowest economic recoveries this country has ever had. We have not had a slower recovery in well over 50 years. The American Enterprise Institute has called this recovery ''glacially and painfully slow by historic standards.'' Even the Center for American Progress, a very liberal think tank, has said that ''this has been a poor recovery in every regard.''

That was last year. This year it is worse. The gross domestic product, which is the value of everything this country produces, last quarter shrank. Let me repeat that. We didn't grow. We didn't grow by 1 percent, 2 percent. The economy of the United States shrank by almost 1 percent. We contracted. It is the third time the economy has shrunk since 2009.

We don't even have a recovery. We don't have a recovery. Right now we have no growth. That means Americans have less money in their pockets. It means wages haven't kept up with inflation. It means the gap between the richest and the poorest is growing. We must get back to higher growth rates. We must get back to traditional levels of American growth. We must get back to an economy that makes us stronger globally and produces hope and opportunity at home.

It wasn't too long ago that we expected in this country at least 4 percent annual GDP growth. That is a very normal, traditional level of American growth. When President Reagan was in office, the average growth rate was about 4.8 percent. During President Clinton and the first term of President Bush it was 3.5 to 4 percent GDP growth.

(Mr. PERDUE assumed the Chair.)

My colleague from Louisiana, who was just presiding, wrote a recent excellent article in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 30, 2015]

DISMAL GROWTH NEEDS THE 3.5% SOLUTION

THE STEPS TO SPURRING THE ECONOMY INCLUDE ALLOWING OIL EXPORTS AND NOT TAXING REPATRIATED OVERSEAS PROFITS

(By Bill Cassidy and Louis Woodhill)

On Wednesday the Commerce Department announced that first-quarter growth of gross domestic product was a dismal 0.2%. Following fourth-quarter GDP growth in 2014 of an anemic 2.2%, the already sluggish economy has slowed almost to a halt.

America is facing a harsh reality. The recovery that began in 2009 is the weakest in postwar history. Millions have dropped out of the labor force, frustrated by lack of opportunity. Lower-income workers are underemployed, middle-incomes have not advanced as in the past, and government dependency has increased. As budget battles rage in Congress, ignored is what really matters: rapid, sustained economic growth.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the U.S. economy will grow by a meager 2.3% over the next decade, and its estimate has declined in the past six months. At this growth rate, Americans face a future of stagnation, inequality and despair.

Here's why: From 1790 to 2014, U.S. GDP in real dollars grew at an average annual rate of 3.73%. Had America grown at the CBO's ''economic speed limit'' of 2.3% for its entire history, GDP would be $780 billion today instead of more than $17 trillion. And GDP per capita would be $2,433, lower than Papua New Guinea's.

Looked at differently, had GDP grown from 2001 to 2014 at the 3.87% annual rate of 1993–2000, the federal government would have had a $500 billion surplus in 2014 instead of a $500 billion deficit. And that's with the same excessive government spending.

The last time the federal budget balanced was 2001 when there was a $128 billion surplus. This was not achieved with spending cuts and tax increases; instead it came after four years of rapid growth—4.45% on average from 1997 to 2000. Helping fuel the economy was a capital-gains tax cut that took effect on Jan. 1, 1997.

The low growth rate during the Obama administration, averaging 1.36%, is not an accident. If the cost of regulations are recognized as taxation by other means, President Obama's first six years of taxes and regulations (and threats of more of both) have undermined confidence among entrepreneurs, small business owners, and the investors that would back them with capital. For the first time in memory, the number of business entities in America is actually falling, according to the Census Bureau.

An example of what not to do is the EPA's proposed ozone rule, which the National Association of Manufacturers predicts will reduce GDP by $140 billion a year, destroy 1.4 million jobs per year and cost each household $830 per year. All for health-benefits claims that public-health experts find questionable.

It's important to be realistic about the future, but 2.3% growth is fatalistic, not realistic.

President Obama and the Congress should be agreeing on what it takes to achieve 3.5% growth. Looking at Social Security Trustees' reports, 3.5% is the rate of growth required to ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, with no tax increases and no benefit cuts.

There are tangible steps we can take toward a pro-growth economy. One step is to reform the uncompetitive corporate tax code, as recommended by President Obama's Bipartisan Debt Commission, among others, including the repatriation of overseas profits without any additional taxation. Increase oil and natural gas exports, which the National Association of Manufacturers estimates would raise 2020 GDP by as much as 1%, while reducing unemployment by 0.5% due to an increase in manufacturing jobs. Rein in the EPA's animus for fossil fuels. Replace ObamaCare with a plan that lowers, rather than raises, the cost of employment, and which does not incentivize businesses to lay off low-wage workers or cut their hours.

Congress should devise a plan for 3.5% economic growth. This isn't wishful thinking. High growth is historically normal for the United States. It is the present imperative, it is the only way forward.

Mr. SULLIVAN. The title is ''Dismal Growth Needs the 3.5% Solution.'' He noted that from 1790 to 2014, almost the entire history of our great Nation, this country grew annually at 3.7 percent GDP growth—3.7 percent. The Obama administration's annual growth rate has been 1.3 percent. Think about that—1.3 percent.

According to the former CBO Director, the difference between 2.5 percent and 3.5 percent growth—just 1 percent GDP growth difference—will have a huge impact on American families. We would be able to produce nationally 2.5 million more jobs and the average income in terms of wages would be $9,000 higher—$9,000 higher. Think about what you could do with that amount of money. Think about what American families could do with that amount of money, just by going 1 percent higher in our growth rate.

Our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania recently mentioned that in order to double the standard of living for a family—to double their income—at 3 percent growth, you can do that in 24 years, or a generation. That is why every generation of Americans has benefitted and done better than the previous one, because we have grown at 3, 3.5, 4 percent growth rate. We are doubling our standard of living. At 1 percent growth, which is the Obama growth rate, it takes 72 years to double your standard of living—72 years. That is the trajectory we are on.

What is most disturbing about this is that this is a huge issue for the country. You don't read about it in the press. Heck, last quarter we shrunk. The economy of the United States, the greatest economy in the world, shrunk, and there was barely a press report about it. It has become what people are now referring to as the new normal. Traditional levels of American growth at 3.5, 4 or 4.5 percent GDP growth—nope, in the Obama era that is a thing of the past. We are in the new normal era, with 1.5 percent GDP growth—maybe 2, if we are lucky.

We need to change that. We need to get the traditional levels of American growth. What is most amazing is that the administration seems to be just shrugging its shoulders. Oh, we contracted last quarter? That is no big deal. A 1.5 percent to 2 percent GDP growth for the entire Obama administration record—that is fine.

But it is a big deal, and it is not fine. We need to change this.

Since 2009, the White House has blamed everything from former George W. Bush to the weather to climate change to Europe's health to growth problems in Africa for these slow growth rates. But have you ever heard the President say: It might be the policies of my own administration. It might be the fact that we are overregulating every element of this great economy of ours. They need to stop blaming and start fixing this economy.

We need to get our country moving again. We have so many comparative advantages to other countries—so many. We have the greatest universities in the world right here in America—the greatest universities in the world compared to any other country. We have agriculture, farmers who feed the world. We have a high-tech sector that is the envy of the world. We have a capital markets sector that commercializes great ideas quicker than any place in the world. We have natural resources—oil, gas, minerals—that are the envy of the world. We are producing more natural gas than any place in the world right now. We are producing more oil than Saudi Arabia right now because our private sector has innovation, ingenuity, hard work. We have tremendous advantages that almost any other country would envy.

What we need to do now is unleash this country's might, unleash the great potential that is the American economy. We need to refuel America. When we grow our economy, we will protect our country.

We need regulatory reform. Right now the cost of regulations to our economy according to the President's own Small Business Administration is close to $2 trillion a year. That is almost $15,000 per American family. Think about that—$15,000 per family is keeping us down. We need a competitive tax system. We need to unleash the might of our private sector through cutting redtape and making sure that we are open for business, not strangling businesses with redtape from Washington.

I want to emphasize these issues because we have been talking about the NDAA, the national defense of our country, for the past few days on the Senate floor, and we are going to be talking about these important issues next week as well. And they are critical issues, but this is a critical issue. If we can't grow our economy, if we can't get back to traditional levels of American growth, we are going to continue to have challenges. But if we can do this, if we can grow consistently by 4.5 or 5 percent in GDP growth, that is the best way to address our challenges, our deficit, our $18 trillion debt, our national security and the funding of our military. We need to focus more on the economy.

This administration has failed the American people on these issues. We need to unleash the might of this great economy of ours, and we will keep our country safe by doing so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:08 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 8, 2015, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. DARREN W. MCDEW

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RONALD F. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3033:

To be general

GEN. MARK A. MILLEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5033:

To be admiral

ADM. JOHN M. RICHARDSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE CHIEF DEFENSE COUNSEL FOR MILITARY COMMISSIONS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014, SECTION 1037:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN G. BAKER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

FRANCIS J. RACIOPPI, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

NATALIE R. BAKAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

PATRICK R. O'MARA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose this appropriations measure—and to oppose the policies that it embodies.

The THUD bill before us, like all of the non-defense appropriations measures being drafted by my Republican colleagues, adheres to the budget caps set under sequestration, which require cuts in BOTH non-defense and defense discretionary programs.

My Republican colleagues have decided that applying these caps to the defense side of the ledger, where the budget authority appropriated by Congress for discretionary programs topped $560 billion in fiscal year 2015, is intolerable.

However, they have decided that these cuts are not only acceptable on the non-defense side of the ledger, they are inadequate, and so the Republicans' budget plan would impose additional cuts over and above those required under sequestration.

Mr. Chair, what is intolerable is failing to invest in our own nation.

The Republicans' unmistakable budget priority is to disinvest in the United States, and that objective is clearly reflected in the THUD bill before us.

Let me tell you about the people who are suffering the consequences of this disinvestment.

They are people just like Freddie Gray.

Mr. Chair, the eyes of this nation saw Freddie Gray only after he was dead.

They didn't see him when he was reading from text books that were 30 years old.

They didn't see him when he was suffering from asthma because of exposure to lead paint in his home.

And they didn't see him when he couldn't find a job.

There are tens of millions of Americans who are facing the same deep and systemic economic challenges today in cities and towns across this nation.

These Americans have watched employers leave their communities and have been left with substandard schools, few job training options, and no path to the better future they want for themselves and their families.

They have been intentionally targeted by leading banks to receive subprime mortgages, or have been left to obtain financial services from liquor stores and pawn shops when banks closed in their neighborhoods because their communities were deemed "unprofitable."

They are people who are working full-time jobs at the minimum wage—but are still left below the poverty line.

They are the millions who are tired of being tired.

Anyone who sees these people should find the bill before us today intolerable.

This bill does nothing to restore the funding cut in past years from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

As a result of these cuts, the CDBG award amount to Baltimore has fallen from $27 million in federal program year 2005 to just $18.8 million in federal program year 2014. Baltimore officials have indicated to me that they will be unable to fund any new non-profit social service activities in calendar year 2016.

City officials indicated to me that among the requests they cannot fund was a request for $187,000 to help provide legal assistance for 300 households facing foreclosure.

This is particularly devastating in my state, which continues to have one of the highest foreclosure rates in the nation, and where many of the people now facing foreclosure are the very people illegally targeted by banks to receive subprime loans.

The bill before us also cuts funding for the maintenance and repair of public housing, cuts the Choice Neighborhoods program, and fails to provide the funding requested by the President to restore the more than 60,000 housing vouchers lost due to sequestration.

According to the Baltimore City housing authority, there are tens of thousands of people waiting for housing assistance in our city. And that's just one city in this nation.

This bill even cuts funding—by 30%—for lead hazard abatement. Baltimore City has one of the highest rates of children testing positive for elevated lead levels among urban centers in the United States, and the highest rates are in the lowest income neighborhoods.

As I've walked Baltimore's streets in the weeks since Freddie Gray's death, I have met countless young people who want exactly what every child in this nation wants.

They want a safe place to live. They want a good school. They want a way to fulfill the promise they feel in themselves.

And they want to know their lives matter—a right deserved by every American, not just the privileged few.

The President has already indicated he would veto this bill—so rather than wasting time on it, why don't we craft a new budget framework that will ensure every American has the chance to succeed?

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Justice, Science, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Chair, I want to compliment the Chairman for a good bill that responsibly invests in law enforcement, space, the sciences, research, our oceans and marine resources, and our weather sciences.

I also want to thank the Chairman for his support in this bill for an innovative data collection initiative to improve fish stock assessments and research of the fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico. As we discussed in our hearings, we as a nation need to utilize all available tools and technology, and work with all fisheries' sector participants, including recreational, for-hire and commercial, to provide the most accurate assessment of the health of our fish stocks, including the Red Snapper species so critical to our quality of life in our Gulf states like Florida and Texas, and so critical to our regional economy. This innovative data collection initiative will better enable the National Marine Fisheries Service and the regional council to make the most informed decisions possible about the length of various fishing seasons.

Mr. Chair, without constantly improving, more accurate, quantifiable data—data that is believed to reliably reflect the fisherman's experience on the water—our commercial and recreational fishermen alike find it difficult to understand decisions made by government to shorten fishing seasons and limit catches.

To be clear, this important new provision included in this year's CJS bill is intended to provide the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office new tools to utilize data collection efforts from our recreational, for-hire and commercial fishermen, state and local officials, third party researchers, and academia—data collection and research focused on the unique stock assessment challenges of Gulf fisheries.

By working with our recreational, for-hire and commercial fishermen, and engaging them directly in data collection, the NMFS Southeast Regional Office will ultimately accumulate more and better data, and will begin to restore trust between the sectors and regulators.

This public-private effort will allow officials tasked with managing our fishery resources to reach the right balance, balance for our recreational fishing community's quality of life and right to fish on our waters, balance for our regional economy fueled by the commercial and

for-hire fishing industry, and balance for our strong interest in stock rehabilitation, species preservation and protecting our critical natural resources.

Mr. Chair, the Florida Institute of Oceanography estimates that Florida's ocean economy generates almost $30 billion dollars per year in economic activity, more than that generated by citrus, cattle, ranching and the space industry of Florida combined. It is critical that we get this right.

I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman CULBERSON through the appropriations process, and with NOAA and NMFS Southeast Regional Office during implementation of this funding, to stand up this critical, innovative stock assessment initiative and make it a success for Florida and for all five of our Gulf States, including the Chairman's home state of Texas.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER–4 MICHAEL A. HUDSON

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, I am very grateful for the opportunity to recognize Chief Warrant Officer-4 Michael A. Hudson, his wife Karin, and their two sons Zachary and Joshua, for their hard work and commitment to our great country, the United States of America. After honorably serving as an active duty U.S. Marine for the past 20 years, CW4 Hudson retired on Friday, May 15, 2015.

CW4 Hudson is an Ohio native from Sandusky who joined the Marine Corps in 1994. He has received numerous personnel awards such as: the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Combat Action Ribbon, two Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals, and two Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals. CW4 Hudson also excelled in his studies having earned a Master's Degree from Webster University in Management and Leadership. CW4 Hudson not only served his country while residing in the United States but also while living abroad in Japan for six years with his family. While on duty in Okinawa, Japan CW4 Hudson worked with General Support Maintenance Company during 1999. In 2006, CW4 Hudson and his family later transferred to Iwakuni, Japan where he served as the Station Motor Transport Officer and Garrison Mobile Equipment Fleet Manager.

It is with sincere gratitude I honor Mr. Hudson's family for their dedication to our country throughout his years of active service. Mrs. Karin Hudson has been happily married to Mr. Hudson for nineteen years. Not only has she held an important position with Valley Counseling in Warren, Ohio as a Program Manager, but she has also fulfilled the role of both parents her husband was deployed. Mrs. Hudson selflessly moved with her family whenever her husband's duty called for them to do so, and I laud her for her commitment to her husband, her family, and her country.

I would also like to acknowledge Mr. and Mrs. Hudson's two sons, Zachary and Joshua, for their patience and spirit as they traveled with their parents around Japan and the United States. It may at times be difficult to have a parent in active service, but they have shown true patriotism in their support of their father. Zachary at thirteen attends Lakeview Middle School, all the while enjoying the responsibilities of being a Boy Scout. His younger brother Joshua is nine years old and currently attends Lakeview Elementary where he enjoys playing baseball.

Mr. Speaker I ask all of my colleagues to join me in extending a heartfelt thank you to Chief Warrant Officer-4 Hudson and his family for their commitment to our country. We will never forget the years you have honorably served and will forever be thankful for it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. AMI BERA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Rollcall vote No. 292, the amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina. Had I been present, I would have voted "No."

TRIBUTE TO CARL ST. CLAIR

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor and celebrate Carl St. Clair's 25th Anniversary as the Music Director at Orange County's Pacific Symphony.

Under Carl St. Clair's brilliant leadership, Pacific Symphony has become the largest professional symphony orchestra formed in the past fifty years. Through St. Clair's outstanding vision, sensitivity, and dynamic leadership, Pacific Symphony has developed programming that has bridged different cultures, engaged creative voices, and opened the door of great music for all.

St. Clair's artistic vision and standards have generated enthusiastic audiences locally and internationally. In 2006, he led the Symphony on its first European tour—nine cities in three countries playing before capacity houses and receiving extraordinary reviews. His commitment to new music has been demonstrated locally and admired nationally. The Pacific Symphony's American Composers' Festival has celebrated leading composers annually for fifteen years; the Symphony has won two ASCAP Awards for Adventurous Programming, and has released eleven recordings—primarily the music of American composers. St. Clair has produced numerous thematic festivals and fostered the return of professional opera to Orange County. He has also developed continuing programmatic relationships with a number of local universities, including USC, Chapman University, and UC-Irvine.

St. Clair is actively involved in both the conception and implementation of Pacific Symphony's education and outreach programs. The orchestra produces more than twenty distinct education and outreach programs—several garnered national attention and are widely replicated.

Maestro St. Clair has proclaimed that "Music is a birthright," and has supported that vision with complementary activities that are accessible to the entire community.

Through HEARTSTRINGS, the Symphony provides music to more than twenty different agencies that range from homeless shelters and after school youth-mentoring clubs to the Center for Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders and Age Well Senior Services. This is accomplished through individual and small group visits to agency sites as well as providing available tickets for major performances. In total, forty-four percent of the Pacific Symphony's annual audiences heard the orchestra at no cost last season. Finally, in perhaps the greatest salute to Maestro St. Clair's musical leadership, fully one-third of Pacific Symphony musicians (37 in number) have tenures with the orchestra that equal or exceed his twenty-five years.

From the highest artistic standards to the breadth of community outreach and service, Carl St. Clair is a vital part of the distinctive quality of life we enjoy in Orange County and Southern California. I thank him for his leadership and for enriching the lives of children and adults throughout the Southern California region, the nation, and the world.

HONORING MARVIN GIBSON ON THE OCCASION OF EARNING HIS SEVENTY YEAR PIN

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Marvin Gibson of Marquette, Michigan on the occasion of earning his Seventy Year Pin in service of the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Gibson was awarded this honor at a ceremony in Northern Michigan on May 31, 2015.

As Scoutmaster of Boy Scout Troop 305 in Marquette, Mr. Gibson has shown his devotion to the scouting way of life. In his long career with the BSA, he has earned several other distinctions such as the rank of Eagle Scout, Vigil Honor in the Order of the Arrow, National Jamboree Leadership, and the Order of the Arrow National Conferences. Mr. Gibson is additionally the father of an Eagle Scout and a long time summer camp staffer at Camp Hiawatha.

As a former Boy Scout myself, I have firsthand experience in the positive work that Scouting provides, especially in helping young men become self-reliant and learn important skills. On behalf of all residents of the First Congressional District, I wish to convey my congratulations to Mr. Gibson, his family, his fellow scouts, and the many that he has helped to positively influence in his seventy years in service of scouting.

IN HONOR OF SHERIFF LEON WILMOT

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a patriot, a public servant and a

great Sheriff, Sheriff Leon Wilmot from Yuma, Arizona.

Sheriff Wilmot has been an effective law enforcement officer and a staunch advocate in opposing illegal immigration and for supporting the rule of law. His leadership has recently been recognized by the National Sheriff's Association which has named him Chairman of its Immigration and Border Security Committee.

Much deserved Sheriff Wilmot, congratulations. Know that we support your efforts here in Washington, D.C.

HONORING SERGEANT ERIC LUND

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sergeant Eric Lund, a true American hero, as well as the community that banded together to help serve one of their neighbors who sacrificed so much in defense of our freedom.

Sergeant Eric Lund joined the U.S. Army National Guard in 2003 after graduating from Ludington High School. He served with the 126th C Company as a gunner atop a Military All-Terrain Vehicle, and was in Afghanistan when he was injured in May 2012 as a result of a roadside IED. The explosion resulted in serious injuries including the loss of both arms.

Eric spent over two years enduring numerous surgeries during his rehabilitation in San Antonio, Texas. However, he knew his goal was to be back home in Ludington—near friends, family, and the water. Returning home for Eric also meant living an active lifestyle that include biking, being outdoors, and most importantly, being able to live independently and tackle everyday tasks on his own.

That dream became a reality as a result of an outpouring of support from the Ludington community and the ''Helping a Hero'' organization.

As part of the their first Michigan project, ''Helping a Hero,'' working with Malliet Construction, built Eric a new home featuring adaptive technology to allow for independent living tools like voice activation and a shower with scrubbers. Donations from the Ludington community came in various forms—from money to materials and labor. There are so many people to thank for making this project a reality for Eric, and I will be proud to join them all on June 8, 2015 for the neighborhood ''Welcome Home'' ceremony.

As our nation's heroes return home, we must welcome them back and recognize the sacrifices they made protecting our freedoms and way of life. As the Ludington community has proven, we can and must help serve these brave men and women. So long as there are soldiers like Sergeant Eric Lund fighting for us, we can never forget that the cost of freedom is high.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition of the proposed cuts to the Transportation Infrastructure Generating Economic Recovery Program (TIGER) under the Fiscal Year 2016 Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Appropriations bill.

Since 2009, the Department of Transportation has provided state and local governments with grants to complete infrastructure projects. Many communities have profited from these investments, providing neighborhoods with safer pedestrian pathways, revitalizing economically distressed areas, and reducing congestion from traffic.

TIGER grants are meant to provide eligibility to infrastructure projects that do not qualify for restrictive formula based federal funding. Freight, port, and bridge projects across the country have benefited from financial support from TIGER. Reducing accessibility to TIGER grants will prolong infrastructure projects and increase traffic in our communities.

The House FY16 THUD appropriations bill includes $100 million for TIGER grants. This is a $400 million reduction from the 2015 enacted level, cutting the Department of Transportation's budget by 80%.

Severe cuts to TIGER are troubling, and substantial funding for the program is crucial to my District. For example, the Durfee Avenue grade separation proposal in Pico Rivera would reduce an estimated 15.3 hours of vehicle delays on a daily basis. Rosemead Boulevard/Lakewood Boulevard in my District carries tens of thousands of cars every day, providing goods movement to the Gateway cities. The Del Amo Boulevard bridge is structurally deficient, outdated, and in need of maintenance to improve lane capacity problems.

I ask that my colleagues join me in opposing the 80% cuts to TIGER grants and language restricting TIGER eligibility in the HOUSE FY16 THUD bill. Providing funding for these and other TIGER projects are about providing services that communities deserve.

THE OCCASION OF THE RETIREMENT OF MS. CORA CIOTTI FROM THE WELDON CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate my constituent, Ms. Cora Ciotti, as she retires after working nearly 40 years in the education field. Ms. Ciotti began her career in education in New York where she worked as a Youth School Officer for the New Hyde Park School system. Later, she moved to Weldon, North Carolina, in my congressional district, where she worked for the Weldon City Public School system in a number of capacities.

Before embarking on a career in education, Ms. Ciotti attended John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York where she was trained and certified as a Youth School Officer. Ms. Ciotti's training helped her to navigate some of the unique challenges that were presented by students and empowered her to have a dynamic and positive influence on their lives. Many of the youth who were influenced by Ms. Ciotti decades ago have grown into productive citizens who are making positive contributions to their communities.

After relocating to Weldon, North Carolina, Ms. Ciotti began working with the Weldon City Public Schools, where she served as a Teacher's Assistant and Attendance Counselor, among other important roles. She demonstrated care, compassion, and dedication to the students with whom she worked. If any student was hungry, Ms. Ciotti fed them. If any student lacked clothing, Ms. Ciotti clothed them. At times, Ms. Ciotti even provided shelter for some of our troubled youth by opening up her own home.

Ms. Ciotti was indeed special in her own way to the youth; she possessed a talent for reaching the youth right where they were; she reserved judgement; she changed the lives of many and pushed them in a positive direction, and for that we should all be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Cora Ciotti has positively influenced the lives of countless young people over her nearly 40-year career in education. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Ms. Ciotti for her dedication to generations of young people and in offering her best wishes as she embarks on the next chapter of her life.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM LOUIS ''BILL'' HORTSMAN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of William Louis ''Bill'' Hortsman, a devoted family man, respected Hoosier leader, and a selfless contributor to the Jennings County community. Bill leaves behind his wife of 52 years, Ruth Ann Hortsman, and his two children, Duane and Denise.

Mr. Hortsman graduated from North Vernon High School in 1951 and, in addition to attending First United Methodist Church in North Vernon, was also a member of Pleasant Grove United Methodist Church in Charlestown.

Bill is a true patriot who served in the U.S. Army from 1953 to 1955 after graduating from high school. In his early career, Bill worked for Hortsman Standard Service Station and Hortsman's Standard Oil Delivery.

Bill was also well-known for his commitment to his community. He was a life-long volunteer

at the Center Township Fire Department, and he served as Chief for eight years. Bill was also a bus driver for Jennings County Schools for 4 decades, Justice of the Peace for Center Township for eight years, Jennings County Treasurer for four terms, and a worker in the Jennings County Treasurer's Office for 28 years before retiring in 2008. In his free time, which was limited, Mr. Hortsman enjoyed word puzzles and the outdoors, including fishing trips and yard work.

Bill was not only a valuable asset to his community, but also my friend. He frequently attended my Coffee with the Congressman meetings in the 6th District of Indiana and was a long-time supporter of my efforts to serve the State of Indiana. I will always be grateful for the encouragement he gave me and the impact he made on me throughout my political career. He will be missed.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of William Louis ''Bill'' Hortsman. My thoughts and prayers go out to Bill's family, and may God comfort those he left behind with His peace and strength.

CONGRATULATING MADISON BRUNETTI AND LOGAN NEELEY

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my warmest congratulations to a staffer at my district office in Charleston, West Virginia. On June 6, 2015, Madison Brunetti will marry Logan Neeley. I am overjoyed that these two people have decided to commit to one another for the rest of their lives, and uphold the sacred institution of marriage.

I join with their families, friends, and loved ones in congratulating Madison and Logan on this momentous occasion. I wish the soon to be married couple the best of luck, and long, happy lives together.

TRIBUTE TO GERTIE WEBB OF SALEM, OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a dear friend of mine who passed away on March 17th of this year. I first met Gertie Webb when her oldest daughter and I worked for former Congressman Denny Smith of Oregon. Subsequently, I developed my long lasting friendship with Gertie when she worked for me while I served as the Oregon House Majority Leader.

Gertie was the youngest of nine children—five brothers and four sisters. Their father was a laborer while their mother tended to the needs of the family and the house. Gertie came along shortly before the onset of the Depression and was old enough to watch her brothers leave the home to serve in World War II. While those were challenging years for an entire generation, those were also the defining years of Gertie Webb's life.

During her childhood years, Gertie was expected to perform her fair share of the chores around the house. By age 13, she was driving the family car to the store to purchase the groceries. When she returned from her babysitting jobs, she would place much of her money in the family jar. It wasn't until she was ready to enroll in high school that her mother returned most of the money so Gertie could attend St. Mary's Academy in Portland, Oregon. Those were tough times, but whenever Gertie spoke of her youth, there always seemed to be a positive message in what she said.

In 1953, Gertie married Charles Webb in Portland, Oregon where they resided until 1964. With their three young children—Sue, Jan and Bill—they then moved to Salem where Gertie lived for almost 50 years. Charles passed away in 1982 and shortly after their college years, the kids scattered in different directions. That is when Gertie returned to the working world, including jobs with Congressman Denny Smith and at the Oregon legislature.

My last visit with Gertie took place at a nursing home where she lived her final three years. These were not sad years but years filled with many friendships and positive memories. She was an active resident, always offering assistance in organizing field trips, social events and other activities for her fellow residents. She would start out every morning in the chapel attending daily religious services.

Gertie's faith was the bedrock of who she was. Not one to wear it on her sleeve, Gertie instead manifested her faith through her actions towards others. A good listener, she had a particular interest in the concerns and needs of the less fortunate. When she would say that she would offer her prayers for someone suffering from a hardship, she truly meant it.

And then there is Gertie Webb, the sports guru. Mr. Speaker, this woman knew sports better than anyone I've ever known. Football. Baseball. Basketball. Golf. It didn't matter what sport, Gertie could tell you what teams were ahead in the standings or what golfer had the best shot at winning the U.S. Open. I was told that some of the nursing home staff would frequently visit Gertie's room for a rundown on the scores. Her favorite team was Notre Dame. Few things caused her as much stress as the Irish facing defeat. Rather than watching the final outcome, she would turn off the TV and rely on one of her children or a close friend to give her the final score.

Gertie leaves behind many family members and friends. I offer my condolences to Sue, Jan and Bill following the death of their mother. Someday, we will all face the same fate as Gertie. When my day comes, I can only hope to be as willing to accept the journey as my friend Gertie. Her faith carried her through a remarkable 85-year journey and I am so thankful that I was able to encounter her during her journey. She was a dear friend to many, and a loving and caring mother of three and grandmother of five.

HONORING JOE DOWLING ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE GUTHRIE THEATER

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Joe Dowling, who is retiring in June from the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, Minnesota after serving 20 distinguished years as Artistic Director. During Mr. Dowling's impressive tenure, he has directed more than 50 shows and reinforced the foundation for this world-class Minnesota cultural cornerstone.

Mr. Dowling joined the Guthrie as Artistic Director in 1995, bringing his ceaseless creativity and tireless dedication to the arts after leading other theater companies in his native Ireland. Among Mr. Dowling's many achievements is the development of training programs like the University of Minnesota/Guthrie Theater B.F.A. Actor Training Program and A Guthrie Experience for Actors in Training. He also solidified a partnership with The Acting Company of New York and created the WorldStage Series, two programs that allow local talent to tour the U.S. and in turn welcome internationally renowned theater programs to Minnesota. He has also shared his vision and talents on Broadway and at other prominent venues throughout the United States and Europe.

Perhaps Mr. Dowling's deepest legacy is the success of a $125 million capital campaign and construction of a new theater home which was completed in 2006. Designed by French architect Jean Nouvel, the theater is an architectural gem. At 285,000 square feet, the new Guthrie includes public gathering spaces and restaurants, and a 178-foot ''endless bridge'' that highlights a spectacular, soaring view of the mighty Mississippi River. At the heart of the new Guthrie are three unique theaters offering special performance spaces and viewing perspectives. The Dowling Studio in particular is an intimate 200-person black box theater that has welcomed 33 local acting companies and stands as a testament to its namesake's commitment to developing and showcasing the Twin Cities arts community.

In a metropolitan area that boasts more theater seats per capita than anywhere else in the U.S. outside of New York, Minnesotans take great pride in our thriving, high quality performing arts community. Experiencing a performance at the Guthrie is a particular joy, and I attend shows there whenever I can. I am clearly not alone, because under Dowling's leadership, the Guthrie entertains, enriches and enlightens 400,000 patrons each year.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise to honor Mr. Dowling and his many contributions to the rich cultural landscape in Minnesota as the Guthrie Theater's Artistic Director as well as his lifetime of commitment to the arts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 21, 2015, I was on medical

leave due to an appointment related to my recovery from surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 261 (on agreeing to the Edwards of Maryland Part A Substitute Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 2262),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 262 (on passage of H.R. 2262), and

"No" on roll call vote No. 263 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 274).

BRADFORD-O'KEEFE FUNERAL HOMES

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bradford-O'Keefe Funeral Homes on the occasion of their 150th anniversary. This milestone marks the continued commitment to service that the O'Keefe family has provided the citizens of the Mississippi Gulf Coast for the past century and a half.

In 1865, Irish immigrant Edward "Ned" O'Keefe established his livery service in Ocean Springs. Ned O'Keefe's funeral business soon expanded to Biloxi and other Coast cities as its ownership and management was passed down to succeeding generations of O'Keefe family members. He would certainly be proud of the success and growth of his family business.

Today, with locations all along the Mississippi Gulf, the O'Keefe family compassionately serves their neighbors, friends, and family during life's most difficult times.

The O'Keefe family distinguishes itself outside the family business in a broad array of community involvement, public service, and philanthropy. This is evident by family patriarch, World War II fighter pilot "Ace," State Legislator, and Biloxi Mayor Jeremiah "Jerry" O'Keefe's service to his state and country.

The O'Keefe family is also blessed with a dedicated and professional staff that combined has hundreds of years of experience. Like the family, they are committed to faithfully serving their community.

Once again, I would like to thank the O'Keefe Family for their 150 years of dedicated service to the citizens of the Mississippi Gulf Coast.

HONORING MR. & MRS. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. & Mrs. Michael J. Bradley, two constituents born and raised in my district, who will be celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary on June 18, 2015.

Michael Bradley was born and raised in Philadelphia and is a graduate of St. Thomas More High School. His loving wife, Bernadette Ann Sherry, was also born and raised in Philadelphia and graduated from West Catholic High School. The Bradleys are an extremely close knit Irish Catholic family, blessed with eight children and twenty-three grandchildren. Mr. & Mrs. Bradley taught their children that the best way out of poverty was through hard work and education. Fortunately, Michael and Bernadette were able to support all eight of their children as they attended college. Above all, the Bradleys always gave their children three major items to live by: "Faith, Family & Friends".

Mr. & Mrs. Bradley are not only prosperous with love from their large family, but have also succeeded in the business realm. The M.J. Bradley Company was founded in 1973, and continues to be a well known contender in the construction industry, installing quality floor and wall products. The M.J. Bradley Co. continues to grow and thrive under the guidance of five of the Bradley's children.

I would like my colleagues to join me in honoring the significance of this occasion, as Mr. & Mrs. Bradley celebrate their 60th wedding anniversary. They are both model citizens of Philadelphia and will remain an inspiration to their family and community for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE 2015 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2015 recipients of the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

This prestigious honor is presented annually by the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations—NECO, and pays tribute to our Nation's immigrant heritage, as well as to those whose achievements and contributions to our Nation embody the American Dream. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor are awarded to U.S. citizens from diverse ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage and culture. Since the Medals' founding in 1986, more than 2,000 American citizens have received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, including six American Presidents, United States Senators, Congressmen, Nobel Laureates, athletes, artists, clergy, and military leaders. The Medal is not about achieving material success, nor is it about the politics of immigration; it is about the people who have committed themselves to this nation, embraced the opportunities America has to offer, and most importantly, who have used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in our country and in the lives of its people.

Citizens of the United States hail from every nation known to man. It is the key to why America is the most innovative, progressive and forward thinking country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our fore bearers, ourselves and the next generation of Americans to celebrate their unique cultural identities while still championing the American way of life. In addition, by honoring these remarkable Americans, we honor all who share their origins and acknowledge the contributions they have made to America.

I commend NECO and its Board of Directors headed by my dear friend, Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as to promote unity and a sense of common purpose in our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NECO and in congratulating all of the 2015 recipients of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

2015 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Shohreh Aghdashloo, Dr. Kamiar Alaei, Masoud "Mike" Altirs, Domingo T. Alvear, MD, FACS, FICS, Shireen Atabaki, MD, MPH, Christopher Atamian, Trisha A Bailey, Jay H. Baker, PhD., Patty Baker, Rear Admiral Paul Becker, U.S. Navy, Miri Ben-Ari, Mirghavamaddin Bozorgmir, Nicholas R. Caiazzo, Esq., Ted A. Chaglassian, MD, FACS, Dr. Allen Chan, D.C, Jo Ellen Chatham, PhD, Diane Cirincione-Jampolsky, PhD, Maj Gen. Vincent A. Coglianese, Rocco B. Commisso, Edward T. Creagan, MD, Juan Carlos Cruz, Rajdeep K. Dhami, MD, Reverend Peter M. Donohue, O.S.A., LCDR Joyce M. Elter, USN (Ret), Ahmass Fakahany, Sheriff Louis Falco III, Adm Mark E. Ferguson III, USN, Meera Gandhi, Chad P. Gehani DDS, Richard L. Gelfond, Palmer C. Hamilton, Esq., Leslie Hanson, Master Chief Eric J. Heimburger, Myron Z. Holubiak, Gerald G. Jampolsky, MD, Dr. Kyo "Paul" Jhin, Rahul M. Jindal, M.D., Ph.D, MBA, Mike O. Joulakian P.E, Pamela J. Joyner, Vahe Karapetian, Colonel James J. Keefe, Mariam Khosravani, Kevin D. Kim, Rev. Seung Hee Kim, Mr. Young Kil Kim, KV Kumar, Chief Cathy L. Lanier, William "Don" Larson, Dr. David Lizarraga, Luis G. Lobo, Howard Lutnick, Martha "Muffy" MacMillan, Hildegarde Ercklentz Mahoney, John (Manoukarakis) Manos, RADM Larry Roy Marsh (Ret.), Major General Thomas J. Masiello, USAF, Lt General Wendy M. Masiello, DAD Brian F. McCauley FBI, Deric A. Milligan, Major Creighton A. Mullins, USAF, Harry Nadjarian, Chief Abdo Nahmod, Alyssa Navallo-Herman, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, James P. O'Neill, Catherine O'Reilly, Dr. Zulfiya Orynbayeva, Anoosheh M. Oskouian, Lieutenant General Raymond P. Palumbo, Congressman Ted Poe, Bernard J. Poussot, Robert L. Priddy, Mariano Rivera, Dr. Mostafa Ronaghi, Andrew Sabin, Mike M. Sarian, John Sculley, Gerard Senehi, Frank Shankwitz, Dr. Simon K. Simonian, Major General Linda L. Singh, S.Mona Sinha, Robert F. Spetzler, MD, Hao Jiang Tian, Jeremy Travis, Peter Unanue, Bob Unanue, George Uribe, Nikiforos Valaskantjis, Meredith Vieira, Wafeek Samuel Wahby, Ph.D, B.Th, Kenneth E. Warner, Esq., James N. Weinstein, DO, MS, Richard Roderick Willis, Rabbi Amiel Wohl, Ehsan Yarshater, PhD., Shirley Young, Theodore K. Zampetis, Francois Zayek. International Medal Recipients: Baroness Dr. Sandip Verma, Bert Sakmann MD, PhD.

International Ellis Island Medal of Honor Recipients: Baroness Dr. Sandip Verna and Bert Sakmann MD, PhD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL JOHNSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that during a two minute

vote series last night I inadvertently voted 'no' on Mr. KING's amendment (roll call vote 293) when I intended to vote 'yes.' I strongly believe that President Obama's executive order granting amnesty to those illegally in America is unconstitutional, and in no way should be implemented or funded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote #284 on House Amendment 333 to H.R. 2578. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

HONORING PEPSICO

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor PepsiCo, which is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary.

Founded in 1965, PepsiCo has had its headquarters in Purchase, New York, since 1970.

As a Fortune 500 company, PepsiCo has not only transformed the food and beverage industry, it is a global leader in finding solutions for many of the serious challenges facing the international community. The company's philanthropic arm, the PepsiCo Foundation, supports programs that encourage healthy lifestyles, improve the availability of nutrition and clean water, and empower women. Most recently, the foundation announced that, through its collaborative efforts, more than four million people in Latin America now have access to safe, clean water.

PepsiCo has displayed a commitment to increasing opportunities for female leaders in its workforce. In 2011, the company launched the Pinnacle Group in the United States as a way of retaining the most talented female employees through career development, leadership training, and mentoring opportunities. In Asia, the Middle East and Africa (AMEA), PepsiCo has successfully increased female participation through gender equity awareness and inclusion of women in leadership roles. Today, more than a quarter of PepsiCo executives in the AMEA region are female and the company is led by Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Indra Nooyi.

Since 2005, PepsiCo has donated more than $600 million to agencies working in the environmental, educational, civic, arts and health and human services fields. It also provided more than $1.4 million for Hurricane Sandy relief efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring PepsiCo on its fiftieth anniversary.

RECOGNIZING SNAP ON ITS 27TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize SNAP (Survivors of Those Abused by Priests) on the occasion of their 27th Anniversary, which they will celebrate at their annual conference here in Washington D.C., July 31–Aug 2.

Founded in 1988 by my fellow Chicagoan, Barbara Blaine, SNAP is a self-help support group for those who were sexually violated—whether by clergy, family members, trusted adults, or strangers. Barbara is a survivor of childhood sexual abuse by a member of the clergy. SNAP has become a voice for childhood sexual abuse prevention, awareness and healing in our community. Today, SNAP is an international organization with members in all 50 states and in 71 countries, with over 70 chapters organized throughout the United States and across the world.

Research conducted by the Centers for Disease Control estimates that one in four girls and one in six boys are sexually abused before the age of 18. Only one in 10 children ever tells anyone.

The median age when a victim discloses childhood sexual abuse is 40. One of the most important public policy developments in this country has been the effort to reform the statutes of limitations laws in states.

SNAP is working to bring a voice and justice to victims and survivors by working to reform a legal system that has imposed inadequately short civil statutes of limitations. Those arbitrary deadlines prevent most victims from ever getting through the courthouse doors to present their evidence and make their case.

Typically, victims of child sexual abuse have only five years after they've turned 18 to pursue civil legal remedies for the justice they seek. That means that after age 23, survivors of childhood sexual abuse are prohibited from seeking legal recourse against their abusers, and it can mean that child sexual predators are allowed to live freely among us.

In 2013, I am proud to report, the state of Illinois enacted legislation to remove criminal and civil statute of limitations for sex offenses that occurred when the victim was under 18 years of age. The new law removes the statute of limitations for child sex abuse that occurs on or after January 1, 2014.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge SNAP and all their volunteer leaders, who give so much of themselves to help others. Protecting children and preventing sexual abuse of children is a worthy effort we all can support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 295 on H.R. 2578, I mistakenly recorded my vote as yes when I should have voted no.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 2015 I was absent for recorded votes #274 through #295 due to the passing of my mother.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here:

On Roll Call #274 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #275 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #276 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #277 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #278 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #279 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #280 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #281 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #282 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #283 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #284 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #285 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #286 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #287 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #288 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #289 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #290 I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #291 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #292 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #293 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #294 I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #295 I would have voted No.

IN RECOGNITION OF BRIAN WHISTON'S SELECTION AS MICHIGAN'S STATE SUPERINTENDENT

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Brian Whiston on his nomination for Michigan's State Superintendent. As a Member of Congress it is both my privilege and honor to recognize Mr. Whiston for his prioritization of the success of our students and guiding them on the right path to higher education and into the workforce.

For the past 8 years, Mr. Whiston has served as the Superintendent for Dearborn Public Schools in Dearborn, Michigan, where he selflessly advocated for the betterment of his students and staff through innovative programs and policies. Mr. Whiston implemented a co-teaching model which blends general and special educators to cater to the specific needs of ESL students who comprise a vast majority of the student population. Breaking down the barriers of the typical high school classroom scenario, Mr. Whiston created initiatives for students to explore career interests and acclimate themselves to the college experience. Advanced placement programs, Dual Enrollment at local universities, a S.T.E.M. based magnet program, and a vocational program for culinary arts and hospitality have created a wide array of avenues for students to venture into higher education. This innovative approach led to increased test scores and graduation rates in the district and was certainly of note as Mr. Whiston was named Michigan's Superintendent of the Year in 2014.

As a proponent and champion of unions, Mr. Whiston fostered a strong working relationship with all unions in the district, which was instrumental in settling contracts that kept jobs in the district, balanced the budget, and saved valuable taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Mr. Whiston for achieving this accolade. I am confident his fantastic work with Dearborn Public Schools will transcend into his tenure as Michigan's next State Superintendent.

HONORING LOS CERRITOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, congratulations. Los Cerritos Elementary School in Long Beach, CA was recently selected as a 2015 U.S. Department of Education Green Ribbon School, an honor shared by several other schools in the Long Beach Unified School District.

The dedicated faculty and staff, students, and families who share the same ideals of conservation and sustainability in their community are commended for integrating these ideals while meeting state education standards. Through hands-on application of activities such as farming and recycling, students become good stewards of their communities and environment and expand the margins of their K–5 education. Additionally, the campus has adopted new technologies to bring their existing infrastructure up to efficient standards. In sum, Long Beach Unified School District has saved approximately $4.9 million in energy costs across multiple school campuses.

Los Cerritos Elementary School is the fifth school in the school district to receive this distinction. I am proud that Long Beach continues to be a leader in green education and I encourage other schools, at all levels, to follow suit in adopting and implementing the leadership necessary to reduce environmental impacts. The environmental instruction being developed by Los Cerritos Elementary as well as previously recognized Green Ribbon Schools should be a model for adoption by all schools nationwide. The value of a quality education to our community cannot be overstated, and investing in green education will offer great returns to our future.

HONORING MRS. CAROLYN SIMS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Carolyn Sims, who is retiring after over 26 years of public service in Tarrant County. The communities where she has served in various positions over her career are better places because of her efforts.

For over a decade I had the privilege of working with Mrs. Sims during her tenure. However, her service and commitment began long before we met, and will have a lasting impact beyond her official duties' end. After graduating from the University of North Texas, Carolyn began working at a bank until she shifted to public service in education, as a middle school teacher and then as a school counselor. Mrs. Sims then served as the President of the Colleyville Chamber of Commerce as well as for the Arts Council of Northeast Tarrant County.

During the 2003 legislative session, State Representative Vicki Truitt recruited Mrs. Sims to serve as her chief of staff in Austin. After returning to North Texas, Carolyn returned to her education roots and began to work for the Town of Westlake, Westlake Academy Foundation, and then the Northwest ISD Education Foundation. Finally, Carolyn utilized her connections and skills to serve the residents of Northeast Tarrant County as the 3rd Precinct County Administrator for Commissioner Gary Fickes.

Over the course of her career, Carolyn has been recognized multiple times for her significant contributions to the North Texas community. In 1994, she received the Women's Award for Business by the Women's Shelter Legacy. In 1995, she received recognition from the Northeast Leadership Forum as the "Outstanding Community Volunteer". Adding to her accolades, the Star Telegram named Mrs. Sims the 1999 "Woman of the Year", while the Business Press named her the "Most Influential Woman" the same year.

As Carolyn retires, her community service and dedicated work will be greatly missed. During her service of over 26 years, spanning from school board to chief of staff, Carolyn habitually placed others ahead of herself. It is my privilege to honor such an outstanding citizen in the U.S. House of Representatives.

A TRIBUTE TO SARAH ELIZABETH WILLIAMS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1918–MAY 9, 2015

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman and a lifelong friend to my family, the late Sarah Elizabeth Williams.

Sarah Elizabeth Williams was born on September 3, 1918 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. She was the oldest of four children and the only daughter born to Rev. Charles E. Williams and Ethel Davis Williams. Her three brothers, Charles, Matthew, and James preceded her in death.

When Sarah was very young, the family moved to historic La Mott, a suburb of Philadelphia, located in Cheltenham Township in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. In 1885 the village was officially named for the famous abolitionist and suffragette, Lucretia Mott, who had moved to the area in 1850. Many longtime residents like Sarah as well as new ones were proud of their community's heritage which stood as an important landmark in black history. One of the first communities to encourage integrated living, the village represented a turning point in the social and racial development of residential communities in the post-Civil War era. "Roadside", the home of Lucretia Mott, was a stop for slaves traveling the Underground Railroad north to safety.

After graduating from Cheltenham High School, Sarah moved to Norfolk, Virginia, attending Virginia Union Jr. College for two years. She took classes in English, Biology, and Zoology, before returning home to help look after her three brothers following her mother's illness and death.

For many years, Sarah worked as a technician at the Fels Research Institute at Temple University in Philadelphia. Her marriages ended in divorce, but out of the union she had one child, Sandra.

Always looking to explore new horizons, Sarah took the Federal Civil Service exam and moved to Washington, D.C., in 1950 to secure employment in the federal government.

Sarah, affectionately known as "Gramm" by family and friends, worked for H.E.W. in Washington, D.C., and the Army Corps of Engineers in Gravely Point, Virginia. She transferred to the U.S. Department of Justice in 1963, and worked there in the Civil Rights Division. At the Department of Justice Sarah provided support to several attorneys, among them her heroes, Thurgood Marshall, and Assistant Attorney General, John Doar.

In 1968 and 1969, Sarah traveled with legal teams to Montgomery and Birmingham, Alabama, and to Chicago, Illinois, to help prepare briefs for various trials. The duration of these trips ranged from three days to as many as three weeks for the trial in Birmingham. One important case in 1980 involved an appeal in a suit alleging brutality and other unlawful practices on the part of the Philadelphia Police Department. Sarah always said her work with the attorneys in the division to combat racial and various other forms of discrimination in housing, education, and employment, while enforcing civil and voting rights, gave her a sense of pride and purpose and she received many special achievement awards for her "Superior Performance".

Sarah retired in 1983 but always stayed connected to her former colleagues, and in 2007, was the oldest former employee to attend the Commemoration of the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division's 50th anniversary at the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C.

Prior to retirement, Sarah began living with her daughter and her husband, E. Lucien Cox, in Montgomery County, Maryland. She was a wonderful influence in the lives of her three grandchildren and family friends, providing them with much of her wisdom and experience. Sarah's example helped them to appreciate the value of hard work, commitment, and best of all, joie de vivre.

After retiring Sarah was able to travel to interesting places throughout the world, become more active in her church, and dote on her seven great grandchildren, as well as volunteering with reading programs at local schools. She continued to be active until age 87, when her health began to fail.

Sarah, to quote Maya Anjelou, was truly a "phenomenal woman", who always seemed to be ahead of the curve. Her interest in ecology and nature, and even encouraging the grandchildren to recycle, goes back 45 years. She also stayed relevant by listening to and engaging young people. They learned from her and she learned from them and respected their views.

Sarah's sense of humor was legendary. Everyone who met her knew she never missed

a beat. You never could predict what was coming next, but you just knew it would be memorable. There will never be another like ''Gramm''.

When Sarah's family moved near her beloved Chesapeake Bay, to the Eastern Shore of Maryland in 2009, she accompanied them. She was a resident at the Berlin Maryland Nursing Center for five years and was cognitive and witty up until her passing on May 9, 2015. One of her greatest joys was living to see President Barack Obama elected twice, and to see Loretta Lynch confirmed as U.S. Attorney General. As she said, ''I never thought I would live to see all of this''.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of Congress to join me in honoring the memory of Sarah Elizabeth Williams. Our wonderful memories of her will sustain us all.

CONGRATULATING KASSIE McKNIGHT FOR COMPETING IN THE SCRIPPS NATIONAL SPELLING BEE

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kassie McKnight for her achievement in representing southwest Missouri at the Scripps National Spelling Bee.

Kassie is a Bolivar native and was an eighth grader at Bolivar Middle School during the time of the competition. She worked hard to get to the top, going through her local spelling bee in Bolivar to the Southwest Missouri Regional Spelling Bee at Missouri State University in Springfield. Kassie competed against 34 other spellers through 64 tough rounds at the regional competition, ultimately spelling ''exacerbate'' correctly to secure her spot at the 2015 Scripps National Spelling Bee in Washington. Kassie was one of 285 contestants to compete in the esteemed national bee.

These accomplishments took a great deal of hard work, including hours of practice and completion of numerous spelling drills, not to mention the ability to spell many difficult words that are rarely used in everyday conversation. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kassie on a job well done. It is great to represent in Congress such amazing talent found in the Missouri's Seventh Congressional District.

IN HONOR OF STEVE BOLLINGER

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, losing a father, mother, husband, or wife is an emotionally traumatic experience for any family. In addition to the burden faced by families that have experienced this type of loss, losing a head of household has severe economic implications for their journey forward. The Bollinger family learned this three decades ago, after unexpectedly losing their beloved Steve, leaving his wife, Lin, with four children and no income other than social security and several small insurance policies. Luckily, the Bollingers had a strong team behind them to help them through the immediate difficulties this presented.

During the Reagan Administration, Steve was Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Previously, he had run for Cincinnati City Council and served as the head of the Public Housing Authority of Columbus, Ohio, where he served honorably. His dedication rendered a sincere appreciation and respect from his colleagues, and these individuals would be the ones that summoned the means of supporting the Bollinger family until they won a worker's compensation claim that enabled them to return funds to the newly established Bollinger Foundation. And so, the group had a newly empowered mission: to support families that faced the same struggle.

I had the opportunity to work with Steve when I was a young staffer on Capitol Hill, working for the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, & Urban Affairs. Steve came before the Committee to bring the Reagan Administration's deregulation of the Community Development Block Grant.

Steve, a young man at the age of 36, died while traveling to Savannah, Georgia, to speak to the Georgia Municipal League. Lin was pregnant with their fourth child, and Steve, who had been a public servant most of his adult life, had not had enough time to build a sufficient nest egg to properly take care of the future needs of his family.

Since its founding, the Bollinger Foundation has provided nearly three quarters of a million dollars to families who have lost a loved one, with assistance given to families of individuals having worked in community or economic development, or assisted housing, as Steve did.

The Foundation has helped countless families including families affected by the bombing of the Murrah Federal Office Building in Oklahoma City, in which the greatest loss of life and injury was to people who worked for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Numerous families have benefitted from the efforts of the Foundation and their committed members, and their efforts represent Steve's memory well. I am grateful for Steve, our friendship of long ago and or the continued work of the foundation bearing his name.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following Roll Call votes on June 3, 2015 and would like to reflect that I would have voted as follows: Roll Call 289: No.

IN HONOR OF RICHARD MILLER

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Richard Miller, a resident of Cheshire, Connecticut, who passed away recently at the age of 100.

Mr. Miller dedicated his life to serving others and was a leader in the community. He served on various municipal boards including the town's Board of Education, Cheshire Hospice, and Senior Center. He also volunteered with countless civic organizations and societies and served three elected terms as the town of Cheshire's Police Commissioner.

Mr. Miller was a long time member of the First Congregational Church in my hometown of Cheshire, and was a very active member of the Rotary. He also established the Cheshire Food Drive, and raised funds for countless charitable organizations.

Mr. Miller was a civil engineer who worked with The American Brass Company and Anaconda Copper before completing his career with Platt Brothers & Company in Waterbury, CT in 1981.

He served our country in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for four and a half years, mainly concerned with the training of Special Engineer service and combat units at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. He was honorably discharged in April 1946 with the rank of Major CE.

Mr. Miller was an inspiration, and I know he is greatly missed by many, especially those in Connecticut's 5th Congressional District.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TRADE TRANSPAREN-C RESOLUTION

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Trade Review Accountability Needs Sunlight and Preview of Any Regulations and Exact Negotiated Components Resolution, or the ''Trade TRANSPAREN-C Resolution.''

Congress has granted the last eighteen presidents the authority to negotiate trade agreements withdrawing significant Congressional participation in the process. The recent past has seen a transformation in this authority, originally established to serve as negotiating guidelines. Today, it is little more than Congressional consent to be a rubber stamp as this implementing legislation sometimes referred to as ''Fast-Track'' or ''Trade Promotion Authority,'' grants sweeping authority to the Executive branch to negotiate trade deals. And it undercuts the Constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations as outlined in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. Instead we are allowed merely an up or down vote.

Today, I introduce this resolution to take back our Congressional authority, and to shine light on the negotiation process and final text of these increasingly massive trade deals.

The Trade Promotion Authority currently under debate would usher through the top secret Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement. It would also grant that fast track authority for up to six years. During that time we would be prohibited from any Congressional amendments or hearings, and given at most 60 days to review any proposed trade deal. This is a very short window if you consider that the draft TPP is between 800–1000 pages.

My Trade TRANSPAREN-C Resolution will put a hold on consideration of any implementing ''Fast-Track'' bill for any trade agreement until the full, final text of that agreement has been available to the public for no less than 60 days. This includes the secretive TPP.

In its current form, the TPP would outsource good jobs, degrade global environmental and working standards and allow investor rights to overrun the rights of workers. The TPP is also packed with special-interest perks thanks to the more than 600 transnational corporations that weighed in on, and in some case wrote, the agreement in secret. Meanwhile the American people have still not been allowed to read it.

For six years the U.S. trade representative has kept the TPP buried under a top secret classification. Even Members of Congress can only read it in a secure room under the watchful eye of a security monitor. I visited that room to review several sections of the deal and was not allowed to make copies, keep notes, take pictures, or share anything I learned with anyone unless they have Top Secret security clearance, all under threat of prosecution.

Despite the secrecy, this deal has provisions the American people need to know about.

The Trade TRANSPAREN-C Resolution will reaffirm Congress's Constitutional authority to set the terms for international trade. It will allow the American public time and sunlight to see the Trans-Pacific Partnership and future trade deals for themselves. As Members of Congress, we have a duty to our constituents to play the role mandated by the Constitution. Not allowing the people access to the full discussion would be a disservice to them. I urge my colleagues to support the Trade TRANSPAREN-C Resolution to ensure U.S. trade policy reflects American principles of representative governance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to make two votes. On roll call vote 288, had I been present I would have voted ''No.'' On roll call vote 289, had I been present I would have voted ''Aye.''

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MS. MARGARET JACKSON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of Ms. Margaret Jackson, a well respected Harlem activist, business woman and all around exemplary human being.

Margaret Jackson serves her community not merely through rhetoric but in her noble actions. The Martin Luther King Jr. Democratic Club exemplifies excellent civic service and brings hope and joy to countless citizens by keeping the legacy of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King Jr. at the forefront of our collective cultural consciousness. Margaret Jackson was the president of that institution. Under her leadership, the club continued its core principle of continuing a sense of altruistic civic mindedness, the likes of which brought great pride to her community. She wasn't, however, merely a member of but one institution focused on community service; she was instrumental to several. Ms. Jackson was the treasurer of the Harlem YMCA where she worked with competence, professionalism, and dignity, and a member of St. Phillip's Episcopal Church where she served and worshipped with great dignity. She was the epitome of a civic minded spiritualist.

Margaret Jackson was an exceptional person, a polymath who mastered many trades and served the public in many ways. She not only made a great impact in the non-profit sector, but she owned several successful businesses. Margaret Jackson was president of two funeral homes, which she led with competence, humanitarian compassion, and a heartfelt and deeply meaningful sense of care towards the neediest among us: traits vital in the managing of a funeral home, where those who came to her needed compassion more than anything else. She also proved her economic expertise in her ownership of a successful realty corporation, which she ran skillfully and prosperously, but always with a civic minded wholly humanitarian desire to serve the needy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing this wonderful person and all of the good that she stood for. The United States is built upon the backs of its most civic and conscientious citizens.

HONORING CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIVIST REV. FREDERICK D. REESE

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 2015

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor renowned civil rights leader Rev. Frederick D. Reese, a pillar in the Selma to Montgomery marches of 1965. This courageous Alabamian is being honored on Saturday June 7, 2015, in my hometown of Selma, Alabama, for his service and contributions to education and politics, as well as the fight for equality and justice. I am proud to be a part of efforts to pay homage to one of the most influential Americans in history.

Dr. Reese was born November 28, 1929. A believer in education, he graduated from Alabama State University and Livingston University, and studied and attended Southern University, the University of Alabama and Auburn University before receiving his doctorate of divinity from Selma University.

Dr. Reese is an historic figure of modern history known for his support of civil rights. Dr. Reese rose to national prominence as a civil rights leader following ''Bloody Sunday.''

This beloved civil rights activist marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama in 1965, along with hundreds of other supporters. By the mid-1960's, Reese was President of the Dallas County Voter's League and was also a local teacher who presided over the Selma Teachers Association. Discouraged by Selma's efforts to hinder voter registration for African Americans, Dr. Reese advocated that teachers press the issue. Dr. Reese invited Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to lead Selma's voting rights protest.

Dr. Reese has served the Selma and Dallas County community faithfully and his exemplary work and commitment to social justice is well known. Notably, Dr. Reese hasn't left the community that he helped become the center of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Dr. Reese has been quoted as saying his new fight is to inspire young people to lead purposeful lives.

''I tell young people today that they cannot rest on our victories,'' Dr. Reese said. ''We have to remain committed. That means registering to vote and participating in what this country has to offer. That means making a difference for others.''

Dr. Reese said that he marched so that everyone, regardless of color, could become a first-class citizen. Dr. Reese knows that you have to stand for what you believe in. He became nationally known for his beliefs and inspired others to stand as well. Dr. Reese has remained committed to education and service. He became a principal and a city councilman, serving 12 years on the Selma City Council. He also ran for mayor in 1984, and led a campaign to motivate Wal-Mart executives to hire African-Americans as store managers.

In 2000, in honor of his civil rights work, a stretch of more than three miles of U.S. Route 80, where he marched to Montgomery, was named the Frederick D. Reese Parkway. The F.D. Reese Christian Academy in Kokomo, Indiana, was also dedicated to him.

Dr. Reese has been the pastor of Selma's Ebenezer Baptist Church since 1965. Although he is retired from teaching, he still works as a Baptist minister and delivers a sermon to his congregation each week.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the accomplishments of Reverend Dr. F.D. Reese. We pay tribute to his distinguished career and honor his contributions and leadership in the civil rights movement. My deep appreciation is expressed for his courageous, distinguished and on-going service.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3731–S3848

Measures Introduced: Twenty bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1502–1521, and S. Res. 192–193. **Pages S3775–76**

Measures Reported:

S. 710, to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, with amendments. **Page S3775**

Measures Passed:

Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S3844**

McConnell (for Toomey) Amendment No. 1782, to change the effective date. **Page S3844**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3734–58**

Adopted:

By 61 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 202), Portman Amendment No. 1522 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide additional amounts for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades, and to provide an offset. **Pages S3734, S3737–38**

Reed (for Bennet) Amendment No. 1540 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to brief and submit a report to Congress on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects. **Pages S3734, S3736–37**

By 48 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 204), Tillis Amendment No. 1506 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for the stationing of C–130 H aircraft avionics previously modified by the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) in support of daily training and contingency requirements for Airborne and Special Operations Forces. **Pages S3746–53, S3754–55**

McCain (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 1618 (to Amendment No. 1463), of a perfecting nature. **Page S3755**

McCain Amendment No. 1539 (to Amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the Department of Defense from entering into contracts to facilitate payments for honoring members of the Armed Forces at sporting events. **Page S3755**

McCain (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 1551 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require a study and report on the changes to the Joint Travel Regulations related to flat rate per diem for long term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014. **Pages S3755–56**

McCain (for Warner) Amendment No. 1571 (to Amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress on diversity among members of the Armed Forces. **Page S3756**

McCain (for Hoeven) Amendment No. 1484 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require a report on Air National Guard contributions to the RQ–4 Global Hawk mission. **Page S3756**

McCain (for Heller) Amendment No. 1511 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require additional elements in the report on the plan on the privatization of the defense commissary system. **Page S3756**

Rejected:

By 53 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 203), Reed (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 1494 (to Amendment No. 1463), to revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S3739–40, S3753–54**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3734**

McCain Amendment No. 1456 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels. **Page S3734**

Reed Amendment No. 1521 (to Amendment No. 1463), to limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending relief from the spending limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011. **Pages S3734, S3744–46**

Cornyn Amendment No. 1486 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security. **Page S3734**

Vitter Amendment No. 1473 (to Amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units. **Pages S3738–39**

Markey Amendment No. 1645 (to Amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil. **Pages S3740–44**

Reed (for Blumenthal) Amendment No. 1564 (to Amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. **Page S3757**

McCain (for Paul) Modified Amendment No. 1543 (to Amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government. **Pages S3756–57, S3758**

Reed (for Durbin) Amendment No. 1559 (to Amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations. **Page S3757**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4 p.m., on Monday, June 8, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the bill. **Page S3844**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army and Navy. **Pages S3847–48**

Measures Referred: **Page S3775**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3775**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3776–78**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3778–81**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3771–75**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3781–S3844**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3844**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3844**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—204) **Pages S3738, S3754, S3755**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:08 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 8, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3844.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Export-Import Bank of the United States, including S. 819, to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States, after receiving testimony from Fred P. Hochberg, President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine security assistance in Africa, after receiving testimony from Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, and Puneet Talwar, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, both of the Department of State; Amanda Dory, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Office of the Under Secretary for Policy, African Affairs; and Lauren Ploch Blanchard, Specialist in African Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

FEDERAL REGULATORY PROCESS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management concluded a hearing to examine practical solutions to improve the Federal regulatory process, after receiving testimony from Susan E. Dudley, George Washington University Regulatory Studies Center, Washington, D.C.; and Michael Greenstone, University of Chicago Energy Policy Institute, Chicago, Illinois.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1137, to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Dale A. Drozd, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, LaShann Moutique DeArcy Hall, and Ann Donnelly, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, John W. Huber, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years, Eileen Maura Decker, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years, and Eric Steven Miller, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT SUBSIDY RULE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts concluded a hearing to examine the process that led to the Affordable Care Act subsidy rule, after receiving testimony from Michael A. Carvin, Jones Day, Michael F. Cannon, Cato Institute, Elizabeth B. Wydra, Constitutional Accountability Center, and Robert N. Weiner, Arnold and Porter LLP, all of Washington, D.C.; and Andy S. Grewal, University of Iowa College of Law, Iowa City.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R.&45 092684; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res.U; and H. Res.)8 09302 were introduced. **Pages H3912–16**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3916–17**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2131, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center" (H. Rept. 114–137); and

H.R. 2394, to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–138). **Page H3912**

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016: The House continued consideration of H.R. 2577, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. Consideration is expected to resume Tuesday, June 9. **Pages H3882–H3903**

Agreed to:

Norton amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the 5th or 14th Amendment to the Constitution or title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; **Pages H3883–84**

Gosar amendment that prohibits the use of funds for the Federal Transit Administration's Rapid Growth Area Transit Program; **Page H3888**

Gallego amendment that prohibits the use of funds by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to redesign the Phoenix Metroplex regional airspace; **Page H3891**

Maxine Waters (CA) amendment that prohibits the use of funds to carry out section 210 of this Act with respect to the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, CA; **Page H3893**

Walberg amendment that was debated on June 3rd that strikes section 102 from the bill which allows the Secretary or his designee to engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider

proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 299); and **Pages H3897–98**

Stivers amendment that was debated on June 3rd that prohibits the use of funds for the Private Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program under section 561(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (by a recorded vote of 224 ayes to 198 noes, Roll No. 307). **Pages H3902–03**

Rejected:

Norton amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to permit air transportation service between midnight and 6 a.m. at Ronald Reagan National Airport (DCA); **Pages H3885–86**

McClintock amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to zero out the funding for Payments to Air Carriers and apply the savings of $155,000,000 to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 255 noes, Roll No. 298); **Page H3897**

Cartwright amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to strike section 134 of the bill, which prohibits the use of funds to develop, issue, or implement any regulation that increases levels of minimum financial responsibility for transporting passengers or property as in effect on January 1, 2014 (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 301); **Pages H3898–99**

Garrett amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Federal Railroad Administration by $16,930,000 (by a recorded vote of 160 ayes to 266 noes, Roll No. 302); **Page H3899**

Brooks (AL) amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to strike the paragraph providing funding for Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (by a recorded vote of 143 ayes to 283 noes, Roll No. 303); **Pages H3899–H3900**

Brooks (AL) amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to strike the paragraph providing funding for Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (by a recorded vote of 139 ayes to 286 noes, Roll No. 304); **Pages H3900–01**

Capps amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to increase funding in the Pipeline Safety Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund by $27,604,000 (by a recorded vote of 202 ayes to 222 noes, Roll No. 305); **Page H3901**

Lee amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to administer, implement, or enforce section 193 or section 414 of this Act (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 247 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 306); and **Pages H3888–91, H3901–02**

Esty amendment that was debated on June 3rd that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Federal Railroad Administration, by $3,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 308. Agreed by unanimous consent that the earlier roll call vote taken on the Esty amendment be vacated). **Pages H3898, H3901, H3903**

Withdrawn:

Polis amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have evaluated ridership on transit by ridership demand; and **Pages H3887–88**

Blumenauer amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have reduced the amount for necessary expenses for the ''Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses'' by $1. **Pages H3895–96**

Proceedings Postponed:

Blackburn amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of June 3, 2015) that seeks to reduce each amount made available by this Act by 1 percent; **Pages H3882–83**

Gosar amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to carry out the rule entitled ''Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing'', published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on July 19, 2013; **Pages H3884–85**

Gosar amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Tank Car Standards and Operational Controls for High-Hazard Flammable Trains''; **Pages H3886–87**

Posey amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Transportation to take any actions with respect to the financing of passenger rail projects along Florida's East Coast; **Page H3891**

Sessions amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to support Amtrak's route with the highest loss, measured by contributions/(Loss) per Rider; **Pages H3892–93**

Sessions amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to support any Amtrak route whose costs exceed 2 times its revenues; **Pages H3893–94**

Schiff amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to enforce section 47524 of title 49, with regard to noise or access restriction of the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, CA; **Pages H3894–95**

Posey amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Transportation to authorize exempt facility bonds to finance passenger rail projects that cannot attain the speed of 150 mph; and **Page H3895**

Posey amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Transportation to make a loan in an amount that exceeds $600,000,000 under the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act. **Page H3896**

H. Res. 287, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2577) and (H.R. 2578) was agreed to on June 2nd.

Passing of Joseph Robinette "Beau" Biden, III: The House agreed to H. Res. 299, on the passing of Joseph Robinette "Beau" Biden, III. **Page H3904**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, June 8 and that the order of the House of January 6, 2015 regarding Morning Hour debate does not apply on that day. **Page H3904**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H3896.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Ten recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3897, H3897–98, H3898–99, H3899, H3900, H3900–01, H3901, H3902, H3902–03 and H3903. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Examining H.R. 2017, the Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act of 2015". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power concluded a hearing entitled "Discussion Draft on Accountability and Department of Energy Perspectives on Title IV: Energy Efficiency". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EPA REGULATORY OVERREACH: IMPACTS ON AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "EPA Regulatory Overreach: Impacts on American Competitiveness". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SIZING UP SMALL BUSINESS: SBA'S FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled "Sizing Up Small Business: SBA's Failure to Implement Congressional Direction". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2596, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016" and considered Member access requests. This markup was closed. The Intelligence Authorization Act was ordered reported, as amended. Member access was granted to the House for the classified schedules of authorizations and the classified annexes accompanying H.R. 2596.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D634)*

H.R. 2048, to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes. Signed on June 2, 2015. (Public Law 114–23)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, June 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, June 8

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E844
Benishek, Dan, Mich., E840, E841
Bera, Ami, Calif., E840
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E847
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E843
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E845
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E841
Capps, Lois, Calif., E846
Clay, Wm. Lacy, Mo., E845
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E839
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E844
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E846
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E840
Hill, J. French, Ark., E846
Hurt, Robert, Va., E844
Johnson, Bill, Ohio, E843
Jolly, David W., Fla., E839
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E846
Long, Billy, Mo., E846
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E845
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E844
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E842
Messer, Luke, Ind., E841
Mooney, Alexander X., W.Va. E842
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E843
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E843, E847
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E840
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E841
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E844
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E847
Smith, Adam, Wash., E842
Takano, Mark, Calif., E844
Walden, Greg, Ore., E842
Walters, Mimi, Calif., E840

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.