United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2015 No. 92

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TSA REPORT CARD IS A GRADE 4

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, TSA is the government agency that is supposed to keep us safe at airports, safe from would-be terrorists that would go through screening and get on America's airplanes. It comes about as a result of the 9/11 attacks on our Nation.

Anybody who flies has been through firsthand—no pun intended—the TSA experience at airports. I, like many Members of Congress, go through TSA screening two times a week, back and forth from my district in Texas. I know numerous TSA employees. Many of them are my friends.

My comments today are not about the TSA employees, but recent news reports about what is taking place at TSA generally, and these news reports are disturbing, Mr. Speaker.

Recent internal investigation has revealed that 67 out of 70 times banned items got through TSA screening at airports through undercover investigations. That is a 96 percent failure rate or, looking at it the other way, that is a grade of 4. TSA gets a grade of 4, Mr. Speaker.

Now, one example, there was an instance where a TSA screener failed to find a fake bomb strapped to the back of an undercover agent going through screening. This was even after the fake bomb set off the magnetometer. They still didn't find it. Now, isn't that lovely? Good thing it was a fake bomb. Fortunately, this was a test. This was part of the undercover investigation. It was not a terrorist seeking mischief at America's airports.

There is more alarming news. Not just the fact that the investigation shows a grade of 4 in folks that are going through the security system, it is also reported this week that TSA failed to identify 73 airport workers who were linked to terrorism. Now, what is this? These are not TSA employees. These are the folks that work behind the security area in the airport, and TSA was not able to identify 73 airport workers linked to terrorism. Now, isn't that lovely? These people, you see, are the people who go to the airport every day, maybe sometimes go through a special line to get behind the security area.

TSA claims it didn't have access to the terror watch list information, so it couldn't identify these potential bad guys. I personally find that difficult to believe that the agency in charge of security at the airport is not able to get security background information about people that work behind security at the airport. In any event, that is not an acceptable excuse for this type of action.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a grade of 4 would not be acceptable anywhere, anyplace in our society, at a business, at school, anywhere, the TSA grade of 4.

I will give you another example. Let's say you want to have a home security system at your residence, and you go out and you solicit different folks that are in the home security business. You meet one sales rep, and you start asking the sales rep, ''How good is the security system?'' The security guy says, ''Well, we have a grade of 4. We have a 4 success rate. 96 percent failure rate.'' You probably wouldn't hire that guy to install the security system on your home.

If you ask him a few more questions and he says, ''We are not only in charge of the security for your home, but we secure the folks that work on your residence when you are gone to work, the plumber, the welder, or the guy who comes in your house, whatever,'' then if you found out that those people who are allowed to go in your home and work through this security system have a reputation for being burglars, you probably wouldn't hire this security agency to do the security on your home.

That is exactly what is happening at our airports. The success rate is only 4. We wouldn't hire that agency to do our home, but yet here is the agency that we have to guard our airports.

This is not an indictment about TSA employees, but I think it is an alarming concern about TSA's general management. The problem is the TSA model of security. It can only get a grade of 4—which would not be acceptable under any system.

You know, there really can't be mistakes and errors like this at our Nation's airports. One thing that we could

Printed on recycled paper.

do, one consideration is we could go to private screening at our airports. The law allows for that. Airports ought to consider those private screeners and maybe think it through, whether or not that is a better alternative to the TSA system that gets a grade of 4.

And that is just the way it is.

CHANGE THE CONVERSATION TO HELP AMERICA'S CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend and all day on cable news ever since, we watched a police officer in McKinney, Texas, wrestle with a 14-year-old teenager after what was reported to be a pool party. He throws her to the ground, pulls his gun out and points it at some other kids, screams at her, and then sits on the teenager, who is in her bikini, for a period of time. This is the latest installment of the hit cable television news story of the last year or more called ''Cops Behaving Badly Caught on Tape.''

This version was not the most deadly, although there have been versions of this story that end in death. It has caused a lot of hot air on radio and TV. Some of it is constructive, and some of it is just offensive.

But has it caused a more serious discussion of police and communities of color? Has it sparked a more serious discussion about how teenagers and police interact or should interact? I hope so, but I kind of doubt it.

Recently, I met with a young man from Chicago who made a real impression on me. He is from the Phoenix Military Academy, a smart teenager. He is going to go places. He said: You know what, Congressman? I have taught myself strategies to deescalate the situation whenever I come in contact with police.

Did you hear that? A teenager feels he needs to teach himself ways to deescalate tensions with adult police officers. We are apparently leaving it up to our teenagers to figure out ways to deal with the police, which is precisely backwards from how things ought to be.

What the videotape from Texas and the comment from my young friend at Phoenix Military Academy in Chicago have in common is that there does not seem to be any communication between adults on the police side and young people in our community, who the police are sworn to protect. Instead of a cooperative relationship between teenagers and adults who are there to protect them, there is an adversarial relationship.

A couple of weeks ago, I looked around while I was at a Judiciary Committee hearing on policing strategies in the 21st century, and all I saw were people who were 50, 60, and 70 years old. There were no young people called to testify, to tell us what they face, how they feel, and what we, as adults, should do to help them.

Very few of us are former or current law enforcement. And while all of us are former teenagers, still, for most of us, it has been quite awhile since we were a teenager, and our experiences may not be all that typical of what young people and the police face today.

I hope adults like me in places of influence and authority can be helpful in creating the conditions where avenues of communication are created, but a 3-hour hearing with political undertones and more than a little grandstanding is not nearly enough.

Almost every city in America is one bad incident, an overzealous policeman, or a videotaped moment of stupidity or hatred away from a riot. Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Walter Scott, and Freddie Gray are names we know, but knowing their names is just not enough. We need a sustained effort from Congress and from every institution in our society to address the chasm between young people, and especially young people in communities of color and the police hired to keep them safe.

And let's remember, while the country was transfixed with a video of the cop, the teenagers, and the pool party in Texas, two of my constituents were shot and killed this past weekend in Chicago. They were among 5 dead in Chicago and among 27 people shot from Friday to Monday. At least 5 people were killed and 25 others were shot in and around Chicago the weekend before; 12 dead and 56 were wounded over the long Memorial Day weekend.

Knowing the names of Sandy Hook, Newtown, and Columbine are not enough when Baltimore, Chicago, and other cities are also losing young people—mostly young people—at this rate.

It goes beyond police practices and the easy availability of guns, but that is part of it. When legislators spend more time making guns easier to carry and stand-your-ground laws make murder wraps easier to beat, our priorities are skewed.

It goes beyond racial profiling, but that is part of it. When 84 percent of sobriety checkpoints in Chicago are set up in Black and Latino neighborhoods so that cops can stop anyone who drives by, that sends a message that is destructive.

It goes beyond economic opportunity, but that is also part of it. Honestly, we do not spend much time in this Congress thinking about how we help 10- and 12-year-olds know that a bright future is possible for them. We do not do much for children to help them achieve their future, but instead we cut things like Head Start and spend more and more money on jails.

Listen, in America, we must change the conversation so that we as a nation are working together to help make sure the next generation lives to adulthood first. We need to stop talking so much about what protects us from those kids and start talking more about what we as adults are going to do to protect those kids from the world we have created for them.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on some of the issues my friend from Chicago just stated, I couldn't disagree more. Let me explain why, why we have problems with our prisons in America and homelessness.

Nearly 10 million Americans have severe mental illness like schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. Yet millions are going without treatment as families struggle to find care for loved ones.

Over the last 30 years, we have shut down the old asylums and what we have seen is an increase in incarceration, suicide, homelessness, emergency room visits, unemployment, substance abuse, and substance abuse deaths. We have failed on all these metrics.

Anyone who thinks we are being successful in helping those with severe mental illness is delusional. We have traded the old hospital bed for the prison cell, the emergency room gurney, the homeless shelter, and the cemetery. We have seen horrible and disturbing increases of the mentally ill being victims of crime, like sexual assault, robbery, and bullying. In fact, we lose 40,000 Americans to suicide each year, and there are another 1.3 million suicide attempts.

These stories are haunting, and the numbers are staggering. Four million people with serious mental illness are not receiving treatment. There is a shortage of 1,000 psychiatric hospital beds nationwide, so there is often nowhere to go when there is a crisis.

How cruel and tragic it was when Senator Creigh Deeds of Virginia took his son to a hospital to be told there were no psychiatric beds, and we know the tragic outcome of that story and the thousands of times it is repeated every year.

We have one child psychiatrist for every 2,000 children with a mental health disorder. While we know that 50 percent of severe mental illness emerges by age 14 and 75 percent by age 24, we don't have a sufficient number of professionals to treat it, so it gets worse.

We have Federal rules to protect privacy, which has frustrated countless numbers of doctors and family members, generating 70,000 official complaints. It was meant to improve patient care, but it acts as an impossible barrier to breach because loving family members can't connect with someone with serious mental illness.

We have a mental health agency in this country that the Federal Government has that doesn't employ a single psychiatrist. This is what the American taxpayer buys for $130 billion a year. Is this success from the over 112 Federal programs and agencies meant to deal with mental illness?

□ 1015

We have failed not because we don't know what to do when it comes to effectively identifying and treating mental illness, but it is because the Federal Government has stood in the way with poorly administered policies and antiquated attitudes.

Our ability to treat serious mental illness is in the 21st century. We know more effective treatments for this brain illness. However, our beliefs about mental illness are still mired in the 19th century. As long as we think that mental illness is an attitude or a difference in perception or that hallucinations and delusions are bizarrely labeled as nonconsensus reality, we are wrong.

Quite simply, we have created the most difficult system for those who have the most difficulty. Now is the time to change and turn this system from top to bottom.

That is why I have reintroduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646. It reforms Federal programs, removes Federal barriers to care, and refocuses research that is updated and innovative legislation that will produce a new paradigm of treatment for those with serious mental health problems.

This bill empowers parents and caregivers to access care before stage IV. It fixes shortages of inpatient beds, helps to reach underserved in rural populations, expands the mental health workforce, drives evidence-based care, provides alternatives to institutionalization. It integrates primary and behavioral care. It increases the mental health workforce in underserved areas by volunteerism. It increases minorities in the mental health workforce. It advances critical mental research and brings accountability to mental health and substance abuse parity in this Nation.

If we want to get people treatment, not jail time, not abandonment; if we want to help the tens of millions of people affected by mental illness and the hundreds of millions of friends and relatives who are emotionally strained; if we want accountability, transparency, and more effective spending of Federal dollars to get care in the community where it is needed; if we want to stop victimization of the mentally ill; if we want to prevent the next Newtown, Tucson, Aurora, Isla Vista, Columbine, or Navy Yard, we have to do something comprehensive and research based, and we have to do it now.

What we need is not only for Congress to act, but, during these next few weeks, we need to hear from every doctor and first responder and teacher and parent and patient and judge and consumer that we have to act thoroughly and thoughtfully and responsibly and now.

On every concern, America needs to speak up and speak out. We need to start treating mental illness as we do other diseases like AIDS or cancer or diabetes, and this legislation, H.R. 2646, gives us the tools to do so. We need evidence-based care before crisis; we need treatment before tragedy.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because treatment delayed is treatment denied, and this legislation marks a new dawn for mental health in America.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, House action is expected on trade provisions this week. A vote on a package that establishes the rules for how the next major trade agreement will be handled, the trade promotion authority, may be voted on, this Friday.

It has been fascinating for me to hear the arguments at home and in Washington, D.C., of those who are opposed to trade promotion authority and have already decided against the Trans-Pacific Partnership before the agreement is even finished.

The critics often cite concerns about the environment, but what I hear from some of my friends on the other side of this question at home stands in stark contrast to what I think reality is. The dreaded ''secret negotiations'' are somehow raised as a negative.

To the best of my knowledge, all major serious agreements are negotiated in private like all labor union contracts. It is after they are negotiated that the Members have them and look at whether or not it is worthy of their support.

There are concerns about various corporate advisers whispering in the Trade Representative's ear and having access to confidential information tilting the playing field. Last week, I met with two of those sinister advisers who happen to be respected environmental leaders. Yes, the advisory panels include environmental leaders and, in fact, union leaders as well.

There was an interesting point that came forward in my conversation with environmentalists that the only way to stop, slow, and reverse the rape of the oceans is by an international trade agreement, and this one is actually shaping up to be pretty strong.

Oceans are threatened by overfishing, having fishery stocks collapse; yet the countries in the 12 countries that are negotiating this agreement have, on average, a 20 percent subsidy to encourage more fishing, overfishing, paying their fishermen to catch the very last fish. The only way to deal with this is by having a multinational agreement that is enforceable to reduce this destructive policy.

Along with the oceans, there is deep concern about what is going on with deforestation, the exploitation of endangered species in the forested areas. Since 2000, we have lost an area ten times the size of Great Britain to deforestation just in the Amazon basin alone. That is why, in the last round of trade negotiations, I fought hard to have provisions against illegal logging in Peru and for them to raise their standards.

We are struggling to make sure that they are fully enforced, but nobody that I have talked to seriously thinks that we wouldn't be better off without an agreement. It gives us leverage, and things are improving.

Well, likewise, we are seeing thugs illegally harvesting endangered species like elephants and rhinos. They are taking illegally harvested exotic timber and disrupting indigenous people.

No nation can prevent the exploitation by themselves, but many nations, armed with an enforceable agreement that we can use trade sanctions to be able to put teeth in it, can make a difference now and raise the bar for future agreements.

The package moving forward has faced some changes that I find troubling. All major legislation that I have seen in my career in Congress is a mixed bag. They had some good things; they had some bad things; and some things that are hard to figure out.

That is going to be our job this week and beyond, to make that evaluation; but on balance, while we are trying to figure out whether we are better off with or without it, it is important that that decision be made on a factual basis, not hypothetical scare tactics.

RECOGNIZING THE TITUSVILLE HERALD ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, The Titusville Herald newspaper will publish its 150th anniversary edition, and I rise today to congratulate them on a century and a half of countless memories and news reporting.

The Titusville Herald was first established in 1865 and was the first daily newspaper in the world's original oil region. For 150 years, The Herald has delivered the latest local and national news to the Titusville community and surrounding areas.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that, with today's technological advances, it is no small feat for a small newspaper to withstand the test of time. However, with an incredible and dedicated staff, The Titusville Herald has expanded in size, technology, and outreach and continues to be a vital part of the Titusville community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and congratulating The Herald's staff on reaching this important milestone. I know that they will continue to successfully deliver the news of the oil region to its readers for generations to come.

HUNTINGDON POST OFFICE CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, the Huntingdon Post Office, located in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, will be celebrating its 100-year anniversary.

The post office, the first established in Huntingdon County, dates back to 1798 during a time when mail was delivered by post riders and stagecoaches.

In 1915, to accommodate the growing business needs of Huntingdon, then Pennsylvania Governor Martin Brumbaugh dedicated a building on Washington Street to house the post office, the Internal Revenue Service, and military recruiting offices. Since then, the post office on Washington Street has become a permanent fixture within the growing Juniata River community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Huntingdon County Post Office and all of its employees on 100 years of dedicated community service.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the sciences and the facts don't lie. Congress has stood here for too long debating the truth about climate change. What is there to debate?

More than 12,000 peer-reviewed scientific studies are in agreement. Climate change is real, and humans are significantly to blame. For those of you keeping track at home, there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that state the opposite.

As we continue to harm the environment, we are ultimately hurting ourselves and human health. In the movie ''Birdman,'' it was written: ''A thing is a thing, not what is said of that thing.''

I feel the need to remind my colleagues that climate change is a real thing, regardless of what is said of that climate change thing; just because you don't want to believe it doesn't make climate change any less real. It is rapidly becoming a threatening crisis in public health. As the planet warms, sea levels rise and lead to increased floods. Droughts are more frequent and intense. Heat waves and hurricanes are more severe.

Climate change makes existing diseases and conditions worse, but it also helps introduce new pests and pathogens into communities. Respiratory allergies and diseases are becoming more prevalent because of increased pollen, molds, air pollution, and dust. Higher concentrations of these particles in the air cause severe breathing problems and lead to heart disease, asthma attacks, inflammation, and lung cancer.

Every year, 220,000 people learn they have lung cancer, and 160,000 people die from lung cancer. That is twice the population size of my own neighborhood, Lakeview.

Children who are especially vulnerable to these pollutants are harmed by the air they breath. Their lungs shouldn't be at risk when they go outside to play or walk to school, but asthma is the third leading cause of hospitalization among children under the age of 15.

Nearly half of this Nation—our Nation—lives in areas with dangerous levels of pollution, 44 percent. My own district is included. Chicago earned itself an F in an air quality study from the American Lung Association.

According to the same study, the Windy City is ranked in the bottom 5 percent for most polluted city in terms of short-term particle pollution in the Nation, and it is only getting worse. Not only is our air quality dangerous, but our most essential resource, which we all depend on, our water, is at risk due to climate change.

Water is vital to survival. As temperatures rise, people and animals need more water to maintain their health and thrive. Increases in water temperature, precipitation frequency and severity, and changes in coastal ecosystem health could increase the incidence of water contamination. Currently, more than 840,000 people die each year from water-related diseases. That is more than the entire city of San Francisco.

Climate change is expected to produce more frequent and severe extreme precipitation events worldwide. Over the past 50 years, the amount of rain falling during the most intense 1 percent of our storms increased by 20 percent. These turbulent changes breed outbreaks of waterborne diseases. In fact, in the United States, from 1948 to 1994, heavy rainfall correlated with more than half of the outbreaks of waterborne disease.

Water sustains our economy by producing energy at power plants, raising livestock, and growing food crops. Many water supply sources are already overallocated, and people are suffering from degraded water quality.

Given our current trajectory within the Western U.S. in severe drought, the competition for water resources will only increase, leading to great impacts on human health.

Albert Einstein once said: ''We can't solve today's problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them.'' We need to adjust how we think about climate change. We need to understand that severe weather, pollution, and changes in our water are not only harmful to the planet, but harmful to the people who inhabit that planet.

Climate change is a direct threat to humanity, and it is time we reexamine how we think about it, talk about it, and respond to this growing problem. The health of humans worldwide is at stake.

CONGRATULATING CANON HUTCHESON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and celebrate my nephew, Canon Hutcheson, and his wife, Courtney, on the birth of their new daughter, their beautiful new daughter, Ella. Ella Brooke Hutcheson was born on June 9 in Warner Robins, Georgia. She weighed in at 8 pounds, 15½ ounces.

I know from experience, the experience of having been blessed with three sons, that parenthood is the most incredible and rewarding experience in the world. I could not be more excited for Canon and for Courtney and their new addition.

I would also like to congratulate Ella's grandparents: my sister, Cissie Hutcheson, and her husband, Craig, of Waycross, Georgia.

Canon was named in honor of my sister, Cissie, and my mother, Zena Cannon Carter, who was born on October 16, 1937, and passed on June 21, 2008. I know that my mother is very proud of her grandson and her namesake.

To the Hutcheson family, and especially to Ella, I wish you the very best, and I am so very proud to welcome a new member to our family.

□ 1030

PROFESSIONAL'S ACCESS TO HEALTH WORKFORCE INTEGRATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Professional's Access to Health Workforce Integration Act, better known as the PATH Workforce Integration Act, of 2015.

The National Center for Health Workforce Analysis predicts that, by 2020, the United States will have a shortage of as high as 20,000 physicians. Other projections are that we will have a shortage of up to 250,000 public health workers. In addition, the Department of Labor projects that, by the year 2025, we will need 500,000 more nurses, 46,000 more mental and behavioral health workers, 38,000 more pharmacists, and 15,000 more dentists.

There are a number of contributing factors to the projected health care workforce shortage. The U.S. population by 2030 is expected to rise by 18 percent. The population of those over the age of 65 is expected to increase three times its current rate, and the Bureau of Health Professions projects a 5.2 percent increase in the utilization of health services. This is all happening while our current health care workforce is retiring in greater numbers than we are able to graduate new workers.

While it is true the Affordable Care Act incorporated numerous provisions for addressing the workforce shortage, our Nation's current educational infrastructure lacks the capacity to train health care professionals fast enough to fill the projected health workforce shortages. In our country today, we have internationally trained health professionals, residing legally in the United States, who are unable to work in their chosen profession. They currently represent a missed opportunity to address our health care workforce shortages.

The PATH Act helps to address this shortage by providing the over 2 million foreign-trained health professionals legally residing in the United States the guidance that they need to work in employment matching their health professional skills, education, and expertise. This includes internationally trained doctors, nurses, dentists, mental health providers, and pharmacists whose linguistic and cultural skills will also help improve the health needs of our diversifying Nation.

What the PATH Act would do is facilitate counseling and training opportunities to reduce barriers to the health workforce; provide access to accelerated courses in English as a second language; provide assistance in the evaluation of foreign credentials; and help in educating employers about the competency of health professionals trained outside of the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, our health care system is rapidly approaching a crisis due to a lack of qualified health professionals. The PATH Act of 2015 will help prevent this crisis, and I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH, NOT PEACE THROUGH ENDLESS WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I spoke to about 200 people at the famous Willard Hotel in Washington in a program put on by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. I had been told that this was a group of CEOs and owners of major companies in southern California—obviously, a very upper-income group.

I got to a point in my speech when I said: ''It is long past the time we need to stop trying to run the whole world and start putting our own people in our own country first once again.''

Much to my surprise, the audience broke into applause. Middle- and lower-income people have applauded when I have said similar things in my district and around the country. Many upper-income people claim to be moderates, and contrary to popular belief, conservatives lose most very wealthy areas 2–1 or worse. I have spoken to a very wide variety of groups in Washington and around the country and in my district, and I have gotten an overwhelmingly positive response every time I have said it has been a horrible mistake to spend trillions on unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

When I was a teenager, I remember reading a publication from the Republican National Committee that read: ''Democrats start wars. Republicans end them.''

There was a time, until recent years, when the Republican Party could make a legitimate claim to being the Peace Party. I sent my first paycheck as a bag boy at the A&P—$19 and some cents—as a contribution to the Barry Goldwater campaign. I have worked on Republican campaigns at the national, State, and local levels for over 50 years, and it saddens me to hear almost all of the Republican candidates for President try to outdo each other in their hawkishness. Based on the response I have gotten, I think it is a recipe for defeat if my Republican Party becomes known as the party favoring permanent, forever wars—wars without end.

All of our candidates try to convince people that they are like Ronald Reagan. President Reagan once wrote: ''Our troops should be committed to combat abroad only as a last resort—when no other choice is available.''

Reagan was certainly no warmonger Republican or a man eager to go to war.

President Eisenhower, one of our greatest military leaders, was another ''peacenik'' Republican. He knew of the horrors of war, unlike many modern day chickenhawks. He famously warned us at the end of his Presidency about the dangers of being controlled by a very powerful military-industrial complex. I think he would be shocked at how far we have gone down the road that he warned us against.

In his book ''Ike's Bluff,'' Evan Thomas wrote: ''Eisenhower would periodically sigh to Andy Goodpaster, his Chief of Staff: 'God help the Nation when it has a President who doesn't know as much about the military as I do.' ''

Pat Buchanan wrote on March 20: ''In November 1956, President Eisenhower, enraged he had not been forewarned of their invasion of Egypt, ordered the British, French, and Israelis to get out of Suez and Sinai. They did as told. How far we have fallen from the America of Ike.''

Senator Robert Taft, who was sometimes referred to as ''Mr. Republican'' in the 1940s and 1950s, once said: ''No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted . . . to the protection of the liberty of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.''

Most of the Republican Presidential candidates have attacked President Obama for acting in some ways that are unconstitutional, and he has. But where in our Constitution does it give us the authority to run other countries as we have been doing in Iraq and Afghanistan—even making small business loans and training local police forces?

My Republican Party was always the party of fiscal conservatism. Yet, with a national debt of over $18 trillion, how can we justify continually spending megabillions in religious civil wars between the Shia and Sunni?

Some people and companies that make money off of an interventionist foreign policy always very quickly fall back on the slur of isolationism, but most conservatives believe in trade and tourism and cultural and educational exchanges with other countries and in helping out during humanitarian crises. We just don't believe in endless war.

We are told, if we don't support an interventionist foreign policy, that this means we don't believe in American exceptionalism, but this Nation did not become exceptional because we got involved in every little war around the globe. It became exceptional because of our great free enterprise system and because we gave our people more individual freedom than any other country.

I have said in thousands of speeches that we are blessed beyond belief to live in this country and that the United States is, without question, the greatest country in the history of the world, but there was much less anti-Americanism around the world when we tried to mind our own business and take care of our own people, and this Nation had more friends when we followed the policy of peace through strength, not one of peace through endless war.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise this morning to sound the alarm, and I want my colleagues to understand that there are just 10 legislative days remaining for Congress to act before the Export-Import Bank shuts down. It is outrageous that we are here today, in this countdown, as the hands of the clock have become a knife-edge pressed against the future of American businesses and the jobs they create.

The Ex-Im Bank has a proven track record of supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs in every single congressional district across this country, and the fact that anyone would even consider shutting it down is shortsighted, and it is harmful to our economy. Ex-Im supports our businesses and our workers, all while not costing taxpayers a dime. In fact, over the past two decades, the Bank has generated a profit of close to $7 billion—a true win-win for our taxpayers. Yet, for the ideologues who are committed to chopping away government programs that

support our Nation's students and seniors, exporters, and others, the facts don't really matter. They just see ending the Bank as a conservative litmus test.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply shameful that the extremist, antigovernment wing of the Republican Party has, once again, pushed us to the brink of actively damaging our Nation's businesses and our competitiveness with this standoff. It doesn't have to be this way. A majority of the House of Representatives is already on record in its support of a long-term reauthorization of the Bank. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to intervene by immediately putting a measure up to keep its doors open for a vote on the House floor.

For 2 years, despite the calls from Democrats and Republicans, Chairman HENSARLING has made it clear that this manufactured crisis is exactly what he has wanted all along. This is not a fight between Democrats and Republicans. It is a fight between ideology and reason in the Republican Party. While the ideologically driven crusade to eliminate the Bank may be a game here in Washington, it certainly isn't a game for the hundreds of thousands of our businesses all over this country.

For example, let's take Michael Boyle, a Republican and a veteran, who recently testified that, thanks to the Bank, he has been able to quadruple his company's revenue and expand his business from just 8 employees to 60 currently.

Mr. Boyle's story is the American story of thousands of businesses, large and small, across this country that rely on the Bank to compete on the global stage. Nevertheless, in the United States Congress, we are talking about shutting down one of the best resources our businesses have—just to make a political statement.

As the deadline for reauthorizing the Bank nears, I have been encouraged to increasingly hear from some of my Republican colleagues who have come out and said, ''Enough is enough.'' As a matter of fact, as I sat in committee, I was very pleased to hear Mr. FINCHER, a Republican, say that his wife told him:

> You don't represent and you don't work for the chairman of the committee, Mr. Hensarling. You don't work for the Speaker, Mr. Boehner. You work for the people who elected you to come to Congress.

Mr. FINCHER basically said to his chairman that it is time to stop playing the game, that we have got to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

I want you to know that Mr. HENSARLING and those rightwing conservatives who want to use this as a political point will have you believe, ''Oh, this Bank is only for Big Business,'' but that is absolutely not true. Not only does the Bank support thousands of small businesses, but the suppliers to the big businesses are small businesses all over this country who rely on the Export-Import Bank for their ability to create jobs and have businesses in their districts.

□ 1045

All of the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, and many of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle support the Bank. So I don't know why the Members on the opposite side of the aisle can't rein in their chairman. I don't know why they are afraid of him. I don't know why they don't speak up.

We have 10 more days. Let's get busy and get this bill reauthorized and this Bank. I am asking Speaker BOEHNER to exercise his leadership and get it done.

JOIN ME IN OPPOSING THE INNOVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to alert my colleagues and to alert the American people that a bill is being marked up in the Committee on the Judiciary this coming Thursday, H.R. 9. This bill is a grave threat to the rights of the American people to own the intellectual property rights that they have created with their own hard work and their own innovative skills.

The bill that is being marked up is called, in fact, the Innovation Act. It is one of the worst misnomers that I have seen in my time in Congress. This should be called the ''Anti-Innovation Act.'' This is yet the latest of a decades-long attack on the patent rights of the American people that were placed into the Constitution by our Founding Fathers.

For decades now, large multinational corporations, very powerful economic entities that have influence on government, have been trying to neuter the patent rights of the American people. Why have they been doing this? Why do they want to eliminate or to dramatically reduce the rights of our inventors to control what they have invented? Because these are big guys who don't want to pay the little guys when they steal from them.

The fact is that our Founding Fathers knew it was important for someone who has created something, whether it is a writer or an inventor, to have the right to control his or her creation for a certain period of time. The time period has been 17 years, traditionally, since the time of our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers knew this was important to our country's well-being, not just in terms of the rights of the individual, which we agree with as Americans and which were written into our Constitution as part of the Bill of Rights.

Only one place is the word ''right'' used in the body of the Constitution, and that is in the section dealing with providing our inventors and, yes, our writers with the right to control what they have created for a certain period of time in order to profit from it.

Our big corporations and these multinational corporations that have no loyalty to the United States, these people who are continually going overseas to China and elsewhere are trying to neuter this so that they can take any new innovation without having to pay the person who has actually been the inventor and created this. That is totally contrary to what our country has been all about.

We have had the strongest patent system in the world—the strongest in the world. What has that given the American people? It has uplifted our standard of living of ordinary people. Yes, these folks in the multinational corporations, they live very well. Well, the American people have lived well because we have had the technology, whether it is agricultural technology or transportation technology or any of the other type of energy technologies that we have. These have uplifted us and created more wealth for our society.

Americans' security, prosperity, and, yes, freedom have been due to our technological advantages. It is not that our people worked harder. It is not that we had such natural resources. There are countries all over the world where people work hard and have natural resources. It is our freedom and our respect for the individual rights of our citizens that have given us prosperity and security and freedom.

Now these powerful multinational corporations have targeted our patent system; and, yes, their motive, as I say, is to steal, let the big guys steal from the little guys. That is what this supposed Innovation Act, which, as I say, should be called the ''Anti-Innovation Act,'' is all about.

In fact, there is a legitimate problem of frivolous lawsuits in our country. There is no doubt about that. It is not just in the area of technology. It is throughout our medicine and everywhere else. But there have been a number of people who have taken patent law and claimed rights that they weren't given by the Patent Office and issued frivolous lawsuits to people to try to get them to pay money to them. They are called patent trolls.

This excuse for changing our patent system is a lame excuse in the sense that we don't need to destroy the patent rights of the little guy in order to cure this problem. Every provision of the Innovation Act—every provision—limits the rights of legitimate patent holders in order to protect their own creation.

Let's not eliminate our freedom to handle those people, those few people, who are abusing it. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing that and alerting the American people to this challenge to their freedom and their security and their prosperity.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES NEED THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I have a simple ask: let the Export-Import Bank answer the call. 2,655—2,655—that is how many small businesses called the Export-Import Bank last year and asked for their assistance in selling American-made goods and services around the globe. That is how many businesses the Export-Import Bank said yes to, without any impact on taxpayers—no cost to taxpayers whatsoever—in order to help those 2,655 businesses be competitive in a global market.

The truth is, in each district—Democratic districts, Republican districts, urban, rural, coastal, interior—each district is rich with businesses large and small. Every Member has small businesses that are the result of hard work, families pulling together to build something of value and worth that can be assisted by the Export-Import Bank—brand-new business as well, not just those that are intergenerational. These are the businesses that create jobs and employ millions of our loved ones and our neighbors and our family. When they want to export their goods and services, who do they call? They call the Export-Import Bank.

Alliance Rubber Company is just one of the 2,655 small businesses that made that call. Alliance is the largest manufacturer of rubberbands in America. It is a women-owned small business located in Hot Springs, Arkansas. They employ a whole 156 employees. Alliance plans to add 15 employees within the next year, but without exports, they will be cutting 10 jobs—our family members, our neighbors. Add 15 or cut 10? It seems like the choice is obvious to me.

Here is what another company said: ''Thanks to credit insurance available through the Ex-Im, we have hired a salesman dedicated to growing international sales. Growing our traffic and safety business internationally will mean more jobs in our Fife facility and more business for our local vendors.''

That is in my district, Fife, Washington. The company is Pexco, another one of the 2,655 businesses. There are Pexcos in Republican districts and in Democratic districts all over this country. There are Alliance Rubber companies in Republican Districts and Democratic districts. And if you listen to these business leaders, it makes sense to help them do what they are doing.

Who will answer the call after June 30? Well, unfortunately, not local banks or even the big banks. If you don't believe me, ask them. They are the ones that usually refer the businesses to the Export-Import Bank.

We have 10 days left, 10 legislative days to act before the help on the other end of the line is gone. Companies have 15 business days to make the call and see how they can sell their goods and expand their exports to foreign customers. If you are a small business looking to export, call 1–800–565–EXIM, 1–800–565–3949. That is why the Bank is there. That is why it should remain.

As a matter of fact, Chairman HENSARLING's own witness—I couldn't make this stuff up—who testified against the Bank as a small-business owner last week told her hometown newspaper this later: ''The fact is that there are a lot of small businesses and large businesses that need the Bank right now, and to pull that rug out from under them would be devastating.'' I couldn't make this up.

Hold a vote, Mr. Speaker. Hold a vote. Give your colleagues the opportunity to vote for our small businesses and the jobs they provide. They are the backbone of this community and this economy and this Nation; 2,655 of them and counting. Let the Export-Import Bank answer the call.

AMERICANS DESERVE TO KNOW WHO RAISED THEIR FOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, Americans want to know: Where does their food come from? Parents want to know before they give it to their children: How was this food raised? Where did it come from? Moms want to know, dads want to know, and today they can; but if proposed legislation passes this body this week, we won't have that information necessary to make those decisions for our family and our family's health.

What legislation am I talking about? I am talking about the country of origin labeling. In other words, right now, if you buy food and it comes from a foreign country, it must be labeled. If you buy pork, you buy beef, you buy chicken, wouldn't you want to know where that food came from?

Why would you want to know? Well, different countries have different rules and different cultures. If you remember back in 2007, we had some pet food that came from a foreign country that killed a lot of pets. It was enhanced with melamine to up the protein readings in it, and it was unsafe for pets. A lot of pets died as a result. Well, it came from a different country that has different ethics. I think Americans deserve to know who raised their food, which country did it come from. But the legislation that is in front of us this week will repeal that requirement to label beef, poultry, and pork.

Now, why are we doing this? Why are we in such a rush? Because we have been told that the World Trade Organization requires it.

What is the World Trade Organization, and who are they to tell Congress what laws we have to pass? These judges weren't appointed by the President. They weren't confirmed by the Senate. These are not judges from our Constitution. These are extra-constitutional judges, yet they are telling us here in Congress you have got to do this or there will be repercussions.

I think our Founding Fathers would be appalled at this notion, that we have given up our sovereignty. I don't accept the premise that we have to make laws here based on what some world court agrees to, but I suppose somebody made a trade agreement in some Congress previous that bound us to decisions of this court.

Now, even if you accept the premise that we have to abide by the World Trade Organization, and because they have ruled that we can no longer label pork and beef as from foreign countries to inform our consumers, then you have got to ask the question: Why did we add chicken to this bill? The World Trade Organization is silent on the subject of chicken, yet it is in the bill.

We are going to remove the labeling requirements for chicken. I think it is a bad idea. I think it is probably motivated by some large meat packing companies; but they are represented here in Congress, and the American consumer and small livestock farmers are not.

□ 1100

I proposed voluntary country of origin labeling last night in the Rules Committee. I had an amendment. It said: Okay. Maybe we shouldn't mandate. Maybe we shouldn't force the foreigners to label their meat when it comes into the country; but how about voluntarily letting American producers put that proud stamp and know that it is the seal of approval that most consumers want so they know that beef, that pork, was raised in this country?

I was shot down in the Rules Committee. It was just a voluntary program. In fact, it was proposed 10 years ago by this Speaker of the House, by the former chair of the Ag Committee, by the current chair of the Ag Committee, and by the current chair of the Rules Committee; yet they wouldn't allow my amendment for a vote in the Rules Committee. All I sought to do was let American farmers proclaim that their beef is raised in the United States.

Today, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here. I am here today to say that we need to assert our sovereignty, the sovereignty of this body. We all took an oath to the Constitution. We didn't take an oath to the World Trade Organization. We need to assert our sovereignty, and we need to uphold our commitment to the Americans who sent us here.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the repeal of the country of origin labeling bill later today.

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, our Commander in Chief admitted that, in the fight against the Islamic State, the U.S. does not have ''a complete strategy.''

It is hard to believe that it has been 1 year since the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—ISIS, ISIL, or whatever you want to call them—began making headlines in American newspapers. It is hard to believe that it has been nearly 1½ years since the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency told members of the Senate Armed Services Committee that it was ''likely ISIL will attempt to take territory in Iraq and Syria.''

But it goes back even farther. In January 2014, the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq said the Islamic State is ''capable of taking and holding ground and causing a lot of trouble.'' In November 2013, a State Department official testified before a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee and specifically cited the ineffectiveness of Iraq's military.

Then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Iraq and Iran said: ''ISIL has benefited from a permissive operating environment due to inherent weaknesses of Iraqi security forces.''

Mr. Speaker, all of these warnings occurred after Iraq's Prime Minister made an appeal to President Obama to help defeat the growing threat to his country. That was 2 years ago; so here we are.

In June 2015, the leader of the free world tells an international conference in Austria that the United States does not have a complete strategy to defeat an enemy he once called a JV squad. Well, that JV squad is responsible for the horrific murders of American citizens.

That JV squad has overtaken territory fought so hard for by American troops, territory that nearly 4,500 American servicemen and -women died to protect in the most violent battles witnessed by U.S. troops since the Vietnam war. That JV squad waves black flags while driving stolen military equipment through streets where Americans made the ultimate sacrifice.

From overlooked redlines to bypassed deadlines, the Obama administration will serve as a case study in how not to conduct foreign policy for future world leaders.

Today, the President wants us to believe that his administration's negotiations with Iran are in Israel's best interests. Ironically, Israel's Prime Minister made a direct appeal to the American people expressing the contrary.

This past March, Prime Minister Netanyahu petitioned Congress from the podium right behind me because he, like so many, has lost faith in the abilities of our Commander in Chief.

He is right; he is right to be skeptical about the State Department's ''trust above all else'' policy with Iran, whose leaders have publicly proclaimed their desire for Israel to be wiped off the map. Mr. Netanyahu has rightly questioned America's once unwavering commitment to his homeland, Israel—our partner, our ally, but, most importantly, our friend.

As I have said before, for those who do not believe in the United States' moral obligation to protect Israel, I remind them about the United States' strategic obligation. Israel benefits from a secure America, just as America benefits in having a secure, stable, and trustworthy ally in a very volatile and dangerous region of the world.

The Obama administration's inability to realize this twofold bond between the United States and Israel illustrates their lack of understanding. I suggest to the President and his advisers that, if they really want to salvage any remaining trace of foreign policy competence for their history books, they walk away from this deal.

I urge our President to pause and reflect on America's role in the world. Mr. Speaker, I urge him to reassess our courses of action abroad. The President must start by determining what is important for America. Only then will he be capable of developing a strategy, let alone the right one.

In God we trust.

REAUTHORIZE THE ESEA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, across my congressional district, elementary and secondary school students are packing up their lockers, taking final exams, and saying goodbye to their classmates and homeroom desks for the summer.

While our students head into a well-deserved summer recess, our teachers have already started thinking ahead to the next academic year, setting up lesson plans and figuring out what their course curriculums will be.

Unfortunately, many of our teachers will be faced with yet another year of stifling one-size-fits-all testing requirements and deadlines. Instead of enabling our teachers to do what they love and inspiring our children to learn and succeed, they are forced to waste classroom time by preparing and administering redundant and often low-quality tests.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 15 weeks since I last spoke on the House floor about the need to provide relief from burdensome testing requirements for our teachers, students, and parents.

At the time, the House was actively considering H.R. 5, legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as an amendment I was pleased to offer with my Democratic colleague, SUZANNE BONAMICI of Oregon. Our bipartisan amendment, which was adopted and included as part of H.R. 5, offers a solution to the overtesting problem that is taxing our schools and teachers.

Our amendment empowers teachers and parents by giving existing Federal funding to State and local education agencies to develop curriculum plans to make better use of tests for the students, with the ability to reduce testing.

It would also allow for quicker delivery of assessment data to educators and parents and a more qualitative analysis of how to shape curriculum for that student from the local school district and parent, not the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue our work on this bill and reauthorize the ESEA. We owe it to our colleagues who have worked for months on this bill and underlying policy. We owe it to our teachers who have dedicated their livelihood and careers to the betterment of our children.

Most of all, we owe it to our children, who deserve the best possible education that we can provide, an education that encourages them to think, learn, and succeed and not that simply tells them how to fill in the blanks on a generic test.

For those of my colleagues who may be undecided on advancing this bill and reauthorizing the ESEA, I ask you to consider: Are you happy with the status quo? Are you content to sit on the sidelines while Common Core standards and a myriad of tests are imposed on our students?

I would like to read into the RECORD a letter I received from the superintendent of my home school district. Let me preface this by saying it was not written to me as a Member of Congress, but rather as a taxpayer in the West Chester Area School District.

I read this because there is no better example of a need and an opportunity for us to help our families back home do our job and govern here in Congress. It reads:

> Dear Parents, many of us are quick to fault the U.S. public education system, comparing it to other smaller European countries and finding deficits and gaps. The system and the way it is funded are far from perfect. However, we manage to educate generations of children who go on to do incredible things.
>
> Now, we are asking our students to do something that is entirely unfair: to spend weeks and weeks filling in bubbles, taking standardized tests, and having their entire educational ambition directed toward passing them. This is not what public education was intended to do, nor should do.
>
> As the superintendent of the West Chester Area School District, I believe in very high standards for our students. I believe in accountability. I do believe that tests can be a good thing, but not the way we are being forced by the government to give them.
>
> We officially began the PSSA testing window on April 13, and we will continue to test through May 27, when we finish with the high school Keystone Exams, a new graduation requirement. Beginning with the class of 2017, even a straight-A student who doesn't do well on these tests won't receive a diploma under State law.
>
> State and federally mandated testing has been around for a long time, and is certainly here to stay, but it has become a massive burden that is stifling creativity and love of teaching and learning.
>
> While our district has embraced high standards and accountability, we now spend the first 7 months of the school year preparing to take three standardized tests; then we spend approximately 6 weeks giving tests to students. Unlike private and parochial

schools, public schools are mandated to use these tests to determine graduation for students and for teacher and administrator evaluations. It is positively stressing us—and our system—to the max.

Our teachers, students, and parents all say the extreme amount of time focused on testing is causing ridiculous amounts of stress in the classroom, faculty room, and at home. The angst is palpable as you walk through our hallways.

Where is there time for creativity in teaching? Where is there time for exploration and collaboration? Our talented staff do their very best to find ways to incorporate what needs to be tested into their dynamic lesson plans, but it is difficult, given the time constraints and enormous amount of material being covered.

Ultimately, that negativity is going to drive down our test scores. Learning should be challenging, but also enjoyable and exciting. Teaching should be dynamic and creative. We are missing that because of these tests.

I am not advocating a system without any testing, rigor, or accountability, but what we are doing right now isn't working.

Teachers have literally sent me hundreds of examples of how students are worried, anxious, and depressed. The rules for taking these exams are crazy as well.

Springtime in a school should be full of excitement and learning—not anymore. The last 3 weeks, our schools have looked more like prisons than educational institutions. The rules allow students to take as much time as they need, but once they close the booklet, the session is over, and they can't return to it.

Let's reauthorize the ESEA. Let's reduce the Federal footprint over public education. It is the right thing to do.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Claudio Kogan, Temple Emanuel, McAllen, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our ancestors, God of compassion, God of justice, and God of peace.

In this great Hall where dreams come true, we ask Your blessings upon these great men and women, the Representatives of the people. They have devoted their lives to our welfare. Give them wisdom and courage. Inspire them with the teachings of our prophets, as they answer Isaiah's call to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, Jeremiah's request to protect the orphan and the widow, and Ezekiel's plea to lift up those who cannot stand on their own in this land and all lands.

As an immigrant who came to this country 16 years ago and became an American citizen just 2 years ago, I join this House in a prayer of profound gratitude and deep appreciation for the blessings we, the people of the United States of America, are privileged to enjoy. I ask You, God, to let the lights of truth and harmony shine from this Chamber as beacons for the betterment of all Americans.

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.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ZINKE 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.

WELCOMING RABBI CLAUDIO KOGAN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rabbi Claudio Kogan from Temple Emanuel in McAllen, Texas, for his service today as guest chaplain.

A native of Argentina, Rabbi Kogan and his wife, Anna, immigrated to the United States where he continued his studies, receiving several master's degrees.

Rabbi Kogan has served congregations all over the United States. He has worked to develop a strong interfaith connection with his Christian and Muslim counterparts. He has received numerous awards for his essays on religion and ethics.

In addition to his rabbinical duties, Rabbi Kogan is also a medical doctor. He has been a high school teacher in Cincinnati, Ohio, and has combined his religious and medical training by serving as a hospital chaplain at a variety of institutions.

Rabbi Kogan is joined here today by his lovely wife, Anna, and his two beautiful children, Milena and Ezekiel.

I want to thank him for his prayer and for his service to my community.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to offer my official resignation as a member of the House Committee on Science, Space & Technology, effective today, June 10, 2015. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve on this committee over the last four years.

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. PALAZZO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 304

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Abraham.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CLEAR PATH FOR VETERANS CELEBRATES FEMALE VETERAN AND ACTIVE DUTY APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our female veterans and Active-Duty military in all branches and areas of service, as well as those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

This week, Clear Path for Veterans, an organization in central New York in my district, devoted to empowering servicemen and -women, veterans, and their families, will celebrate Female Veteran and Active Duty Appreciation Day to honor the countless women in our community who have served our country.

Women across our great Nation have and continue to put their lives on the line for our freedom and for our democracy. America's servicewomen, veterans, and their families are continually changing the way that our military is defined within our homes, our communities, our Armed Forces, and around the world.

With the number of female veterans at its highest percentage in United States history, Clear Path for Veterans is a pioneer in its commitment to empowering and inspiring women from all branches of service. I stand beside this organization in working to enable women veterans to reach their full potential.

These women have made our country stronger. Their courage and strength have given us freedom, and their sacrifices that they and their families have made should never be forgotten.

DAY OF PORTUGAL

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today is Dia de Portugal, a time when Portuguese Americans and families of Portuguese descent around the world come together to celebrate their shared heritage and rich cultural traditions.

Over the years, the United States and Portugal have shared a strong friendship, beginning in May of 1791 when Portugal became the first neutral country to recognize the new American Government and continuing today through the pursuit of our shared national security objectives, including our cooperation in the global war on terror.

I am particularly honored to celebrate Day of Portugal because my district, Rhode Island's First Congressional District, has a larger percentage of Portuguese American constituents than any other congressional district in the country.

As chair of the Portuguese American Caucus, I am proud to join my Portuguese American constituents in celebrating Dia de Portugal and working to strengthen U.S.-Portugal relations through my work in Congress today by fighting to maintain operations at Lajes Field in the Azores and working to promote better cooperation in the areas of agriculture, education, tourism, and health.

I wish everyone celebrating today a Happy Day of Portugal.

CELEBRATING BULGARIAN DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today was one of the most meaningful of my life as I served as an election observer for the post-Communist parliamentary elections in the Republic of Bulgaria with the International Republican Institute, nominated by RNC Chairman Lee Atwater.

It was a dream come true to visit talented and enthusiastic people at polling locations in the Hissar, Plovdiv region and see a restoration of democracy amidst the amazing antiquities of ancient Thracian, Greek, and Roman cultures. I was welcomed by Professor Stefan Stoyanov, who was elected to the National Assembly and later reinstituted the Rotary Club of Sofia.

In Congress, I have been grateful to co-chair the Bulgarian Caucus; work with dynamic Ambassador Elena Poptodorova; and, this year, led a delegation to Sofia to meet with Prime Minister Boyko Borisov, who is courageously promoting reforms for the people of Bulgaria.

It has been uplifting to meet with dedicated Bulgarian troops, along with my son, serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, who now train with Americans at the Novo Selo training base.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

God bless Bulgaria.

REMEMBERING JOHN GRANVILLE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, John Granville grew up in south Buffalo. He had a curiosity about the world and a desire to serve others. He was a Fulbright scholar and a Peace Corps volunteer who became a career diplomat for the United States Agency for International Development.

In 2007, John was distributing solar-powered radios to remote villages in South Sudan to ensure that the people could participate in upcoming elections. On New Year's Day in 2008, John and a colleague were targeted and assassinated by terrorists in Khartoum. He was 33 years old.

Four men were convicted of the murders, but 6 years ago today, they escaped with the aid of a man later pardoned by Sudanese President al-Bashir. Two of the killers remain at large, and the Department of Justice has offered a $5 million reward for their arrest.

Today, I will introduce a resolution calling on the State Department to maintain Sudan on the state sponsors of terrorism list until al-Bashir's pardon is repealed and John's killers are captured.

When his family expressed concern about his safety, John would say that he knew his work was dangerous, but he wouldn't want to be doing anything else. Today, we remember a man of light and peace and pledge to bring to justice those who took him from us far too soon.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Chairman CONAWAY and the Agriculture Committee for their prompt, bipartisan response to the recent WTO ruling against country of origin labeling.

Since 2009, Canada and Mexico argued that our country of origin labeling policy distorts trade across our borders and increases the cost of meat and poultry. In the U.S., we had hoped for a favorable ruling from the WTO, but their rulings and appeals have all been against us. Today, it is time to act to address the problems posed by COOL and prevent the retaliation from our friends in Canada and Mexico.

If not addressed, Canada and Mexico have threatened $3.6 billion in trade retaliation. This would be a major blow to pork and beef producers in my district; but it is not just livestock producers that would feel the pain. Threatened retaliation would also impact the corn growers in my district, one of the most productive corn growing districts in the Nation, and candy makers like Hershey and Mars that have plants in my district.

Again, I am grateful to Chairman CONAWAY and his attention to this issue and his prompt response to the WTO's ruling. I support this bill to repeal COOL and end the years of uncertainty faced by our farmers, ranchers, and so many others and urge my colleagues to do the same.

INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, fixing our Nation's crumbling infrastructure to boost the economy and increase transportation safety should not be a partisan issue; yet Republicans in Congress continue to show neglect and indifference towards the Nation's infrastructure and transportation safety needs.

The 2-month extension of the highway trust fund they offered in their unacceptable T-HUD appropriation bill is the latest example. The T-HUD bill shows a dangerous disregard for safety measures on America's highways at a time when we well know transportation safety should be a priority.

It allows massive, double 33-foot tractor-trailers to travel at high speeds on America's Interstate Highway System, and it suspends Federal safety guidelines aimed at eliminating trucker fatigue, allowing long-haul truckers to work more than twice the average workweek for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the short-term highway trust fund does not solve the problem of deteriorating roads and bridges; it simply puts a Band-Aid on it.

Republicans kicked the can down the road, but it got stuck in a pothole. Now is the time to fix the infrastructure in our counties, and we need to put people back to work in order to do it, but what we really need is a robust, long-term commitment.

□ 1215

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

I want to thank Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership on this issue.

On May 18, the World Trade Organization ruled against the U.S. COOL requirements. This ruling gives Canada and Mexico the green light to retaliate against United States products, particularly beef, pork, and chicken products. We are not looking here at a slap in the face, ladies and gentlemen. Unless COOL is repealed, U.S. goods could be hit with retaliatory tariffs that total $3.6 billion.

My home State of Iowa would be hit really hard. We have over 20 million hogs and almost 4 million cattle. Last year, Iowa exported almost $2 billion of pork, with Canada and Mexico as our top export markets. We need to repeal the country of origin labeling requirements in pork, beef, and chicken, which could hurt American workers.

While COOL is well-intentioned, we have voluntary programs already in place that give consumers information and the right to know where these products came from. We are out of options. Other legislative and regulatory fixes have been ineffective.

As the U.S. and State economies recover, the choice is clear. We cannot wait and see what trade retaliation from our closest trading partners would look like. It is time to repeal COOL now.

THE TIM COLE EXONERATION REVIEW COMMISSION

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the Texas State Legislature in passing House Bill 48, establishing the Tim Cole Exoneration Review Commission. Tim Cole was wrongfully convicted of rape and was the first Texas man to be posthumously cleared by DNA testing.

I know that, oftentimes, when people hear these stories, they think: What did he do to get on the police department's radar? Had he done something previously in his life that would have made the police department suspect him? I can tell you that, in Tim Cole's case, Tim was an Army veteran from Fort Worth; he was a Texas Tech student; and he honorably served in the military. Sadly, it was just a very bad time to be a Black man living in Lubbock, Texas. Tim was sentenced to 25 years in prison, and he died behind bars without being able to prove his innocence.

I am happy to let you know that this 11-member panel will examine wrongful convictions to determine what went wrong and then will make recommendations aimed at avoiding in the future the mistakes that were made in Tim Cole's case. On June 1, Governor Abbott signed a bill into law affirming that all Americans are entitled to due process. Tim Cole's family can take some small solace in the knowledge that his death has resulted in changes that can provide hope to those who are also wrongfully convicted.

I want to applaud Tim's brother, Cory Session, who has worked tirelessly for years to clear his brother's name. I also applaud his late mother, Ruby Session, who didn't get to see this bill signed into law, but she did get to see some changes made in Texas. I am just happy for this family. I am sad that this happened to Tim Cole, but I am glad that something positive has taken place.

PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the millions of men and women from the Armed Forces who are living with or who have died from the effects of post-traumatic stress disorder. June is PTSD Awareness Month.

In my home State of Montana, nearly 15,000 veterans, or 15 percent of the population of all veterans, suffer from PTSD. PTSD, no doubt, is a serious condition that touches every aspect of a person's life. Every day, 22 veterans commit suicide nationwide. Many of them struggle to live with PTSD. Many of our veterans who live with PTSD struggle to transition to civilian life because they have not been given essential resources in the care they need at VA hospitals and clinics or from their local communities.

I urge the Veterans Health Administration and local communities to work together to do everything we can to combat this epidemic.

God bless America and the men and women who serve and defend her.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SALVATION ARMY

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of this year's being the 150th anniversary of the Salvation Army.

It all started in 1865 with a minister named William Booth. He took to the streets of London's slums to champion the poor and neglected, and he decided that we have got to do something. That ''something'' was transformed into innovative approaches to eliminate poverty by demonstrating faith and by offering practical support to those in need.

In my Third Congressional District and across the Nation, the Salvation Army provides assistance to families in need by providing clothes and furniture, food, job training, and much more. We have all seen the volunteers with red kettles who ring the bells and ask for donations. Nationally, they have raised $135 million and continue to make tremendous contributions locally in Ohio, nationally, and globally.

I thank the Salvation Army's members, staff, board, and volunteers in my district, and I honor their work and service throughout this yearlong celebration of their 150th anniversary.

Happy anniversary.

NEGOTIATION WITH IRAN

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as the House debates giving guidelines to the President on opening up American trade, I rise to urge the President to secure a verifiable nuclear agreement with Iran.

America's response to Iran's nuclear program will be the most important foreign policy decision in a generation. This problem grows more urgent by the day. On June 1, The New York Times reported that Iran's nuclear stockpile had grown by 20 percent over the previous year and a half. Secretary of Energy Moniz revealed that Iran was 2 to 3 months away from a nuclear weapon in April, which was 2 months ago. A nuclear agreement without verifiability is not an agreement at all but an act of faith in the worst state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

I want to remind the President that he has repeatedly said that a nuclear-

armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained and that the United States will do what it must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I hope that this will not be another vanished red line for the President, who has also said, ''As President, I don't bluff.''

TIME TO MAKE PROTECTING THIS NATION A PRIORITY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my anger at what I saw on the video that was taken of the event down in McKinney, Texas, on Friday, in which a big and burly police officer, wearing white socks, manhandled a young, 15-year-old Black girl in a bathing suit and man-handled other young Black people who were there simply to attend a pool party.

That kind of heavyhanded, out-of-control police misconduct must be stopped in this country. We must do something about it. I was so angry that I could not be there to do something about it, but I am here to do something about it. I pledge to the people to do everything I can to make sure that we eliminate those kinds of officers from police forces throughout the country.

TIME TO MAKE PROTECTING THIS NATION A PRIORITY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, much of the economic turmoil that has gripped this Nation is the result of the Federal Government's spending beyond its means. However, Democrats continue to insist on ignoring the consequences of our crushing debt burden. Last week, Democrats in the Senate announced they would block any appropriations bill, including legislation providing funds for the defense of this Nation, until Republicans meet their demands for increased government spending.

At a time of grave threats to our Nation, we must be vigilant, determined, and united in the full support of our military personnel. Providing for the common defense of the United States of America is the Federal Government's primary duty. Holding hostage the funding for our troops, their families, and the Nation's veterans in order to extract more taxpayer dollars for Washington bureaucracy is the worst kind of political gamesmanship. It is time to make protecting this Nation a priority.

EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 52nd anniversary of the passage of the Equal Pay Act, I rise today to reflect on our commitment to equality and the work ahead to turn this commitment into a reality.

In 1963, our Nation declared that women deserved equal pay for equal work; yet, more than half a century later, we still have much work ahead to end pay discrimination against women. Today, women make just 77 cents for every dollar men earn, amounting to an $11,000 gap per year between full-time men and women. That is almost $1,000 each month to help with groceries, rent, and student loans.

The workforce disparities have disastrous effects on our Nation. According to the Census Bureau, 1 in 3 women lives 200 percent below the Federal poverty line compared to 1 in 4 men, and of the more than 100 million Americans who live paycheck to paycheck, almost 70 percent of them are women and their children. Meanwhile, of the S&P 500 companies, women make up just 14.2 percent of their leadership positions, and only 24 companies have female CEOs.

Women deserve a fair shot at the American Dream. I urge my colleagues to work with me to address these issues. Together, let's eliminate gender disparities in our workforce.

CLEARWATER, FLORIDA'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

(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 centennial anniversary of one of our Nation's most beautiful communities—the city of Clearwater, Florida.

Named for its abundant fresh springs and waters, the city was established by colonists in the 1830s and was originally named Clearwater Harbor until 1895. It was then renamed Clearwater and was later established as a municipality on May 27, 1915.

Clearwater is known internationally for its clear gulf waters, award-winning beaches, a rich history of Major League Baseball spring training, and it is even home to our very own movie star—Winter, the dolphin. Not only is Clearwater a great place to call home, but it is also a great place to visit year round. In fact, Clearwater currently holds the Guinness World Record for the most consecutive days of sunshine in a single year, which is why, today, Clearwater continues to warmly welcome hundreds of thousands of visitors each year.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent the people of Clearwater and our greater Pinellas County community. I urge this body to join me in recognizing this most significant milestone. Happy anniversary to Clearwater, Florida.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats continue to try to move this country forward, but the Republican majority continues to try to turn back the clock. The effort to eradicate the Export-Import Bank is just another example of a reckless act of legislative malpractice.

First, House Republicans shut down the government for 16 days, costing the American people $24 billion in lost economic productivity. Then House Republicans attempted to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, risking the safety of the American people. Now House Republicans want to shut down the Export-Import Bank, risking tens of thousands of jobs for hard-working Americans.

What is your addiction to shutting things down?

The American people want us to lift them up, and the best way we can do it right now is to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

ELIZABETH BARTA WIDEL

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize someone who is a very familiar voice to readers of The Omak-Okanogan County Chronicle newspaper, which is located in Okanogan County, in my district, in the State of Washington.

Elizabeth Barta Widel is one of the most senior journalists in the Pacific Northwest. For 61 years, she has shared her love of the outdoors, her photography, and her passion for all things concerning the Okanogan community. Since 1954, Elizabeth has written a column for the Chronicle, titled, ''Exploring the Okanogan.'' So far, she has written almost 2,900 columns on an array of topics, and she continues to add to that number regularly. Through sharing her stories, her down-to-earth words of wisdom, and her curiosity of the world around her, Elizabeth has shown a profound connection with the Okanogan Valley and has inspired generations of readers and those who know her.

Please join me in celebrating the contribution and dedication of this remarkable lady, an explorer of things great and small.

□ 1230

BOKO HARAM

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today six young girls who escaped Boko Haram will join us at a press conference after votes on Wear Red Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has launched a terrifying slew of attacks that have killed more than 109 people in the last 2 weeks. As its ties to the jihadi group, the Islamic State, strengthen, Boko Haram becomes an even greater global and domestic threat. Boko Haram and ISIS have now joined together.

We must act now to ensure that our young people are not enticed by this terrorist group. I can see African American children this summer become infatuated and move in that direction. These extremists exploit this, filling young people's heads with terrible lies and destructive ideas.

Every day that Boko Haram is left undefeated is one more day that our young people are at risk. We are in danger. Tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson. We must destroy Boko Haram and ISIS.

THE INNOVATION ACT STIFLES INNOVATION

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to think about where the hotbeds of innovation are in this country. They are at universities, where students and professors come up with new ideas. They are at our startups, where inventors and entrepreneurs pursue their dreams late into the night, toiling away, backed by venture capitalists who fund their dreams and their ideas.

But why would venture capitalists, entrepreneurs, inventors, and universities be against a bill called the Innovation Act? I will tell you why. Because the Innovation Act stifles innovation.

Mr. Speaker, would you take a lawnmower to your flower garden if you saw a weed in it? I sure wouldn't, but that is what the Innovation Act does. It will destroy and degrade our patent system in this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Innovation Act, H.R. 9.

RECOGNIZING LG ELECTRONICS' COMMITMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize LG Electronics for winning the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries' Design for Recycling Award.

Recycling is one of the most consequential activities each and every one of us can do on a daily basis to protect the environment and conserve natural resources. Contestants in the ISRI's Design for Recycling are some of our country's largest and best manufacturers, all working to preserve our environment by improving the recyclability of their products.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of recycled material comes from items such as automobiles, refrigerators, old tires, and electronics such as televisions and computers. This year, LG Electronics won for their 4K Ultra HD OLED and LED TVs. These TVs include innovative new technologies that were designed with recycling in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the ISRI in recognizing LG Electronics for their commitment to the environment and recycling.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JOHN J. DEARBORN

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life, service, and valor of Captain John J. Dearborn, a Granite Stater, family man, and American hero.

Captain Dearborn, a lifelong resident of Deerfield, was New Hampshire's oldest living U.S. marine, having served in World War II as a Corsair fighter. During his service, Dearborn witnessed history in the making, having seen the final Japanese surrender aboard the USS *Missouri* on September 2, 1945, marking the end of World War II.

Dearborn remained as an active member of the veterans community and just this April traveled from Manchester, New Hampshire, to Washington, D.C., to participate in an Honor Flight with other veterans from around the Nation. His service, legacy, and courage live on.

We will never forget the service and sacrifice that Captain Dearborn made for our freedoms and our liberty. It is because of our Nation's heroes like Dearborn that our Nation remains the land of the free and the home of the brave. For that, we are forever grateful.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARISSA BARTELS

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Marissa Bartels on winning an astounding four gold medals at the recent Minnesota State track and field meet.

Marissa was born with spina bifida but refuses to let that slow her down. In middle school, when no longer able to participate in the sports she knew and loved, Marissa discovered wheelchair sports. This was her third year participating at State, and Marissa dominated, winning the 100 and 800 meter races as well as shot put and discus.

Marissa's athletic abilities extend beyond track and field. She is also a national champion in baseball and basketball. It is no surprise that this impressive competitor will be heading to the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater in the fall as a student athlete.

Best of luck and congratulations, Marissa. You are an inspiration to each of us to never give up, no matter what obstacle or adversity we may face.

LET'S DELAY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW CFPB RULE

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today relating to the new CFPB rule combining the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act and Truth in Lending Act disclosure that is scheduled to take effect on August 1.

On behalf of home buyers across this country, the real estate industry has requested a grace period or hold harmless period for 90 days. To date, the CFPB will only commit to saying they will have relaxed enforcement for a period similar to that of the qualified mortgage/ability to repay rule.

Now, leaving aside whether this rule will provide more clarity or more confusion to the real estate purchaser, leaving aside whether it will provide more protection to buyers or be more problematic for them to close on a real estate transaction, I want to focus on the August 1 deadline.

I spent 10 years in the real estate industry working with real estate agents, banks, mortgage professionals, title insurance agents, and it is well known that June, July, and August tend to be the most active months for real estate transactions. Changing disclosure requirements in the middle of the busiest part of the calendar year for real estate deals causes difficulty for those involved in conducting settlements. And changing them without the ability for professionals to test their systems and procedures doesn't make much sense, either.

It is also unfair to consumers in that you are compelling their retained professionals to receive the training during the busiest months, implement new procedures, and account for unanticipated disruptions. Any hiccup along the way is actually to the detriment of the consumer.

Let's make the rule effective in January or February of 2016, which are historically the slowest months of the year, and when it is most fair to real estate consumers.

HONORING ALL THE ROSIE THE RIVETERS

(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, Mae Krier of Levittown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was a young woman

when our country went to war in 1941. As men answered their Nation's call, millions of women left their homes for factory jobs, working as riveters, buckers, welders, and electricians.

Mae Krier, who is approaching her nineties, still beams with pride when she recalls her days as a riveter on Boeing's B–17 warplane assembly line. American women like Mae gained notoriety as Rosie the Riveters, and they remain a symbol of strength and confidence for our Nation.

In paying tribute to these American heroes who served our country during World War II, let us also gratefully acknowledge the women who served patriotically on the home front with continued recognition of a national Rosie the Riveter Day.

To all the Rosie the Riveters, on behalf of Pennsylvania's Eighth District, thank you for your contributions to our country and your role in the legacy of the Greatest Generation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2685, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2393, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 303 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 303

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, H. Res. 303, providing for consideration of two important pieces of legislation: H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, and H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2393 under a closed rule and H.R. 2685 under the customary modified open rule process, which allows any Member to offer an amendment to the bill so long as the amendment complies with the rules of the House. The only restriction is on the amount of time that will be allotted for debating each amendment.

H.R. 2393 is an urgent and critical response to the World Trade Organization's ruling on May 18 of this year, which found country of origin labeling, or COOL, for muscle meat cuts to be in violation of the U.S. trade obligations with Canada and Mexico. H.R. 2393 will simply repeal the COOL meat cut provisions, making the U.S. compliant and prevent retaliation.

Critics of H.R. 2393 will say we have more time, but in truth, we don't. This final ruling is the fourth time the WTO has ruled against the U.S. for various versions of COOL, and on this final appeal, the WTO has given both Canada and Mexico the authority to impose more than $3 billion in combined retaliatory tariffs against U.S. products within 60 days of the ruling.

□ 1245

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are now down to just 37 days to respond before these tariffs are imposed. This could deal an enormous blow to U.S. companies and the workers they employ, just when our economy is beginning to rebound.

There is also an argument floating around that this will prevent all labeling or that a ''Made in North America'' label will satisfy our trade obligations. A North American label will not necessarily satisfy our obligations and can in no way, no matter how fast we try, be negotiated in the remaining 37 days to prevent retaliation.

Also, it is important to note that repealing mandatory COOL doesn't prevent voluntarily labeling, as some companies already do.

Finally, it is worth noting that some critics claim that this will weaken inspections for meat imports. Nothing can be further from the truth.

The United States Department of Agriculture has and will continue to provide the most rigorous, science-based import inspections, inspections of foreign plants which export to the United States. Whether or not the product has a mandatory country of origin label on it will not affect these rigorous inspections.

This legislation is desperately needed. Our manufacturers, pork producers, grape growers, confectionary exporters, and ranchers have repeatedly asked Congress to ensure that we repeal the COOL provisions and bring the U.S. back into compliance with our WTO obligations fully and quickly.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2393 is important to ensure our economy is protected and that the U.S. plays by the rules we agreed to with two of our biggest trading partners, which are by far our largest export markets.

This rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, which funds our Nation's national defense and provides the resources necessary to continue our essential military efforts abroad, as well as the funding for health and quality of life programs for the brave men and women of our Armed Forces.

Overall, the bill provides $578.6 billion in discretionary funding, $800 million more than the President's request and $24.4 billion above the fiscal year 2015 funding level. Within this amount, $88.4 billion is appropriated for our war efforts in the global war on terrorism.

H.R. 2685 is an imperative measure that funds our critical national security programs and addresses the vital needs of our men and women in the armed services. An effective military, one that is well equipped and well trained, is indispensable to the common defense of our country and is in the best interest of all Americans. This bill includes vital funding for the U.S. military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to instability abroad.

This bill contains $133 billion to provide for 1.3 million Active-Duty troops and 820,000 National Guard and Reserve troops; $219 billion is included for operations and maintenance, which provides for the funding of readiness programs that prepare our troops for combat and peacetime missions.

The Constitution charges the Congress to provide for our national defense, and this bill ensures we will fulfill that obligation. Our highest national priority should always be the protection of our country, and the funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must provide the resources necessary to fight America's enemies abroad. With the rise of ISIS, the continued presence of al Qaeda, the growth of terrorist groups in North Africa, instability throughout the Middle East, and Russian aggression in Ukraine, our military must be prepared for not only current threats, but for future ones as well.

We also need to support those willing to fight alongside us, which is why H.R. 2685 includes critical support for our allies who are also facing this unprecedented instability due to the aggression of nation-states and terrorist organizations alike.

This bill makes difficult budgetary choices without undermining the safety, security, and success of our servicemembers and their families. It uses every tax dollar responsible to give our Armed Forces the resources they need to stay prepared, safe, and in peak fighting form.

Supporting the men and women of our armed services—who, day in and day out, risk their lives in the service of our country—is one of the most important functions that we perform as Members of Congress, and this responsibility should not be taken lightly.

I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides for our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two very critical pieces of legislation that will protect our economy, provide necessary funding for our servicemembers and the defense of our country, and I support its adoption.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, as well as the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this grab bag rule and both underlying pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 18th time in this Congress that House Republicans have brought to the floor a grab bag rule, a single rule that governs floor debate for two or more unrelated pieces of legislation.

Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the use of grab bag rules has dramatically increased by over 400 percent. Using one rule to govern multiple, oftentimes unrelated bills stifles debate, which I guess is the point of them merging all these bills under one rule on the House floor, and leads to disjointed and confusing discussion between two sides.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and my Democratic colleagues on the House Rules Committee have raised these concerns with Chairman SESSIONS, but unfortunately, we are back on the floor today to consider one rule for two completely unrelated measures.

Today's rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act, also known as COOL, under a completely closed process. No amendments are allowed, none.

Clearly, this is an issue that we need to address sooner rather than later, but H.R. 2393 is not the answer. It was introduced just 2 days after the World Trade Organization ruled against the United States' country of origin labeling requirements for meat.

H.R. 2393 is a knee-jerk reaction to the WTO ruling that completely does away with labeling requirement for beef, pork, and chicken, which wasn't even addressed in the WTO ruling.

We know from past WTO disputes that there are several steps that need to occur before retaliation would take place. The arbitration panel takes at least 60 days, but in the U.S.-Brazil cotton case, it took 15 months to produce a ruling. The sky is not falling; we have some time to come up with a workable solution.

Instead of H.R. 2393, we ought to be working toward a more thoughtful approach that balances consumers' right to know where their meat comes from with our trade obligations.

More than 60 countries have successfully implemented COOL-like labeling requirements that comply with WTO standards, and we ought to look toward these programs for a workable solution.

Such an important issue that impacts the safety of food we eat and the health of American families deserves the most robust debate possible, but this closed rule from House Republicans prevents us from having that kind of debate. As I said, not a single Member, Democratic or Republican, is allowed to offer an amendment to this bill. It is completely closed.

Today's rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations Act, there is much to praise about the bill. It contains many important provisions and strong funding for suicide prevention and training, improved response to sexual assault and prevention, and medical research.

I applaud the hard work put into drafting this bill by Defense Subcommittee Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, along with Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY. However, this bill suffers from two major—I emphasize the word ''major''—flaws, which to my mind makes it difficult, if not impossible, to support.

First and foremost, this bill continues to use the overseas contingency operations account, or OCO, as a slush fund to get around parts of the Budget Control Act that Republicans don't like—namely, the caps on defense spending—while ignoring the damage the caps are doing to all our nondefense programs.

This bill, like the Defense Authorization bill before it, completely bypasses the caps set down by the BCA by increasing OCO funding by $38 billion above the President's request. The bill shifts $38 billion from the defense base budget and shoves those moneys into the off-budget OCO meant to cover the costs of our various wars.

Rather than wrestle with the hard question of how to get rid of the sequester and the budget caps and bring our spending back into regular order, the Republicans have decided to wallow in a slush fund. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, don't you think it is about time that we found a way to provide for our national security needs without relying on war contingency slush funds to pay for the everyday expenses of the Department of Defense?

Members on both sides of the aisle have recognized that the sequester does not work. Shouldn't we be honest about that? Shouldn't we negotiate a workable plan, rather than play these games of smoke and mirrors that actually undermine the Pentagon's ability to budget and plan for the long term?

Second, Mr. Speaker, this bill continues to appropriate billions of dollars to carry out the war against the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere; but Congress has not even debated, let alone authorized that war.

The leadership of this House continues to fail in carrying out its responsibilities under the Constitution and bring an AUMF before this body to authorize the military operations that have been ongoing since last August.

In fact, just last night, we learned that the U.S. presence in Iraq will increase even further, with the administration planning to establish a new military base in Anbar province and send hundreds of additional American military trainers.

This move is aimed at helping Iraqi forces to retake the city of Ramadi from the Islamic State, but it is clear our involvement is getting bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger—but still, no word from this leadership that it has the political will or intention to bring an AUMF to the House floor this month, next month, or the month after.

With Americans investing more and more in this conflict—we are told that we spend about $3.5 million an hour on this latest war against the Islamic State—there has never been a greater urgency for this Congress to debate and to vote on this war.

Time and again, bipartisan letters have been sent to the Speaker asking him to bring an AUMF to the House floor. Time and again, individual Members have sought to bring amendments up for debate that would authorize military operations in Iraq and Syria, only to have the Republican majority on the House Rules Committee reject them, depriving them of consideration and depriving them of debate.

Just last night, I offered an amendment that simply states that no funds in this act may be obligated or spent on military operations in Iraq and Syria in the absence of an AUMF for such operations. It was also rejected by the Republicans of the House Rules Committee.

Some stated that they voted to reject it because 10 minutes, which is the amount of time limiting debate on all amendments to the defense bill, is simply not enough time to debate a serious question. Well, I agree. Ten minutes is not enough time, but the Rules Committee has the power to increase that limit to as much time as it feels appropriate, and it failed to do so.

The Rules Committee could provide 2 hours of debate or 2 days of debate or 2 weeks of debate; that is the power of the Rules Committee. Don't hide behind this excuse as a reason for Congress not to live up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we can always find the time and find a way to spend billions of billions of dollars to fund wars; we can always find a way to send our brave men and women overseas to fight and die in these wars, but we can't ever seem to find the backbone or the time to debate and authorize them.

Each night, each week, the Members of this House get to go home to their families and their communities, surrounded by loved ones and people who support them. If we don't have the stomach to take responsibility for sending our troops into danger, then the least we can do is bring them home to their families so that they might enjoy the same peace and privileges that we take so much for granted.

□ 1300

If we want to spend our Nation's treasure on these wars, if my colleagues believe that the war in Iraq and Syria is a priority for our Nation and our national security, then we should carry out our constitutional mandate and debate and vote on an AUMF.

Now, I welcome the fact that the House Appropriations Committee, in a bipartisan vote, supported an amendment by the honorable gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, that says: ''Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL.''

That provision is in the Defense Appropriations bill. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we shouldn't just be saying that Congress has a constitutional duty; we should actually be carrying out our constitutional duty.

So I hope that every single one of my colleagues will remember that when they cast their votes for final passage of this bill, you are providing money and equipment and lives to carry out a war that this House doesn't even have the courage to debate and vote on.

The leadership of this House has to stop whining and stop trying to shift the responsibility on to anyone and everyone except to whom the responsibility really falls. It falls upon each of us to say to this leadership that the time has come to bring an AUMF before this body, and for the leadership to let us debate it and vote on it.

It is time that we stopped acting like cowards and started behaving like Members of Congress our constituents elected to make the tough decisions. So I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, just let me say before I turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me on the floor that I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. These are important issues, especially when we are talking about appropriations for the Defense Department. We do need an AUMF, and I remain committed to work with the gentleman from Massachusetts to accomplish that; that we should have that open debate and that discussion through the committee system.

This is not the vehicle. But we will do that. We need to do that, and I agree with the gentleman.

Today, I am very happy to have with me several people who would like to speak on this issue. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the underlying legislation to repeal country of origin labeling for meat products, and I believe this effort is long past due.

I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing this rule to the floor, and I appreciate Agriculture Committee Chairman CONAWAY'S expeditious response to the WTO's final ruling that sets the table for a huge hit to America's struggling economy.

Not only has COOL been a costly burden on our Nation's meat industry for more than a decade, but now massive retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico will inflict pain on a vast amount of U.S. industries and jobs.

At a time when American GDP is actually shrinking, and U.S. farmers and manufacturers are desperately seeking export markets, the worst thing we can do is allow this policy to damage our ability to get American-made to market.

COOL represents yet another failed government mandate imposing heavy costs on private sector industry for no defensible purpose. While the primary goal of COOL is to give American-grown meat a competitive advantage, the result has been exactly the opposite.

Even the Department of Agriculture agrees that COOL has actually negatively impacted the industry that it was supposed to benefit. As a direct result of this policy, we have not only seen sharp increases in the cost of marketing and selling beef and pork, but looming trade retaliation is already costing American industries that contract for future delivery of goods into these export markets.

If we allow these retaliatory tariffs to go forward, our Nation's businesses will experience billions of dollars of market loss, which will kill jobs, harm our U.S. competitiveness, and have a long-term negative impact on America's economic health.

Fortunately, today we have a chance to end the harmful impact of this policy. I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation to repeal COOL once and for all.

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

Let me just say to my colleague on the Rules Committee, I am glad he supports my position that we ought to have a debate on an AUMF when it comes to these wars against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

But my question is, what are we waiting for?

Eleven months ago, Congressman WALTER JONES, a Republican, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, a Democrat, and myself actually brought a resolution to the floor saying that if we are going to be engaged in combat operations in Iraq, that we ought to have a vote on an AUMF, and that passed overwhelmingly.

We have been at war now for over 10 months. I mean, bombing every day. We have thousands of troops over

there. The President is going to send several hundred more over there. What are we waiting for?

We were told in the 113th Congress that we ought to wait till the 114th Congress. I don't know why, given the fact that the war began under the 113th Congress. But anyway, January came, and we are in the 114th Congress.

Then we were told we have got to wait for the President to submit a strategy or an AUMF. He did.

Now, I know you don't like it. I don't like it. Some people want it broader and bigger. Some of us want it more restrictive. But nonetheless, he did what he is supposed to do. What we are supposed to do is deliberate.

And here we are, 10 months later, and we are all told we will get to it. We will get to it. We will get to it.

We announced yesterday that we are going to establish a new military base in Iraq, and close to 500 more American troops are going to go over there. What are we waiting for?

We ought to be debating these AUMFs before we put people into harm's way, before we start getting engaged in hostilities.

So I have to tell you, I am frustrated not only by the inaction of the leadership of this House, the excuses of the leadership of this House. I am frustrated by my friends who say, I am with you, but we will just get to it at some other point. I mean, how many months, how many years have to go by before we do our job?

The gentleman talked about our constitutional duty to protect the people of the United States. We also have a constitutional duty when it comes to war, and we are not living up to that at all. We are failing miserably, and it really is a disgrace, and it is a disservice to the men and women whom we put into harm's way.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, on the COOL legislation, let me remind my colleagues that consumers, the American people, the people we are supposed to represent, are increasingly seeking more information and want more information about food source and production methods and want to make purchases from a trusted source.

A 2013 Consumer Federation of America study found that 90 percent of Americans strongly support mandatory COOL for fresh meat and strongly favor requiring meat to be labeled with specific information about where the animals were born, raised, and processed.

A 2010 Consumer Union study shows that 93 percent of consumers would prefer to have the country of origin label on the meat that they buy. That is what the American people want.

And yet, rather than trying to respond to that, the first inclination in the aftermath of this WTO ruling is to basically cave, saying, We don't really care what the American people want. We are just going to cave.

I think that is the wrong way to proceed, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this COOL legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for giving me the opportunity to testify today regarding the rule governing debate on H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL for short, was first enacted for meat products as part of the 2002 farm bill. Implementation of the law was delayed until 2008.

Less than 5 months after the COOL implementing rule was published, Canada and Mexico challenged the rule at the WTO, arguing that it had a trade-distorting impact by reducing the value and number of cattle and hogs shipped to the United States.

The process has since progressed through the dispute settlement panel phase and a U.S. appeal to the WTO's Appellate Body. In both instances, the WTO found that the way the regulations were implemented violated WTO obligations by discriminating against imported livestock.

The United States was given until May 13, 2013, to bring its COOL regulations into compliance. In response, USDA issued a revised COOL rule in May of 2013 which required that production steps—born, raised, and slaughtered by origin country—be included on meat labels. The revised rule also prohibited the commingling of meat from imported and domestic livestock.

At the request of Canada and Mexico, the WTO established a compliance panel to determine if the revised rule brought the United States into compliance with the previous ruling. Canada and Mexico claimed that not only did the revised rule fail to bring the United States into compliance, but certain parts, especially the prohibition on commingling, were even more onerous than the original rule.

A key criterion for current COOL implementation is that it requires ''segregation'' of animals by country of origin, which significantly raises the cost of utilizing imported livestock. The compliance panel report, released October 20, 2014, upheld the earlier findings of discrimination.

The United States appealed the compliance panel report and on May 18, 2015, the WTO rejected, again, the United States appeal, and found for the fourth and, believe it or not, final time that the U.S. COOL requirements for beef and pork were unavoidably discriminatory.

The final rule kick-starts the WTO process to determine the level of retaliatory tariffs that Canada and Mexico can now impose on the United States, which has been widely predicted to have effects in the billions of dollars.

During a hearing in the House Agriculture Committee's Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee to examine the implications of potential retaliation against the U.S., witnesses made it clear that losing the final appeal to the WTO and the inevitable impacts of retaliation against the United States would have a devastating impact on our economy.

Witnesses included representatives from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Confectioners Association, the Wine Institute of California, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Pork Producers Council, and the National Farmers Union.

Some have asked why we should act on the basis of a WTO decision. If COOL worked, perhaps there would be a response other than a repeal, but the fact is COOL is a marketing failure. In an April 2015 report to Congress, USDA explained that COOL requirements result in extraordinary costs with no quantifiable benefits.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONAWAY. In response to those who argue that COOL enhances food safety, I have also maintained for over 10 years now that is simply not the case. If it were, then all meat served at restaurants would come with an information label of the meat's origin. But it doesn't, and that is because retail food establishments are exempt from the COOL requirements.

In a May 1, 2015, letter to Congress, Secretary Vilsack reaffirmed the need for Congress to repeal the disputed COOL label requirements. In other words, if we go down this path with Canada to try to negotiate something they have no reason to negotiate on, it will fail as well.

Repeal is the only viable option for us to avoid these retaliatory statements. Canada and Mexico have both said they are uninterested in negotiation. We are now at a point of fixing this.

COOL repeal is the answer. This bill does that. I support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

We have been involved with a long struggle in this Congress and Congresses before, dating back some 13 years, and even before that, about country of origin labeling. Do people have the right to know where their food comes from?

As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, the American public supports this.

We have had a ruling from the WTO that does not prohibit country of origin labeling. To the contrary, the case upheld the country's right to require food labeling when it serves a broad

public interest that does not lead to treatment of a foreign product in a less favorable way than a domestic one.

We are rushing in a repeal that goes beyond just the disputed elements, adding poultry, and raising questions, I think, about our commitment to being able to give consumers what they want.

There are those that would attach cost to this, but it also is in terms of what people want.

And I think, we ought to take a deep breath. There is not going to be any retaliatory tariffs that are going to be actually inflicted quickly. This is a process that is going to take months.

The Brazilian cotton subsidies, about which I personally think Brazil was right—we had inappropriate cotton subsidies, and we are paying Brazilian cotton interests now because of our refusal to make our own cotton policies WTO-compliant.

□ 1315

That is another scandal, in my judgment, that we are giving $148 million to Brazilian cotton farmers, because we are giving inappropriate subsidies to American cotton farmers when we have other priorities.

But in this case, we have plenty of time in this Congress to follow regular order, to be able to carve out specific provisions that speak to the weakness in what the United States did. Because the United States, in enacting this for meat products, it was pretty convoluted, and the American Government had been told before that it would not be WTO compliant.

So this isn't a surprise. It is not an emergency. It is a responsibility we have to try to make these adjustments.

I don't want to have our other industries penalized with retaliatory tariffs, and they won't be, but we don't have to pass this bill. We ought to deal with the underlying problems, be narrow, be specific, and uphold the right of American consumers to have as much information as we can give them.

So I would strongly recommend that we reject the rule and the underlying bill. Let's have this conversation. Let's do it right. And let's make sure that we defend our right under WTO to have appropriate food labeling.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This very important legislation is a direct response to the fourth and final World Trade Organization ruling that mandatory country of origin labeling, or COOL, is anticompetitive and will allow Canada and Mexico to seek over $3 billion in tariffs on American products, directly placing American producers at a competitive disadvantage.

H.R. 2393 removes cattle, hogs, and chicken from COOL labeling to allow our producers to maintain access to two of our largest trading markets and protect U.S. exports from destructive sanctions.

Again, I urge my colleagues to adopt this combined rule and vote in support of the COOL Amendments Act. I encourage the Senate to move this legislation as quickly as possible so our producers can compete on a level playing field.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, country of origin labeling stands for the proposition that knowledge is power. The more knowledge you have, the better decisions that you can make. This is true about the food that you eat, and it is also true about the trade deals that we are being asked to swallow this week.

With Fast Track hurtling down on us for a vote the day after tomorrow, this recent World Trade Organization decision against the United States ought to serve as more than a blinking yellow light. It ought to be viewed as a giant red stoplight.

The World Trade Organization ruled that it just isn't ''cool'' to supply consumers more information. And while this decision may not actually overrule our law, what you are seeing today is the possibility—indeed, the probability—of expensive retaliation against American exports unless we yield to this WTO decision. If you support local decisionmaking, you need to consider the significance of our experience at the World Trade Organization.

There have previously been some challenges to United States laws just like this, and the record of the United States at the World Trade Organization when it is challenged is not one to be really proud of. We have had 6 wins and 66 losses. These are losses that have been sustained when other countries challenge our laws.

Only recently, as my colleague from Connecticut ROSA DELAURO and I attempted to present an amendment to a bill to say that corporate deserters—those that leave our country and renounce their charters here in order to dodge taxes—ought not to be given government business paid for by our taxpayers, we had some organizations who came and said: You can't do that. You can't deny corporate deserters an opportunity to get money from other taxpayers for government work because the World Trade Organization wouldn't like it.

So there is already a range of threats being used based on existing trade laws. Consider now what will happen when the number of those who can challenge decisions in this Congress, at the State level, and at the local level is multiplied geometrically because of the fact that now, under an investor-state dispute settlement provision, thousands of foreign corporations can challenge our regulations and our laws. Taxpayers will be exposed to unprecedented amounts of liability because of our decision to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people that we represent.

At least the World Trade Organization, the group that decided this case, has an appeal process. There is no such appeal process for these cases that will be brought by foreign corporations.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. And the panels that will decide them are usually made up of a majority of private lawyers, who one day are litigating cases for multinationals and the next day are deciding these cases.

If you agree that foreign investors should not receive greater rights than American investors, if you support local and State decisionmaking to keep our air and water and our environment clean without having to pay foreigners for the privilege of doing so, then there should be great concern about these trade deals that are being fast-tracked this week.

We don't have to look far to see the damage that could occur, because only three months ago, in Canada, it happened when a local decision about expanding a quarry in an environmentally sensitive area was challenged successfully. That is an unfortunate decision.

We need to be wary of these Fast-Track proposals and insist that they put us on the right track for more trade without jeopardizing the health and safety of Americans. I tried to do that in the Ways and Means Committee, but, like every other amendment to put us on the right track, it was rejected. We need to reject that wrong track approach this week.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for this rule and for the underlying bill, H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act. This bill repeals the country of origin labeling requirement for certain meat products because, as it currently stands, it threatens the economic livelihood of farmers and ranchers in northeast Georgia and, really, across the Nation.

Like so many other regulations that have been promulgated and upheld by this administration, it has achieved nothing but harm to our economy—not what it was ''intended to do.'' It does not improve food safety, and it now threatens to further devastate the ability of America's agriculture industry to provide for their families by violating our trade obligations and encouraging retaliation from two of our largest trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

I was sent to Washington to be the voice of 700,000 Americans who live in northeast Georgia. These hard-working Americans produce more chicken than any other district in the United States. And now, like so many other Americans, they are facing devastating financial harm because of the COOL requirement, which arbitrarily mandates that meat products have a label that shows what country they were produced in.

You see, the WTO has ruled on four separate occasions that mandatory COOL requirements violate our obligation to treat our trade partners fairly, just as we demand to be treated fairly by them. Now Canada and Mexico may seek to impose retaliatory tariffs against not only our meat exports, but exports on virtually every industry in the United States.

Now I can't imagine how knowing that a pork chop came from a pig that was born in Canada could possibly improve food safety, and I really can't imagine it when we already require that all meat imports be inspected by at least the same standards that the USDA uses to inspect meat here at home, but I can tell you that it takes no imagination to foresee how this will impact our economy. Our trade partners will retaliate against us by taxing our exports.

Retaliatory tariffs are expected on $493 million worth of Georgia exports alone. Nationally, tariffs will impact billions of dollars worth of exports. Chicken exports from my district will be taxed the moment they leave the country, and with 20 percent of chicken produced in the United States being exported, the impact will be overwhelming.

So what will happen if we fail to repeal these mandates? The hard-working farmers in my district and in districts across the country will be unable to compete in the international market.

We need to support this rule and the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me say that this COOL repeal I think is a rash overreaction to the WTO ruling, and I think that we owe it to the American people to try to figure out whether there is a middle ground here.

And to answer my friend from Georgia, who was like: Well, why do people want to know? Well, maybe the American people want to support American farmers. Maybe they want to support the small- and medium-sized farms that are doing such incredible work all across this country. I don't think that that is an outrageous idea. As I mentioned before, there is overwhelming support for this. Ninety percent of the American people support this country of origin labeling.

Let me suggest to my colleagues, let's do something really radical. Let's actually give the American people something that they want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, as well as the rule.

Mr. Speaker, we oftentimes hear the debate that the mandatory COOL label is about food safety and protecting our food supply. Let me be clear. Mandatory COOL labeling is not about food safety. No matter where our food comes from, regulations remain in place to ensure safety and traceability, regardless of origin. This debate is about the cost that a government-mandated marketing program is having on our economy.

The World Trade Organization has ruled against the United States four times in favor of Mexico and Canada, our largest trading partners. Over the next month, Canada and Mexico will begin seeking retaliatory damages against U.S. products from all over the country. In fact, Canada has already announced that it will seek more than $3 billion in retaliatory sanctions. These damages are real. They will affect farmers, manufacturers, and small-business owners in my State of Michigan and around the country.

Michigan's First District produces 70 percent of the tart cherries in the country. We export a lot of these cherries to Canada. Canada has placed cherries on the list for retaliatory sanctions.

We also produce other things in my district, like apples, pork, wine, maple syrup. Michigan is also famous for its auto and steel industry. Canada plans to target all of these things. These penalties are real. They will cost jobs, which is the last thing we can afford to lose right now.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), another fine member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the House floor. I will make my remarks short and simple.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL, has been a 13-year failed experiment in public policy. It provides little to no value for the consumer, raises costs for all producers, and has created a significant trade dispute with our number one and number two trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

It is an embarrassment to our country that we have lost four times in the WTO court and now are facing significant retaliation from our two closest trading partners. This is particularly concerning when you consider that my home State of Missouri alone could face up to $623 million in economic losses from retaliation.

America should be a leader in creating free and fair trade around the world by focusing on removing tariff and nontariff trade barriers, not creating our own.

Americans expect labels on their meat and other food products to clearly state the health and safety information. COOL goes beyond that, though, and has amounted to nothing more than a government-mandated marketing program that provides little to no value to producers and consumers. The only solution to this failed experiment in public policy is full repeal of the country of origin labeling law.

I support the underlying bill and encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2393.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentlewoman from Missouri that a lot of small- and medium-sized farmers strongly disagree with her. There are a lot of consumers who would like to support American farmers. Nine out of 10 Americans support country of origin labeling. Repealing this law would restrict their access to critical information about the food they feed their families, making it impossible to avoid food from countries with poor safety records.

□ 1330

The WTO has repeatedly ruled that using country of origin labels to inform consumers about the source of the food that they eat is a legitimate goal. More than 60 other countries have done this successfully without sanctions. So instead of throwing out COOL entirely, we should study the successful models and develop an alternative system that still maintains our constituents' access to the information that they demand.

The legislation that we are talking about here today goes beyond the scope of the WTO case and repeals labeling requirements for ground beef, ground pork, and chicken, ultimately putting the interests of industrial meat processors above the concerns of 90 percent of the American public.

Again, it shouldn't be a radical idea around here to try to do what the American people want. They want to know where their food is grown, where their food is produced. Let's give it to them. Let's try to work a compromise out here rather than just this knee-jerk bill that kind of throws the baby out with the bathwater.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, on the COOL repeal, I include for the RECORD a letter to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON signed by hundreds of organizations—farm organizations, consumer groups, labor groups, food safety groups, and I could go on and on and on—basically saying that this legislation that we are considering here today is a bad idea.

JUNE 8, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. COLLIN PETERSON,
Ranking Member, House Agriculture Committee, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY AND RANKING MEMBER PETERSON: The undersigned 283 farm, rural, faith, environmental, labor, farmworker, manufacturer and consumer organizations respectfully urge you to reject the repeal of the Country-of-Origin Labeling (COOL) law and support commonsense food labeling. Polls show that nine out of ten Americans support COOL. Consumers continue to demand more information about their food and producers want to share that information.

Although the World Trade Organization (WTO) Appellate Body has issued its decision on COOL, the United States has a sovereign right to allow the dispute process to proceed to its completion and then decide how and whether to implement the adverse ruling. Our organizations remain steadfast in their opposition to any efforts to undermine COOL through repeal or any other measures.

It is premature for the Congress to unilaterally surrender to saber-rattling from our trading partners in the midst of a longstanding dispute. COOL opponents have highlighted Mexico and Canada's threats of retaliation as if their aspiration to seek billions of dollars in penalties were already approved by the WTO. But these unapproved, unrealistically high retaliation claims are merely aggressive litigation tactics designed to frighten the United States—a standard practice in WTO disputes. Congress should not fall for it.

The WTO can only authorize penalties based on the extent to which COOL caused a reduction in the volume and price of livestock imports. But the economic recession was the driving factor behind declining livestock imports, not the application of a simple label.

Cattle imports are higher today than when COOL went into effect and hog imports are rapidly rebounding, even with COOL in place. This straightforward logic is buttressed by a recent economic report from Auburn University that demonstrates that COOL has not impacted the livestock trade and that any harm to our trading partners has in fact been negligible at most.

Moreover, retaliation is only relevant if the United States, Canada and Mexico cannot reach an agreement after the parties have undergone the full WTO arbitration process. In past WTO disputes that the United States has lost, the United States has waited for the process to conclude and then has successfully avoided WTO-authorized trade sanctions by negotiating a settlement with the other country in the dispute.

Finally, the proposed COOL repeal legislation is particularly extreme in that it would roll back commonsense labels that the WTO actually supported or that never even were raised in the WTO dispute. The legislation would repeal COOL for ground beef and ground pork as well as for chicken, but the WTO explicitly ruled that the COOL label on ground meat was WTO-legal, and the dispute never addressed chicken or other covered commodities (including seafood, fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables, goat, venison and some nuts).

COOL is extremely important to our organizations and to the American public. We oppose any legislation that would repeal any portion of the COOL law. We urge Congress to stand up for America's consumers, farmers and ranchers by rejecting any effort to unilaterally repeal a popular food label even before the WTO process has concluded. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

AFL–CIO; AFL–CIO of Nebraska; Alabama Contract Poultry Growers Association; Alabama State Association of Cooperatives; Alaska Farmers Union; Alianza Nacional de Campesinas; Alternative Energy Resources Organization (AERO) (MT); American Agriculture Movement; American Corn Growers Institute for Public Policy; American Federation of Government Employees (AFL–CIO), Local 3354, USDA-St. Louis; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 2748 (WI); American Grassfed Association; American Indian Mothers, Inc. (NC); American Raw Milk Producers Pricing Association; Angelic Organics Learning Center and Farm (IL); Arkansas Farmers Union; Ashtabula, Geauga, Lake County (OH) Farmers' Union; Berks (PA) Gas Truth; Berkshire Organics (MA); BioRegional Strategies;

Bold Nebraska; Boots on the Ground, LLC; Boston Food & Farm PBC (MA); Buckeye Quality Beef Association (OH); Buffalo Mountain Coop (VT); California Dairy Campaign; California Farmers Union; Campaign for Contract Agriculture Reform; Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment; Caney Fork Headwaters Association (TN); Carbon County Resource Council (MT); Carolina Farm Stewardship Association (NC); Catholic Charities of Central and Northern Missouri-Social Services Office/Diocese of Jefferson City; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Cattle Producers of Louisiana; Cattle Producers of Washington; Center for Earth Spirituality and Rural Ministry (MN); Center for Family Farm Development (GA); Center for Food Safety; Center for Foodborne Illness Research & Prevention;

Center for Media and Democracy's Food Rights Network; Center for Rural Affairs; Central Co-op (WA); Chicago Consumer Coalition; Church Women United in New York State; Citizen Action Coalition of Indiana; Citizens for Sanity.Com, Inc. (FL); City Market Onion River Co-op (VT); Cleanwater Action Council of Northeast Wisconsin; Coalition for a Prosperous America; Colorado Independent CattleGrowers Association; Communication Workers of America; Communication Workers of America Nebraska State Council; Community Alliance for Global Justice (WA); Community Farm Alliance (KY); Community Food and Justice Coalition (CA); Connecticut Families Against Chemical Trespass; Consumer Action; Consumer Assistance Council, Inc.; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Federation of California;

Consumers Union; Contract Poultry Growers Association of the Virginias; Cooperative Grocer Network; The Cornucopia Institute; Cornucopia Network NJ/TN Chapter; Cottonwood Resource Council (MT); Crawford Stewardship Project (WI); Cumberland Countians for Ecojustice (TN); Dakota Resource Council; Dakota Rural Action of SD; Dawson Resource Council (MT); Detroit Coalition Against Tar Sands; East New York Farms!/United Community Centers; EcoHermanas; Ecological Farming Association (CA); The Ecology Center (CA); The Ecology Party of Florida; Endangered Habitats League (CA); Equal Exchange; Fair World Project (OR);

Family Farm Defenders (WI); Farm Aid; Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance; Farmworker Association of Florida; Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund; Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Rural Training and Research Center (AL); Fiddleheads Natural Food Cooperative (CT); Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection; Food & Water Watch; Food Chain Workers Alliance; Food Democracy Now!; Food for Maine's Future; Friends of the Earth U.S.; Global Justice Ecology Project; GMO Free New Jersey; GMO Free Pennsylvania; GMO-Free Florida; Grand Forks County Citizens Coalition (ND); Grassroots International; Grow Youngstown (OH);

Hanover Consumer Cooperative Society, Inc. (NH); Hawaii Farmers Union United; Hmong National Development, Inc.; Hunger Action Los Angeles; Idaho Organization of Resource Councils; Illinois Farmers Union; Illinois Stewardship Alliance; Independent Beef Association of North Dakota (I-BAND); Independent Cattlemen of Nebraska; Independent Cattlemen of Wyoming; Independent Cattlemen's Association of Texas; Indian Nations Conservation Alliance; Indiana Farmers Union; Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Institute for Rural America (IA); Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Intertribal Agriculture Council; Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement; Iowa Farmers Union; Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (MD);

Kansas Cattlemen's Association; Kansas Farmers Union; Kansas National Farmers Organization; Kansas Rural Center; LabeIGMOS.org; Land Stewardship Project (MN); Leverett Village Coop (MA); Local Futures/International Society for Ecology and Culture; Long Beach Food Policy Council (CA); Lowcountry Local First (SC); MA Right to Know GMOs; Maine Fair Trade Campaign; Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA); The Manufacturers Association of Central New York; Massachusetts Consumers' Council, Inc.; Michael Fields Agricultural Institute (WI); Michigan Farmers Union; Michigan Food & Farming Systems; Michigan Organic Food and Farm Alliance; Middlebury Natural Foods Co-op (VT);

Midwest Organic Dairy Producers Association; Midwest Environmental Advocates, Inc. (WI); Milwaukee Fair Trade Coalition (WI); Minnesota Farmers Union; Minnesota National Farmers Organization; Mississippi Assoc. of Cooperatives; Missouri Farmers Union; Missouri National Farmers Organization; Missouri Rural Crisis Center; Missouri's Best Beef Cooperative; Monadnock Food Co-op (NH); Montana Farmers Union; Montana Women Involved in Farm Economics; Montgomery Countryside Alliance; Murray County (OK) Independent Cattlemen's Association;

National Center for Appropriate Technology; National Co-op Grocers; National Consumers League; National Family Farm Coalition; National Farmers Organization;

National Farmers Union; National Hmong American Farmers, Inc.; National Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade Association; National Organic Coalition; National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition; National Young Farmers Coalition; Nature Abounds; Near East Side Cooperative Market (OH); Nebraska Alliance for Retired Americans; Nebraska Easement Action Team; Nebraska Farmers Union; Nebraska League of Conservation Voters; Nebraska Sierra Club; Nebraska State Grange; Nebraska Sustainable Agriculture Society; Nebraska Wildlife Federation; Nebraska Women Involved in Farm Economics; Nebraskans for Peace; Neighboring Food Co-op Association (MA); Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ;

Nevada Live Stock Association; New England Farmers Union (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT); New York National Farmers Organization; New York Women Involved in Farm Economics; NH Right to Know GMO; North Carolina Consumers Council; North Dakota AFL–CIO; North Dakota Farmers Union; Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—MA; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NH; Northeast Organic Fanning Assoc.—NJ; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NY; Northern New Mexico Stockman's Association; Northern Plains Resource Council (MT); Northern Wisconsin Beef Producers Assoc.; Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance (MA); Northwest Farmers Union; Oglala Sioux Livestock and Land Owners Association (SD); Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association;

Ohio Environmental Council; Ohio Environmental Stewardship Alliance; Ohio Farmers Union; Oklahoma Black Historical Research Project; Operation Spring Plant, Inc. (NC); Oregon Rural Action; Oregon Rural Action Blue Mountain Chapter Food & Ag Policy Team; Oregonians for Safe Farms and Families; Organic Consumers Association; Organic Farmers' Agency for Relationship Marketing (OFARM); Organic Seed Alliance; Organic Seed Growers & Trade Association (OSGATA); Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Inc.; Organization for Competitive Markets; PCC Natural Markets (WA); Peach Bottom Concerned Citizens Group (PBCCG) (PA); Pennsylvania Farmers Union; Pennypack Farm and Education Center (PA); Pesticide Action Network North America;

Powder River Basin Resource Council (WY); Progressive Agriculture Organization (PA); Provender Alliance (OR); Public Citizen; R-CALF United Stockgrowers of America; Raritan Headwaters Association (NJ); Real Food Challenge (MA); Real Food for Kids—Montgomery (MD); Real Pickles Cooperative, Inc. (MA); Right to Know Minnesota; River Valley Market (MA); Rocky Mountain Farmers Union; Roots of Change (CA); Rosebud Protective Association (MT); Rural & Agricultural Council of America; Rural Advancement Foundation International—USA (RAFIUSA); Rural Coalition/Coalicion Rural; Rural Development Leadership Network (NY); Rural Vermont;

Rutland Area Food Co-op (VT); Sacramento Natural Foods Co-op (CA); Seacoast Eat Local (NH); Slow Food Nebraska; Slow Food USA; Small Planet Institute; Socially Responsible Agricultural Project; Society of Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace, IFPTE Local 2001 (WA, KS); South Agassiz Resource Council (ND); The South County Food Co-op (RI); South Dakota Farmers Union; South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association; South Dakota Stockgrowers Association; South Dakota Women Involved in Farm Economics; Southwest Nebraska Women Involved in Farm Economics; Springfield Food Co-op (VT); Stone Valley Coop & Café (VT); Texas Farmers Union; Tilth Producers of Washington;

Tooling, Manufacturing and Technologies Assoc. (MI); Toxics Information Project; U.S. Cattlemen's Association; U.S. Public Interest Research Group (USPIRG); United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries; United Steel Workers Local 1188 (ME); United Steel Workers Local 900 (ME); Vermont National Farmers Organization; Virginia Association for Biological Farming; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Walter's Signs (NJ); Waterkeeper Alliance; Western Colorado Congress; Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC); Western Sustainable Agriculture Working Group; Western Wisconsin AFL–CIO; Wild Oats Market (MA); Willimantic Food Coop (CT); Wisconsin Fair Trade Coalition; Wisconsin Farmers Union; Women Involved in Farm Economics; Women's Environmental Institute; World Farmers; Yellowstone Valley Citizens Council (MT).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I would just say to my colleagues on this legislation, the American people do not want a total repeal. Nine out of ten Americans support country of origin labeling. We ought to work out a good compromise so the American people can get what they want and have access to the knowledge about their food that they want. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule with regard to this and ''no'' on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a few words about the Defense Appropriations bill. And for the viewing public who are watching this and who are trying to figure out what does country of origin labeling have to do with a Defense Appropriations bill, I would again remind them that the Republican leadership and the Republicans on the Rules Committee have this new technique of bunching diverse pieces of legislation together under one rule to stifle debate and to make it more difficult for people to have their say on these important bills and to try to confuse things.

But I do think that it is important that people understand that the Defense Appropriations bill is given a role under this rule, and I would urge my colleagues to think long and hard before they vote. I would urge them to vote ''no'' on the Defense Appropriations bill for a whole number of reasons, notwithstanding the slush fund, the so-called OCO account, that is playing fast and loose with the numbers so that my Republican colleagues don't have to deal with the issue of sequestration. But I would also urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this, because this bill will appropriate billions of more dollars for a war in the Middle East that Congress hasn't had the guts to debate and vote on.

It has been 10 months—10 months—thousands of our troops have been deployed into harm's way. The President announced last night we are establishing a new base in Iraq. Close to 500 more American troops are going to be deployed in Iraq, and not a single debate in this Congress, not a single vote on whether this is the best strategy.

The President has submitted his AUMF. I think it is too broad; some people think it is too restrictive. But it is up to the Congress to fashion an AUMF that gets 218 votes or to vote to bring our troops home. That is the choice. But doing nothing is not a choice. That is an abrogation of our constitutional responsibilities.

Every single Member should be ashamed of the fact that 10 months into this war we haven't done a thing. How do you explain that to your constituents whose sons and daughters have been placed into harm's way? How do you explain that to your constituents that we are mostly borrowing $3.5 million an hour to pay for these wars, but we don't have the time to debate it or to vote on it?

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD two articles. The first one is an Associated Press article, entitled, ''U.S. to Send More Troops to Iraq for Expanded Training Mission''; and the other is a New York Times article, entitled, ''U.S. Embracing a New Approach on Battling ISIS in Iraq.''

[From the Associated Press, Jun. 10, 2015]

U.S. TO SEND MORE TROOPS TO IRAQ FOR EXPANDED TRAINING MISSION

(By Robert Burns and Lolita C. Baldor)

JERUSALEM.—An expected White House decision to send several hundred more troops to Iraq to expand training of Iraqi forces in Anbar province is not a shift in U.S. strategy but is aimed at helping Iraq retake the provincial capital, Ramadi, and eventually blunt the Islamic State's battlefield momentum.

The decision, which could be announced as soon as Wednesday, would increase the number of U.S. training sites in Iraq from four to five and enable a larger number of Iraqis—mostly Sunni tribal volunteers, in this case—to join the fight against the Islamic militant group. It is consistent with the overall U.S. approach of building up Iraqi forces while simultaneously conducting aerial bombing of Islamic State targets.

U.S. officials have said repeatedly that getting the Sunnis more deeply involved in the war is critical to ousting IS from Anbar.

It leaves open, however, the larger question of whether the Shiite-led Iraqi government will make the troop commitments necessary to oust the Islamic State from Ramadi, which the militants captured last month, and Fallujah, which they have held for more than a year. Up to now, Iraqi officials have chosen to deploy most U.S.-trained Iraqi troops in defensive formations around Baghdad, the capital.

President Barack Obama has ruled out sending U.S. ground combat forces to Iraq.

There now are slightly fewer than 3,100 U.S. troops there in training, advising, security and other support roles. The U.S. also is flying bombing missions as well as aerial reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering missions to degrade the Islamic State's forces, while counting on Iraqi ground troops to retake lost territory.

A U.S. official said Wednesday that the extra U.S. training site will be at al-Taqqadum, a desert air base that was a U.S. military hub during the 2003–2011 war. Establishing the training camp will require between 400 and 500 U.S. troops, including trainers, logisticians and security personnel, the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity because a final administration decision had not been announced.

The U.S. already is training Iraqi troops at four sites—two in the vicinity of Baghdad, one at al-Asad air base in Anbar province and one near Irbil in northern Iraq.

The addition of one training site is a modest tweak to the existing U.S. approach in Iraq. It was unclear Wednesday how many more Iraqi troops could be added to the fight against IS in coming months by opening one new training base. One official said the training at al-Taqqadum is likely to being this summer.

Over the past year the U.S. has trained approximately 9,000 Iraqi troops.

The new plan is not likely to include the deployment of U.S. forces closer to the front lines to either call in airstrikes or advise smaller Iraqi units in battle, officials said. One official, however, said the adjustment may include a plan for expediting the delivery of arms and military equipment to some elements of the Iraqi military.

On Tuesday, Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in Jerusalem that he has recommended changes to President Barack Obama but he offered no assessment of when decisions would be made and announced. He suggested the president was considering a number of questions, including what adjustments to U.S. military activities in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world might be needed if the U.S. does more in Iraq.

Dempsey said the Pentagon also is reviewing ways to improve the effectiveness of its air campaign, which is a central pillar of Obama's strategy for enabling Iraqi ground forces to recapture territory held by the Islamic State.

Obama said Monday that the United States still lacks a ''complete strategy'' for training Iraqi forces. He also urged Iraq's Shiite-dominated government to allow more of the nation's Sunnis to join the campaign against the violent militant group.

Dempsey said Obama recently asked his national security team to examine the train-and-equip program and determine ways to make it more effective. Critics have questioned the U.S. approach, and even Defense Secretary Ash Carter has raised doubts by saying the collapse of Iraqi forces in Ramadi last month suggested the Iraqis lack a ''will to fight.''

The viability of the U.S. strategy is hotly debated in Washington, with some calling for U.S. ground combat troops or at least the embedding of U.S. air controllers with Iraqi ground forces to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of U.S. and coalition airstrikes. Dempsey was not specifically asked about that but gave no indication that Obama has dropped his resistance to putting U.S. troops into combat in Iraq.

''What he's asked us to do is to take a look back at what we've learned over the last eight months of the train-and-equip program, and make recommendations to him on whether there are capabilities that we may want to provide to the Iraqis to actually make them more capable . . . whether there are other locations where we might establish training sites,'' and look for ways to develop Iraqi military leaders, he said.

Dempsey said there will be no radical change to the U.S. approach in Iraq. Rather, it is a recognition that the effort has either been too slow or has allowed setbacks where ''certain units have not stood and fought.'' He did not mention the Ramadi rout specifically, but Dempsey previously has said the Iraqis drove out of the city on their own.

''Are there ways to give them more confidence?'' This, he said, is among the questions Obama wanted Dempsey and others to answer.

[From the New York Times, June 10, 2015]

U.S. EMBRACING A NEW APPROACH ON BATTLING ISIS IN IRAQ

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON.—In a major shift of focus in the battle against the Islamic State, the Obama administration is planning to establish a new military base in Anbar Province, Iraq, and to send up to 450 more American military trainers to help Iraqi forces retake the city of Ramadi.

The White House on Wednesday is expected to announce a plan that follows months of behind-the-scenes debate about how prominently plans to retake Mosul, another Iraqi city that fell to the Islamic State last year, should figure in the early phase of the military campaign against the group.

The fall of Ramadi last month effectively settled the administration debate, at least for the time being. American officials said Ramadi was now expected to become the focus of a lengthy campaign to regain Mosul at a later stage, possibly not until 2016.

The additional American troops will arrive as early as this summer, a United States official said, and will focus on training Sunni fighters with the Iraqi Army. The official called the coming announcement ''an adjustment to try to get the right training to the right folks.''

The troops will set up the training center primarily to advise and assist Iraqi security forces and to engage and reach out to Sunni tribes in Anbar, a senior United States official said. The focus for the Americans will be to try to accelerate the integration of Sunni fighters into the Iraqi Army, which is dominated by Shiites. That will be an uphill task as many of the Sunni fighters in the area do not trust the Iraqi Army.

But the Obama administration hopes is that the outreach will reduce the Iraqi military's reliance on Shiite militias to take back territory from the Islamic State. ''The Sunnis want to be part of the fight,'' the official said, speaking on the condition of anonymity. ''This will help empower them, creating more recruits and more units to fight ISIL,'' he added, using another acronym for the Islamic State.

He said the arms and equipment sent will go to the Iraqi government forces in Anbar, not directly to the Sunni tribes, adding that the new strategy was not a change in policy to directly arm Sunnis, but rather a faster way to get equipment and arms to the battlefield, which the Iraqi government had requested.

The United States Central Command's emphasis on retaking Mosul depended critically on efforts to retrain the Iraqi Army, which appear to have gotten off to a slow start. Some Iraqi officials also thought the schedule for taking Mosul was unrealistic, and some bridled when an official from the Central Command told reporters in February that an assault to capture the city was planned for this spring.

Now, pending approval by the White House, plans are being made to use Al Taqqadum, an Iraqi base near the town of Habbaniya, as another training hub for the American-led coalition.

Alistair Baskey, a National Security Council spokesman, said that the administration hoped to accelerate the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, and that ''those options include sending additional trainers.'' The United States now has about 3,000 troops, including trainers and advisers, in Iraq. But the steps envisioned by the White House are likely to be called half-measures by critics because they do not call for an expansion of the role of American troops, such as the use of spotters to call in airstrikes.

There has long been debate within the administration about what the first steps in the campaign should be. Led by Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III, the Central Command has long emphasized the need to strike a blow against the Islamic State by recapturing Mosul, Iraq's second-largest city, which was taken by the group in June 2014. Mosul is the capital of Nineveh Province in northern Iraq and was the site of a sermon that Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of the Islamic State, defiantly delivered in July. The Baiji refinery, a major oil complex, is on a main road to Mosul.

While General Austin was looking north, State Department officials have highlighted the strategic importance of Anbar Province in western Iraq.

Anbar is home to many of Iraq's Sunni tribes, whose support American officials hope to enlist in the struggle against the Islamic State. Ramadi, the provincial capital of Anbar, is less than 70 miles from Baghdad, and the province borders Saudi Arabia and Jordan, two important members of the coalition against the Islamic State. The differing perspectives within the administration came to the fore in April when Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asserted that Ramadi was not central to the future of Iraq. The Islamic State's capture of Ramadi last month also punctured the administration's description that the group was on the defensive.

Iraqis are ISIS, are Sunni, are Shia. But we'll train whomever shows up and give them weapons and air support. At what point does U.S . . . .

Suddenly, it appeared that the Islamic State, not the American-led coalition, was on the march. Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi of Iraq scrambled to assemble a plan to regain the city.

The Islamic State now controls two provincial capitals, as well as the city of Falluja. With the help of American air power, the Iraqis have retaken Tikrit, northwest of Baghdad, but so many buildings there are still rigged with explosives that many of its residents have been unable to return.

To assemble a force to retake Ramadi, the number of Iraqi tribal fighters in Anbar who are trained and equipped is expected to increase to as many as 10,000 from about 5,500.

More than 3,000 new Iraqi soldiers are to be recruited to fill the ranks of the Seventh Iraqi Army division in Anbar and the Eighth Iraqi Army division, which is in Habbaniya, where the Iraqi military operations center for the province is also based.

But to the frustration of critics like Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, who say that the United States is losing the initiative to the Islamic State, the Obama administration has yet to approve the use of American spotters on the battlefield to call in airstrikes in and around Ramadi. Nor has it approved the use of Apache helicopter gunships to help Iraqi troops retake the city.

General Dempsey alluded to the plan to expand the military footprint in Iraq during a visit to Israel on Tuesday, saying that he

had asked war commanders to look into expanding the number of training sites for Iraqi forces. The United States is not the only country that is expanding its effort.

Britain's prime minister, David Cameron, said this week that his country would send up to 125 additional troops to train Iraqi forces, including in how to clear improvised bombs.

Italy is also expected to play an important role in training the Iraqi police.

Helene Cooper contributed reporting from Jerusalem.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House, this Congress, is not working. The fact that we can be in the middle of a new war, spending all these resources, committing all these young lives into harm's way, and we can't even bring an AUMF to the floor to have a debate, it is appalling. I don't know how we can face our constituents, look them in the eye, and say we are doing our job here. We are not. I don't know anything more important that we should debate and deliberate on than war. I mean, war is a big deal. The unfortunate thing in this institution, war has become too easy. I am tired of the excuses, and I am tired of the whining. The President has done what he is supposed to do. Everybody has done what they are supposed to do except us. I am not going to vote for any bill that appropriates more money for a war that we don't even have the guts to authorize.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this grab bag rule, vote ''no'' on this ridiculous COOL repeal, and vote ''no'' on the defense appropriations bill. Let's vote these down and come back and do our job the way the American people expect us to do our job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and let me say thank you to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the points he raises. I enjoy serving on the Rules Committee with Mr. MCGOVERN.

Let me just say, this Congress, we are on track to be one of the most productive Congresses in many, many years, and part of the reason is the use of the compound rule, which provides for separate consideration of each underlying measure under a single rule. It helps expedite legislative business. Consideration of one rule allows the House more time to debate the underlying measures. It has given us the opportunity to achieve that efficiency and that effectiveness and productivity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield for a 10-second question?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a 10-second question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How does this rule give us more time to debate the COOL repeal? It is a pretty straightforward, limited debate that we are given. I would argue that what you are doing is denying us the right to debate appropriately these important issues. We are not saving time. What the Republican majority is doing is limiting our opportunity.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Reclaiming my time after that 10-second question, the Agriculture Committee has had ample time for debate on that question. We are bringing forward what is a very critical decision that has to be made in a very limited timeframe, and so it is an appropriate approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the issues we are considering today have serious consequences for the security and economic well-being of our country, which is why I am urging my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills.

H.R. 2685 is an important measure that funds our Nation's national defense and its critical national security programs. It provides the resources needed to continue our essential military efforts abroad and addresses the vital needs of our men and women in uniform.

An effective, well-equipped, well-trained military is in the best interest of all Americans and is indispensable to the common defense of our country. This bill includes vital funding for the U.S. military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to these challenges abroad. This bill also makes difficult budgetary choices that will help us save taxpayer dollars wherever possible, but it does so without undermining the safety, the security, and the success of our troops and their families.

With the rise of ISIS, the continued presence of al Qaeda, the emergence and growth of terrorist groups in North Africa, near systemic instability across the Middle East, and the ongoing situation in Ukraine, our military must remain strong and ready to address evolving threats both at home and abroad.

Our highest national priority should always be the protection of our country, and the funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world. To me the choice is clear. What side are we on? We choose to be on the side of our troops, and I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

This rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act, a measure that warrants immediate and serious consideration by both Houses of Congress, because the ramifications of doing nothing will be severe and could imperil many sectors of our country, from ranchers and grape growers to manufacturers and exporters.

With only 37 days left to respond, the threat of retaliation is very real. My friends on the other side of the aisle may argue that we have more time to address this issue, but the reality is time is simply running out. For over 7 years, we have been trying to rectify this issue. WTO's latest verdict, handed down on May 18, is our fourth and final loss in the court proceedings. Now both Canada and Mexico have publicly stated they will retaliate against the United States, and the official request for retaliation is set to occur on June 17. This is not an idle threat. It is not saber rattling. Last week, Canada announced that it will seek $3 billion in retaliatory measures, and Mexico stated it will be seeking tariffs totaling $635 million.

Even before retaliation, COOL has had a negative economic impact in many areas across the country. Tyson Foods has a plant in my district, and given the proximity to Canada, this plant in Pasco depends on Canadian cattle. However, under COOL, the plant cannot commingle U.S. and Canadian cattle. They have to be run in separate lines, and the plant has to use multiple labels depending on the origin of those cattle. COOL has increased the Pasco facility's operating costs due to the requirements and inefficiencies involved with the segregation of the cattle; and with less animals available across the Pacific Northwest, the plant is currently operating at less than 40 hours per week, leading to less money being put into the local economy from less compensation from employers.

Mr. Speaker, COOL threatens the trade relationships we have with two of our biggest markets for the export of U.S. meat and agricultural products. If we don't repeal the requirements of COOL, we are in violation of our WTO obligations. As I said, we could face billions of dollars in retaliation that would hurt farmers and ranchers, small businesses, and, yes, American consumers. We need this legislation now in order to prevent those retaliatory actions and to bring the United States into compliance with our WTO obligations, which can only be done by repealing these provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last hour. Although we may have some differences of opinion—we usually do—I believe this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to the future of our country. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 303 and the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise against yet another closed rule on an issue that deserves weeks of open, transparent debate: trade.

This House is debating whether or not to repeal a consumer protection measure that 9 in 10 Americans support—country of origin labeling on meat in our grocery stores. This essential provision could be reversed in one fell swoop all because the World Trade Organization has decided that those labels hurt Mexico and Canada, our so-called ''Trading Partners,'' who have threatened the United States with billions of dollars in sanctions if we don't capitulate.

The WTO's ruling highlights yet another example of a trading system that benefits foreign competitors and global corporations at the expense of the American consumer.

I hope my colleagues will remember this vote when the House turns its attention to fast track and the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade agreement.

Advocates of fast track are selling the American people a flawed trade deal which has been negotiated in secret by multi-national corporations. This trade deal, which proponents will tell you will reinvigorate the middle class, create jobs, and strengthen the American economy, will do just the opposite. What's more, the president wants to circumvent congressional authority by stopping debate and using fast track to ram a bad deal through this chamber.

Not only will fast track and the Trans-Pacific Partnership cause serious harm to the American worker, they threaten American sovereignty, and this repeal bill is a prime example of that.

Not only does this silence the voice of the American people, it cuts out the People's House and would topple even more consumer protections.

From changing fuel efficiency standards, limiting access to prescription drugs, weakening the Clean Air Act, and more, the TPP is not simply about trade, it puts every facet of our daily lives at risk.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their path forward and work for the American people, not against them.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 303 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 295 and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 187, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
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
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
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 (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
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

NAYS—187

Aguilar
Ashford
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)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Adams
Flores

□ 1411

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from yea to nay.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 6, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—421

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—6

Harris
Nugent
Palazzo
Perry
Rooney (FL)
Ross

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Jolly

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Byrne
Flores
Messer
Webster (FL)

□ 1421

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 331 I was unable to register my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 168, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

YEAS—256

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palmer
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—168

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Foxx
Fudge
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn

Maloney, Sean	Perry	Sewell (AL)
Marchant	Peters	Shuster
Matsui	Peterson	Sinema
McDermott	Pittenger	Slaughter
McGovern	Poe (TX)	Smith (MO)
McKinley	Poliquin	Stivers
McSally	Price, Tom	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Ratcliffe	Thompson (MS)
Messer	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Miller (FL)	Renacci	Tiberi
Moore	Rice (NY)	Tipton
Mulvaney	Richmond	Turner
Murphy (FL)	Rigell	Valadao
Murphy (PA)	Rohrabacher	Vargas
Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Veasey
Noem	Rouzer	Velázquez
Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Walberg
Nugent	Sánchez, Linda T.	Watson Coleman
Palazzo	Sarbanes	Weber (TX)
Pallone	Schakowsky	Woodall
Paulsen	Schiff	Yoder
Payne	Schrader	Yoho
Pearce		Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert	Tonko

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Pitts	Sires
Flores	Quigley	
Grijalva	Reichert	

□ 1433

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 10, 2015 at 11:14 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 653.

That the Senate passed S. 611.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

AUTHORIZING THE REPRINTING OF THE 25TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 54, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution shall be reprinted as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 285,400 copies of the document, of which 235,400 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 50,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of $135,312, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

(c) DISTRIBUTION.—The copies of the document reprinted for the use of the House and the Senate under subsection (a) shall be distributed in accordance with—

(1) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the House; and

(2) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 292, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 292

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 303, I call up the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2393

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING REQUIREMENTS FOR BEEF, PORK, AND CHICKEN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 281 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (7);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (1)(A) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

''(i) muscle cuts of lamb and venison;'';

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

''(ii) ground lamb and ground venison;'';

(C) by striking clause (viii); and

(D) by redesignating clauses (ix), (x), and (xi) as clauses (viii), (ix), and (x), respectively.

(b) NOTICE OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN.—Section 282 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BEEF, LAMB, PORK, CHICKEN,'' and inserting ''LAMB,'';

(B) by striking ''beef, lamb, pork, chicken,'' and inserting ''lamb,'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D); and

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''GROUND BEEF, PORK, LAMB, CHICKEN,'' and inserting ''GROUND LAMB,''; and

(ii) by striking ''ground beef, ground pork, ground lamb, ground chicken,'' each place it appears and inserting ''ground lamb,''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 2393.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

Mandatory country of origin labeling is really a marketing program, a heavy-handed approach by this Federal Government to demand a marketing program that may or may not work.

Those were my words before this very Chamber, spoken more than 10 years ago today. It turns out that my doubts were well founded. The program has not worked, and it is time to put this failed experiment behind us once and for all.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL for short, was first enacted for meat products as a part of the 2002 farm bill. Implementation of the law was actually delayed until 2008.

Less than 5 months after the COOL-implementing rule was published, Canada and Mexico challenged the rule at the WTO, arguing that it had a trade-distorting impact by reducing the value and number of cattle and hogs shipped to the United States market.

The WTO process has since progressed through the dispute settlement phase, a U.S. appeal to the WTO'S appellate body, review by a WTO compliance panel, and an appeal by the U.S. of that decision. In all four instances, Mr. Speaker, the United States lost.

In the fourth and final decision, released on May 18, the WTO rejected the United States' argument and found that the U.S. COOL requirements for beef and pork are unavoidably discriminatory. The final rule kick-starts the process to determine the level of retaliatory tariffs Canada and Mexico can now impose on the U.S., which has widely been predicted to have effects in the billions of dollars.

During a hearing of the House Agriculture Committee's Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee to examine the implications of potential retaliation against the U.S., witnesses made it clear that losing the final appeal to the WTO and the inevitable impacts of retaliation against the United States and its economy would be devastating.

Some have asked why we should act on the basis of a WTO decision. If COOL worked, perhaps there would be a response other than repeal, but the fact is COOL has been a marketing failure. In an April 2015 report to Congress, USDA explained that COOL requirements result in extraordinary costs with no quantifiable benefits.

Although some consumers desire COOL information, there is no evidence to conclude that this mandatory labeling translates into measurable increases in consumer demand for beef, pork, or chicken.

In response to those who argue that COOL enhances food safety, as I have maintained now for 10 years, that is simply not the case. If it were, then all meat served at restaurants would come with information regarding the meat's origin, but it doesn't. That is because retail food establishments are exempt from COOL requirements.

Meat sold in the U.S. will continue to be inspected for safety by the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service. This bill does nothing to change that and will simply repeal a heavy-handed, government-mandated marketing program that has proven to be unsuccessful.

Here we are with a policy that imposes high costs, no benefits, and if we keep it in place, our national economy will suffer significant damage that can reach into the billions of dollars.

Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack has been quoted numerous times acknowledging that repeal of the COOL requirements is a viable option for bringing the U.S. into compliance with its WTO obligations and avoiding retaliatory measures.

In a recent letter to Congress, Secretary Vilsack reaffirmed the need for Congress to repeal the disputed COOL requirements or develop a generic North American label. However, Canada and Mexico have previously rejected the North American label, rendering that option unacceptable.

In other words, if we go down this path which Canada and Mexico have already rejected, we will continue to face retaliation unless and until we can demonstrate we are in compliance with our trade obligations. Repeal is the only viable option before us to avoid this retaliation.

I urge all Members to support this simple, straightforward legislation so that we can, in the best bipartisan tradition of this House, avoid damage to our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this bill. H.R. 2393 is a premature reaction to the WTO ruling against the U.S. country of origin labeling, or COOL, law. Rather than taking the time to find a workable solution, the committee passed a repeal just 2 days after the WTO issued a ruling. We understand that this needs to be dealt with.

My problem with this whole process is that it just is not giving people enough time to look at this and figure out what is a reasonable solution. Most other countries have labeling. The American people want to know where their ag products come from.

If we repealed this on meat, we wouldn't be able to know where meat comes from, but we would be able to know where your carrots, lettuce, and all these other things come from. They all have mandatory country of origin labeling.

We understand that this needed to be worked on, and we understand that we can't get into a situation with the retaliation, but this is a rush to judgment that is not necessary because this retaliation process is going to take a while.

We had the Step 2 cotton case. It went 2 or 3 years before it got resolved; this is going to go faster, but the first thing that has to happen is they have to figure out what the damage is. That is going to take them a while, a month or two, and then they are going to have to have an arbitration panel to get everybody to agree that that is exactly what it is.

□ 1445

So this Canadian claim that there are $3 billion in economic losses due to COOL is ridiculous and is based on unsubstantiated and not publicly available data. The U.S. studies, using USDA data, have found little, if any, economic harm.

As I said, more than 60 other countries, including Canada, have their own version of COOL. In fact, Canada has a host of protectionist agriculture laws in place that damage the U.S. dairy, poultry, and egg sectors.

The Canadian system puts U.S. products at a disadvantage every day. And yet, the Canadians take issue when we try to give consumers additional information on where their meat comes from, claiming it disadvantages Canadian producers.

Additionally, consumers are demanding more and more information about where their food comes from and how it is produced. The WTO has repeatedly ruled that COOL is a legitimate goal.

Rather than abandon our efforts to provide consumers with this information, we need to have the time so we will be able to find a reasonable solution to work this out without WTO sanctions. I believe it can be done, and it can be done in fairly short order.

So, as I said, my biggest problem is that this bill is premature. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, for his leadership on yet another important issue for agriculture this week in the Congress.

I rise in strong support of the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which would repeal mandatory country of origin labeling for meat and bring the United States back into international trade compliance.

I have always had concerns about mandatory country of origin labeling, and now the WTO's continued rulings against this practice, as well as Canada's and Mexico's threats to seek $3

billion in retaliatory tariffs, make the hard and fast case for repeal.

For my home State of Virginia, it is estimated the potential economic impact of retaliation from Mexico and Canada could add up to tariffs of $331 million worth of exports on products like paper, aluminum, and bread.

Mandatory COOL has failed and threatens our trade relationship with two of our strongest partners. Our markets, producers, and consumers cannot afford the cost of this failed policy. We will all benefit by its repeal.

Mandatory COOL for meat has been debated for almost 15 years. Within 5 months of its 2009 implementation, Canada and Mexico challenged COOL at the WTO, arguing that it had trade-distorting impact by reducing the value of cattle and hogs shipped to the U.S. market. The WTO ruled in favor of Canada and Mexico four times.

Now that the U.S. has lost its final appeal, it is imperative that the Congress act quickly to avoid billions of dollars in retaliation.

In the case of cattle, hogs, and chicken, it has proved to be a failed experiment, imposing significant costs on producers, packers, and consumers with no quantifiable benefit.

United States Department of Agriculture Secretary Vilsack has stated the Department has no further options for administrative remedies. The issue has to be fixed legislatively through Congress, and this way of repeal is, by far, the best.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to repeal the country of origin labeling.

I want to thank the chairman for bringing this measure up. I also want to thank the ranking member always for his efforts to be balanced and to try to solve problems.

But I have been saying—and he and I disagree on this measure—for years that this country of origin labeling has simply not worked. So I am pleased that we are here today to debate the legislation that, in fact, repeals the country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken products. Hopefully we can move on to figure out a solution to this problem.

That said, let's be clear: I want to emphasize, this measure has nothing to do with food safety. Let me repeat. It has nothing to do with food safety. The inspection process by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration remains in place for all consumable products that the American public eats.

So what this has to do with is simply about how we market beef, pork, or chicken across the country.

Going further, to ensure that we act on this measure, we do not want to have to deal with a devastating blow to our economy through economic retaliation.

Last month, as has been noted by my colleagues, the World Trade Organization rejected the United States appeal. This was our last and final appeal. And for many of us, we felt it was predictable.

We now face harsh trade retaliations from two of our largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, against products that are produced in America. This especially impacts California, the number one agricultural State in the Nation. The Canadian Government has already published its list of commodities that will be subject to tariff increases and estimates the impact could reach in excess of $3 million, with the direct effect in California being over $1 billion.

This is real. They prepared the list, and it could be implemented as early as this fall.

For example, Canada imports 90 percent of its table wine from my home State of California. If the tariff is increased to 100 percent, that will mean customers in Canada will have to pay double for a bottle of good California wine. If consumers in Canada see that price double, I suspect they are going to buy their wine elsewhere.

This will be detrimental to U.S. trade, as an example, but to all products that are produced in America.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COSTA. The bottom line is, we don't want to see any retaliatory efforts made by Canada and Mexico, and I don't think they want to impose them.

This bill is our only option right now to satisfy the WTO compliance. In addition, as has been noted, the Secretary of Agriculture has stated a legislative fix is required to resolve this problem.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure, and let's take action. And the Senate will need to then act, and then we have a chance to come together and fix this legislation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I also rise in support of H.R. 2393, which, as has been mentioned, provides a long-overdue repeal of the country of origin labeling requirements for beef, pork, and poultry products.

Over the years, this law has forced USDA to use limited resources to implement and enforce a program that has nothing to do with food safety, and there is little to no evidence that it has increased consumer demand, according to a USDA-commissioned survey.

Serving as chairman of the House Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, I am very aware of the economic harm that this burdensome law has already caused U.S. livestock producers, and more economic harm is on the horizon.

The World Trade Organization, the WTO Appellate Body, has ruled in favor of Canada and Mexico and found the U.S. country of origin labeling requirements are in violation of international trade obligations.

Both the Governments of Canada and of Mexico have clearly expressed their intent to seek authority from the WTO to retaliate. This could end up suffering economic impact in this country of almost $4 billion.

The FY 2015 exploratory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriation bill directed the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a report with his recommendation for establishing a trade-compliant country of origin labeling program. In his response, repeal of this provision was a clear solution.

I know that there are some here in the Chamber this afternoon that will not agree with the answer, but there have been ample opportunities to craft another labeling program that meets our trade responsibilities.

This could have been addressed in the farm bill, or those individuals wanting a labeling program could have been working on it since last October, when the WTO ruled again that this law violated our trade obligations.

We are out of time, and the repeal is the only option that we have at hand. I urge my colleagues to support the bill that is before us today in order to prevent harm to U.S. jobs, to prevent harm to the United States economy, and to protect the trading relations with our Nation's strongest partners.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time and for taking up this important issue and helping us to better understand the importance of it.

In my opinion, we shouldn't even be here today debating a repeal of this important consumer protection law. I don't know if this bill is a huge overreaction to the WTO decision or it is just an excuse to gut these commonsense country of origin labeling requirements.

For years, we have required labels on virtually everything imported into the United States. Every piece of clothing you wear has to have a label showing where it was made. Your smartphone has to have a label showing where it was manufactured. Even umbrellas and tablecloths have to list their country of origin.

But for some reason we are here considering a bill that would make it impossible for parents to know whether the chicken they are serving their family came from the United States or China. Think about that. What consumer, what parent would tell you they don't care what country the food came from that they are about to serve their children?

Let's just talk about the WTO ruling for a minute. First of all, the World Trade Organization ruling said that the

labels for ground beef were acceptable but doesn't even consider any complaints from Canada or Mexico about chicken. So why are we voting on a repeal of the labeling requirement for those products?

Secondly, the WTO has not even ruled about the extent to which country of origin labeling affects exports from Canada and Mexico. And it can't be much, since Mexico exports more beef into the United States than before this law went into effect.

We do not have to give in to the WTO this easily. These kinds of disputes are frequently settled by negotiations with Canada and Mexico, not by giving up and throwing out an entire set of consumer protections.

We don't back down this easily, and we shouldn't back down this easily.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. PINGREE. So maybe the powerful special interests behind this repeal are really using this WTO ruling as an excuse to roll back basic right-to-know for American consumers. I don't think we should let them get away with it.

I doubt there is a single consumer in America who says, ''I want to know less about the food I am eating.'' In fact, the opposite is true.

Now more than ever, Americans want to know where their food comes from, and they want to buy local food when they can. Buying local has created huge new markets for American farmers, great economic growth in States like mine, like Maine.

If this bill passes, it will be harder to know if the pork chop or hamburger you are buying came from around the corner or around the world.

Country of origin labeling is good for consumers; it is good for our farmers and ranchers. Please don't gut these commonsense requirements.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify. We do not import chicken from China, period. And the economic impact estimated for the State of Maine will be something on the order of $74 million every single year in imports that won't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee, I rise in support of this bill, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which repeals the country of origin labeling law, also known as COOL.

After numerous failed attempts to make COOL compliant with the World Trade Organization, it has become apparent that full repeal of COOL is unquestionably the right thing to do.

That said, I am sure there are some who are concerned that repeal of COOL may compromise food safety. America had the safest, most trusted food supply in the world before COOL and, let me assure you, we will continue to have the safest food supply after this law is repealed.

□ 1500

Let me explain why. Regardless of origin, if an animal is imported as a live animal, it is harvested in USDA-inspected facilities. Additionally, cattle, hogs, and poultry are inspected prior to harvesting as live animals and throughout processing as a meat product.

If the animal originates and is harvested in a different country, the plant has to have equivalent U.S. safety inspection standards and must be regularly audited by the USDA. The U.S. only imports meat products from countries that meet our standards. Furthermore, a foreign plant that does not fully comply with our standards is not permitted to ship meat into this country.

In short, the fundamental protocols ensuring food safety are apart and separate from country of origin labeling. Suppliers in foreign countries will still be expected to comply with the same inspection standards as they have now.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY, subcommittee Ranking Member COSTA, and the committee staff for their tremendous help and guidance on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues and appreciate their support.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and the former co-chair of the Congressional Chicken Caucus, I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

More importantly, as a Congressman for a heavily rural district, with lots of poultry and beef production in middle and southwest Georgia, I rise to support ending this failed experiment and repealing this harmful government mandate.

Since its passage in 2002, the country of origin labeling law has caused severe tension between the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Canada and Mexico argue that country of origin labeling has hurt their livestock industries, and they have taken their argument to the World Trade Organization, which has ruled in their favor and against the United States four times. We are now out of appeals.

Because of the WTO rulings, Canada and Mexico can now request authorization to retaliate against the United States in order to repair the damages they claim our labeling law has caused to their economies.

Therefore, we must act decisively to repeal the current COOL regulations on beef, pork, and chicken. If we fail to do so, Canada and Mexico have made clear that they will retaliate against a range of U.S. products within a matter of months by imposing onerous tariffs, resulting in higher costs and lost market share for U.S. producers up to $3.5 billion a year. A hit of that magnitude would be devastating to the U.S. pork, beef, and chicken industries.

While some say we need to hold out for arbitration, I believe we need to repeal this harmful law and correct the situation ourselves before facing overwhelming retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico.

By the way, it should be noted that this bill will not entirely undo the country of origin labeling law, only parts of it.

I urge support for H.R. 2393 because it will safely remove unnecessary burdens on our beef, pork, and poultry industries; bring us into compliance with our trade obligations; and ensure that we avoid damaging retaliatory tariffs.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 2393.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member on the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's make no mistake about it. I will just tell you this retaliation situation is real from Canada and from Mexico.

The question is: Why should we here put our agriculture foundation at such a tremendous risk? Canada and Mexico are right now moving to institute retaliatory tariffs against U.S. exports.

It is critical that Congress also take this corrective legislation and act on it right away before the August recess—it is just that important—so we can send a powerful, quick message because Canada has already issued a preliminary retaliation list, targeting our commodities and our manufactured products not just in one State, not just in two States, but in every State in the United States of America, totaling over $3.5 billion in the first year alone. My own State of Georgia will have an impact of losing $180 million.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with this right. This country of origin labeling is not about food safety. Let's not scare the American people into thinking that; we don't need to make the American people confused or feel that we are doing something to make the food unsafe.

What we are doing is protecting our American economy. We are protecting our agricultural interests. More than anything else, at a time when America needs it the most, we are standing up for America for a change. Protect our farmers. Protect our agricultural economy. Protect our people.

Make sure we pass H.R. 2393. Send a powerful message that we are not going to stand for Mexico and Canada putting their tariffs on us. We are going to stand firm and protect American interests.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for yielding and for all of his work on this issue. He has been great at trying to mitigate the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of the idea of country of origin labeling, and I think it is a good idea.

I refute what some have said, that there is no benefit to this. There is great benefit to this. Area of origin labeling allows people to get to know from where their food comes, and that is, I think, incredibly important.

I don't think that repeal is the number one preference here. I don't think that is what we should be doing; we should be fixing the problem, but, because the majority hasn't been willing to work to fix the problem, we are in a real catch-22.

I rise today in support of this bill because, if it is not repealed, we are going to face tremendous retaliatory acts from both Mexico and Canada, and these are going to be of great fiscal impact to our economy.

My home State of California, for instance, it is estimated that we will be hit by $1.8 billion worth of retaliatory action. A good part of that comes from my home industry, the wine community; they will be hit heavily. We know what happens. We have seen this movie before, and the end is not good.

When Congress put in place the trucking program to deal with the Mexican trucking problems, we were sued. The wine industry was hit with retaliatory actions, and we saw a 25 percent reduction in our business. That was financially devastating not only to California, but this is an industry that puts $160 billion a year into the national economy. This hurt us all. That was bad enough, but it took us 3 years to get back that market share that we had lost.

It is important that we repeal this and then get on to fixing it right away. I ask that we vote in favor of this bill today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who has worked really hard on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding and for leading on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just would remark that wine has informed the meat debate several times here today, and I am glad of that.

I rise in support of this legislation to repeal these components of country of origin labeling. I have long held the position that this is a North American market. We don't treat our best trading partners as well as we should, Mr. Speaker, and that includes Mexico, and it especially includes Canada.

I often have to go through the list of things we have done that turn out to be something that looks like trade protection at least to them. We have done it with steel. We have done it with softwood timber. We have done it when we have BSE circumstances with beef, which did originate in Canada, spilled over to the United States, and they opened up their foreign trade before we did.

This is one of these examples of what happens when you go a little overboard in an effort to try to establish some trade protectionism. This was driven by the people, especially in the Northwest, that thought that they would get an advantage on their cattle industry in that part of the country.

Now, we are looking at these sanctions which, by my numbers, likely go to somewhere in the area of $3.15 billion in sanctions between Canada and Mexico. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of our consumers don't even look at the label to see where that comes from.

Consumers still have a choice. There is nothing that would prohibit in the aftermath of this legislation. The consumer is saying: I would like to know if this pig was born in Canada and fed in the United States.

To give you an example of how this is, there is a lot of U.S. capital that is invested also, especially in farrowing operations in Canada. When the exchange rate was even more advantageous than it is today, a lot of U.S. dollars went into Canada to establish farrowing operations to raise pigs up there because they could isolate in order to do disease prevention and because it was a good investment; then those isowean pigs came down to the United States.

The numbers that I had was 6 million pigs coming down; 4 million of them came to Iowa. A third of the pork raised in the United States is from my State, and they are at a disadvantage because of this country of origin labeling. It penalizes, Mr. Speaker, the very people we are trying to help.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

As it has been discussed in this debate, the WTO has made its fourth and final ruling against the United States. Farmers and ranchers in my district in Texas will be hit with tariffs if we don't act right away. COOL has already put a burden on the beef, chicken, and pork producers in the State of Texas.

For example, Texas cattlemen are required to spend another $35 to $45 per animal just to comply with complex cattle identification requirements mandated by COOL. This cost will only get worse if retaliatory tariffs are implemented on our exports, tariffs which are completely legal under the World Trade Organization agreement that we have.

For example, I have spoken to my friends on the other side of the river, on the Mexican side, and they said that the American products that will be hit by tariffs include beef, wine, corn, corn syrup, furniture, dairy products, machinery, and a range of fruits and vegetables. That doesn't even include the tariffs that the Canadians will put, which probably includes jewelry, bread, beef, tomato products, and other goods.

Again, we cannot afford these tariffs, and we should pass the amendments to this COOL bill that we have to remove the threat of those tariffs completely.

In Texas, we raise beef, chicken, and pork that is ''made in the U.S.'' We only ask that this be voluntary labeling. We should act quickly to avoid those tariffs, so we don't punish those farmers and ranchers in the State of Texas.

I thank the ranking member and the chairman for all the good work they have done.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership in bringing the repeal of the COOL amendments to the House floor so quickly.

I would like to thank my fellow Ag Committee colleagues for their bipartisan support in passing the repeal of the COOL amendments out of the committee.

The COOL amendments, or country or origin labeling, has nothing to do with food safety. It is a mandatory marketing program. The USDA stamp of inspection ensures consumers the meat we eat is safe and wholesome, not COOL.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. The U.S. has lost its last three appeals in the WTO to Canada and Mexico regarding COOL. Both countries are ready to retaliate against us, as we have heard, to the tune of billions of dollars, thus hurting our ag sector and American jobs.

Agriculture Secretary Thomas Vilsack has said that only a legislative fix of COOL would bring the U.S. back into compliance.

Again, I thank and congratulate Chairman CONAWAY and urge all of my fellow colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1515

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Let me first point out the irony that we are considering this bill in what

could be a matter of days before we will vote on the administration's request for trade promotion authority.

Last month, President Obama said in his speech at Nike: ''Critics warn that parts of this deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, would undermine American regulation—food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They're making this stuff up. This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws.''

Country of origin labeling was passed by the Senate, passed by the House. It is the law of the land. Yet today, the House of Representatives is getting ready to repeal country of origin labeling. Why? Because the World Trade Organization ruled against it, a trade agreement ruled against it.

Contrary to what the President has said, trade agreements have a direct effect on our sovereignty. They have the ability to uproot domestic laws here in the United States. Members and the public need to know what we are opening ourselves up to when we sign these trade agreements. Literally no area of United States law is safe: food safety, drug safety, consumer protection, environmental protection, health care, label rights, Dodd-Frank, even the minimum wage.

In fact, today's trade agreements, including the TPP, go further than the WTO rules. They allow challenges to U.S. laws not only by governments, but also by foreign and domestic multinational corporations who can circumvent U.S. courts and seek a remedy in an independent tribunal.

Today, the casualty is country of origin labeling. I was conferree on the farm bill in 2008 with my colleague Ranking Member PETERSON. I helped to work to author the language that expanded the country of origin labeling. I have worked on this issue for many years as a member and a former chair of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee. I am proud of that record.

People deserve to know where their food comes from. American farmers and ranchers deserve the opportunity to distinguish their products. It is an economic truism that complete and accurate information is one of the cornerstones of a free market. More than a decade of polling data proves that American consumers consistently and overwhelmingly want country of origin labeling, and frequently by majorities of more than 90 percent.

The World Trade Organization itself has repeatedly ruled provision of information to consumers to be a legitimate goal for domestic regulations. In light of that ruling, I agree that we should seek to protect American exporters by avoiding retaliatory sanctions, but that has not yet become necessary. It has been less than a week since Canada and Mexico filed their retaliatory tariff requests. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body will not consider it for another week.

We do not know whether retaliation will be approved. Canada and Mexico have asked for $3 billion, but they must prove that they have been harmed, and that could be difficult.

A study by Dr. Robert Taylor of Auburn University found that in the case of Canada, COOL had no significant negative impact on either imports of cattle or the price of imported cattle relative to domestic cattle. Instead, Dr. Taylor concluded the decrease in exports was likely the result of the global recession and a weak recovery. Even if harm is found and retaliation is approved, it will probably not go into effect for several months.

There is plenty of time to look for a reasonable resolution, as we have done previously. More than 60 other countries have mandatory labeling requirements. So it seems there is a scope to find an acceptable way forward without compromising U.S. sovereignty. It is much too early for outright appeal, but that is what this bill does. Indeed, it is unprecedented for Congress to intervene so early in the WTO process.

Moreover, this bill goes well beyond the scope of the WTO ruling. It would repeal country of origin labeling on chicken, which is not addressed in the ruling, and on ground beef and ground pork, which the tribunal explicitly found compliant.

Why are we rushing to judgment on this issue? I am forced to conclude that this bill is, in fact, a veiled attempt by the meatpacking industry to deny consumers their right to know where their meat and poultry is coming from. Is it coming from China? Is it coming from Australia? Is it coming from New Zealand? Where is it coming from?

Earlier this week, a broad coalition of 283 agricultural organizations wrote to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON urging them to reject the repeal of country of origin labeling. Farmers, rural advocates, faith groups, environmentalists, labor unions, farmworkers, manufacturers, consumer groups all oppose this ill-conceived and premature repeal. Why are we not listening to them?

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. As I mentioned at the outset, the context for this bill is a failure of U.S. trade policy. The administration tells us that trade agreements do not alter domestic laws. Clearly, this is false.

I admonish my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, beware of the road that you go down today. Beware of a trade agreement that puts American sovereignty at risk.

I hope that Members will bear that in mind and in that context as we vote on this bill today and, in addition to that, when we come to debate the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and grant fast-track authority on that agreement.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlewoman referenced a letter opposing what we are trying to do here today. As you look through that list of organizations that is cited, it is not surprising to find that several have consistently advocated for policies that are intentionally destructive to animal agriculture. So it is no wonder that these groups support a policy that imposes a heavyhanded financial burden on livestock producers, processors, and, ultimately, consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

In my home State of Illinois, we are a rich agricultural State, and we have a rich agricultural heritage. Illinois is a national leader in corn and soybean, but also beef and pork production. If Congress does not act to address this issue of labeling, products in my State could face higher tariffs from Canada and Mexico to the tune of $880 million worth of goods.

I urge my colleagues to stand with American agriculture and support the underlying legislation in order to avoid this harmful measure.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PETERSON for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of maintaining food labeling for the American people.

Polls show 9 out of 10 Americans overwhelmingly support country of origin labeling. I certainly look for those labels when I go to the store. It ensures that the public knows the source of their food. What could be more important? In fact, American producers want to share that information because it is a way to differentiate their products in an increasingly international marketplace.

Country of origin labeling is strongly supported by America's farmers and ranchers, who are proud of what they produce. Restoring local food markets, in fact, is a growing trend across the Midwest and the whole country. Farmers and ranchers know that people are demanding more and more information about their food. Restaurateurs are putting on their menus ''local beef,'' ''local pork,'' and ''local chicken.''

COOL allows farmers and ranchers the ability to market their products with pride because the label has integrity. The widespread support for country of origin labeling is what led to its enactment and implementation in the 2002, 2008, and 2014 Farm Bills. The trend is very clear.

Current efforts in Congress to repeal country of origin labeling are simply veiled attempts to gut these laws for meat—for beef, for pork, for chicken, three arenas that are completely controlled by a few processing companies. It is just like the book that Upton Sinclair wrote at the beginning of the 20th

century. We are back to the jungle. We are back to the jungle.

Opponents are pressing for less information for consumers, not more. They want to hide the product's origin.

H.R. 2393 is a premature attempt to undermine food labeling. They argue it is necessary because of the World Trade Organization decision that puts Canada and Mexico at a disadvantage. Well, this bill, as such, was never even raised in the WTO dispute, and labeling is supported by the WTO. The WTO dispute never addressed chicken. It has explicitly ruled U.S. labeling requirements for pork and beef are legal. And more importantly, Canada's claims of $3 billion in economic loss due to COOL are absolutely unfounded. The data is not even publicly available, and they are unsubstantiated.

The bottom line is the rationale behind this bill is a clear example of what is wrong with our trade policy. Congress should not let a few meatpacking companies use trade disputes as an excuse to gut important consumer protections and the rights of farmers in this country. It is our duty to protect American consumers, American farmers, and American ranchers, not the trade interests of any other country. Our people deserve a right to know where their food is produced and where it comes from.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The previous speaker made reference to the current animal agriculture businesses as being associated with those horrible circumstances of the Upton Sinclair book. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is they would be vehemently opposed to that comment because their practices today do not remotely reflect those in Upton Sinclair's book.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Agriculture is the backbone of many communities in Michigan's Fourth Congressional District. With over 10,000 farms and 15,000 farm operators, approximately $1.7 billion in products from our area are sold across the country and around the world.

The law on the books right now that mandates country of origin labeling threatens the success of agricultural exports. It is unnecessary. It imposes a heavy burden on our farmers. It puts our agricultural exports at risk, and it needs to be repealed.

Recently, based on the ruling from the World Trade Organization, it is apparent that severe consequences could result and that our trading partners and neighbors could penalize American-made products sold in those countries with steep tariffs.

Already, Canada has announced that it will put tariffs on beef, pork, and cherries if the current labeling law is not repealed. Manufactured goods, including office furniture, would also be subjected to tariffs.

H.R. 2393 passed the Agriculture Committee on a bipartisan vote of 38–6. It is a good bill, and it repeals the current labeling law. It will eliminate the possibility of steep tariffs and let Michigan farmers and manufacturers focus on creating jobs and growing their businesses without worrying about more regulations or retaliation.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

□ 1530

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

COOL was perhaps a worthwhile effort at the time but, unfortunately, has outlived its usefulness and its appropriateness. Country of origin labeling, well intended, has started to cause irreparable harm to producers in the Pacific Northwest. Beef and hog producers are facing serious problems trying to work things through the packing plant.

We have international trade now; we have a global market. That needs to be recognized. It is harming not just Canada and Mexico, but Pacific Northwest producers. That point has to be driven home.

We are now facing huge retaliatory tariffs in the Pacific Northwest. Some of our premier crops are wine, cherries, apples, cheese, potatoes.

COOL may have been well intended, but we lost four times at the WTO. We tried to fix it. We worked on it in the farm bill last go-around last year—couldn't get it done. We are facing these retaliatory tariffs right now. Let's repeal it, and let's move on.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM).

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and your committee for your hard work on this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the passage of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This important legislation repeals country of origin labeling requirements for muscle cuts of beef and pork. Unfortunately, the World Trade Organization issued the final judgment of a long-running case brought by Canada, ending all doubt that COOL violates U.S. trade obligations.

Now, America's two largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, are moving to institute retaliatory duties against U.S. products, including $1.3 billion of products from Iowa. Canada has published their list of retaliatory targets, including those aforementioned meat cuts, but also corn, fructose, cereals from my district, along with products from districts all across the United States.

Mexico has not yet published their list, but is likely to include some of the same corn-based products and perhaps even include ethanal.

It is critically important that COOL requirements be repealed to comply with existing trade obligations as soon as possible. Implementations of these tariffs would negatively affect a great deal of farmers and processors in my district and across Iowa.

I urge the House to pass this legislation today and the Senate to act swiftly to avoid these potentially devastating economic consequences.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to join my colleagues in rising in opposition to this important consumer and farmer protection legislation. Someone said it earlier; knowledge is power. When people know where something comes from, it gives them some very clear ideas about what the content of it may be.

Furthermore, the legislation, as has been pointed out here, is really quite, quite, quite premature. We need to let this process play itself out. There may very well need to be a fix here on this whole matter, but right now, it hasn't really been conclusively proven that the Canadian and the Mexican claims are valid. There has been some suggestions that perhaps they are not. Of course, this legislation goes way beyond the scope of the dispute at hand here.

I want to thank my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, and all my other colleagues for standing up in opposition to this legislation. Let's let the process play itself out, and then, when and if it is necessary, we can fix things at that time.

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

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

Again, I don't think anybody on our side wants to have retaliation, but, again, we believe this is premature right at this moment.

We don't know how much damages are going to be found, if any. We just feel that repeal is not where we are going to end up and where we should end up. We understand this needs to be fixed, but I think there is another way to do it short of repeal.

At this point, because of that, I encourage people to vote against the bill. I kind of understand where this is going, but, as it gets over to the Senate, we will figure out a way to work through this so that we end up not having any retaliation.

We still have a system where people can figure out where their food is coming from. It would be ironic, if this repeal would happen to get through the Senate and signed by the President, you wouldn't be able to find out where your chicken or beef or pork came from, as I said earlier, but you will be able to find out where all the other ag products come from, which I think most consumers would see as kind of ridiculous.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that no one wants the retaliatory measures to be put into place. A ''yes'' vote on this bill that we will take up on the floor here shortly will assure that of happening.

Arguments that it is premature fall on deaf ears. Four years of arguing with the Canadians and the Mexicans in the world court in this deal has left ample time to have come to some sort of conclusion if, in fact, there was a deal out there.

Quite frankly, if we had won a trade issue as decisively and resoundingly as Canada and Mexico did, we wouldn't negotiate either. We have no leverage; we have none to leverage against Mexico and Canada to get some sort of a deal that might fix this without the repeal.

Frankly, this is not about the merits of country of origin labeling; it is not about the merits of people knowing where their food comes from. We are beyond that point. We lost four straight times.

If those merits or those arguments upheld in the court in our trade obligation, then it would have prevailed, but it didn't. This isn't about people knowing where their food comes from. This is about avoiding the retaliatory measures that will be implemented by Canada and Mexico.

The argument that folks want to know where their food comes from, if you walk up to a normal person on the street and ask them that question, I am surprised it is not 100 percent of Americans who would say: Yes, I want to know where that food comes from.

But, if you follow that person into the grocery store and they go up to the meat counter, they buy based on price and quality of the meat and what it looks like. They are not looking at the label; 85 percent of them couldn't care less.

If you go into every single restaurant and you order chicken or beef or pork or fish or whatever, you have no clue where that came from. You trust the safety network that we have in place at USDA to make sure that that beef or that chicken, that pork, that whatever, is, in fact, safe for you.

The argument that we are somehow depriving the American people of information that they desperately need in order to make informed consumer decisions, again, falls on deaf ears.

Mexico is not a stranger to retaliatory measures. As my colleague from California mentioned earlier, they implemented those measures in 2011 as a result of a trucking case that we also lost in that regard, and it took the wine industry 3 years to recoup and get back to where they were when those retaliatory measures went in.

If you are not a wine connoisseur, pork rinds were also targeted. We had testimony from an individual from New Mexico that said they lost 15 percent of their business as a result of Mexico including pork rinds on the retaliatory measure. Somewhere between pork rinds and wine, you have got some products that are going to be impacted by this.

These retaliatory threats that are going to come happen are already having a chilling effect on commerce between our three countries. If you are a wine distributor in Canada, you are not going to make any kind of long-term deals with the United States until you know whether or not what the impact is going to be. Commerce right now is being affected; hence, time is of the essence to get this behind us and move forward.

I would also argue that most Members down here would be very quick to argue and demand, quite frankly, that our trading partners around the world live up to their obligations, and we demand that. We get on our high horse, and we thump our chest like crazy, demanding that other folks live up to their agreements. That is what this is.

We have lost the appeals every step of the way. We have an agreement that says we will treat our trading partners certain ways. We crafted a law that broke that deal. We are now being demanded and required to live up to our trade obligations. This is no different than us trying to force all the other countries around the world to live up to their obligations as well.

This is about protecting American exports from these retaliatory measures that are unnecessary to happen. If consumers want their business and want to know where their food comes from, we can certainly craft a voluntary program that allows the market to exploit that information if, in fact, consumers want that.

Nothing that we are doing today will prevent us from creating some sort of a voluntary program that would, in fact, give consumers that information without being in violation of our trade agreements with our partners.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, avoid these retaliatory measures, which are totally unnecessary, if we would, in fact, do the work we are supposed to do.

I also want to thank my team that put together the work on this. They have been incredibly diligent. I know the folks on the other side as well have worked hard on this.

We have tried to come to a bipartisan agreement; we just couldn't get there, but I want to thank my team for the great work that they have done in getting us to that point.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, consumers deserve greater access to information about where their meat comes from, which is why I have always believed Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) is a critical tool for American families and ranchers.

I join many South Dakotans in being deeply disappointed by the World Trade Organization's recent ruling against COOL. While I don't necessarily concur with the WTO's conclusions, I agree with my colleagues that something ought to be done to make COOL workable and prevent any damages against our agriculture industry. After all, it is essential that South Dakota farmers and ranchers can continue to be competitive in the export market.

The COOL repeal bill that the House is considering today, however, is premature. By moving on this legislation just weeks after the WTO ruling, we do not have the time necessary to explore what other options may be available. We owe it to consumers and producers to thoroughly consider alternatives. For these reasons, I am voting against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE BELARUS'S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 2015*.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2685 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1545

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

As I rise to present the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation for the fiscal year 2016 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, there are nearly 200,000 servicemen and -women serving abroad, doing the work of freedom on every continent, and there are many more at home who are serving in every one of our States—Active, Guard and Reserve—all volunteers. We are grateful to them and their families.

They are certainly not all experts in some of the language and terms that will be part of our vocabulary during this debate over the next 24 hours—phrases like ''sequester'' and ''continuing resolution,'' ''Budget Control Act,'' ''overseas contingency account,'' and the ''global war on terrorism account''—but they have every expectation that they will have our united, bipartisan support for this bill whether they serve aboard a ship, fly through airspace, or provide overwatch on land to support a military mission. This legislation was developed after 12 hearings, many briefings, travel to the Middle East and Europe, and countless staff hours, with those who serve us, military and civilian, very much in mind.

This is a product of a very bipartisan and cooperative effort, for which I thank my good friend, the ranking member, PETE VISCLOSKY. It has been a pleasure to work with him. We are both fortunate to have committee members who are engaged and committed so much to this product. We are grateful for the support of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY.

In total, the bill provides just over $578 billion in discretionary spending, an increase of $24.4 billion over the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. This topline includes $88.4 billion in the global war on terrorism funding for war efforts, and it is at the level assumed in the House-Senate budget conference agreement. I would point out that our House total is very close to the number President Obama submitted in his fiscal year 2016 budget request for national defense. Of course, the base funding recommendation is just over $490 billion, which reflects the budget caps enacted in 2011 as part of the Budget Control Act, signed by President Obama.

To reach our reduced allocation, we reviewed in detail the President's submission and found areas and programs where reductions were possible without harming military operations, warfighter readiness, or critical modernization efforts. Please be assured we made every dollar count. To do so, we have taken reductions from programs that have been restructured or terminated, subject to contract or schedule delays, contain unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need, or because of historical underexecution and rescissions of unneeded funds.

Of course, our bill keeps faith with our troops and their families by including a 2.3 percent pay increase, a full percentage above the President's own request. It also provides general funding to their benefits and critical defense health programs. In another key area, this package contains robust funding to counter serious worldwide cyber threats—now an everyday occurrence.

But I think we would all agree that the world is a much more dangerous, unstable, and unpredictable place than it was in 2011 when the Budget Control Act was signed into law by President Obama. The budget caps developed back then could never have envisioned the emerging and evolving threats that we are seeing today in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

So, to respond to current and future threats and to meet our constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common defense, we developed, in a bipartisan way, a bill that adheres to the current law and provides additional resources to end catastrophic cuts to military programs and people. These additional resources are included in title IX, the global war on terrorism account. That account has been carefully vetted to assure its war-related uses.

Our subcommittee scrubbed the President's base budget for this year and past budget requests, and it has identified those systems and programs that are absolutely connected to our ongoing fight against threats presented by ISIL, al Qaeda, al-Nusrah, the Khorasan Group, Boko Haram, and other radical terrorist organizations, including the Iranian Quds Force.

We also projected what resources the military and intelligence community will need to meet ongoing challenges of nation-state aggressors like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and others. Not surprisingly, we have heard objections about the use of title IX to boost our topline national security spending in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the Capitol who believes this should be our first go-to option. Rather, it is a process we undertake as a last resort to make sure our troops can answer the call amid a worsening threat environment around the world.

Again, we have been very careful about what went into this global war on terrorism account. We resisted the temptation to simply transfer large portions of the base bill's operations and maintenance accounts into the global war on terrorism account. We painstakingly worked to provide needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field whenever a crisis may exist or develop in the future, like the current unfolding disaster which is Iraq.

In a recent Statement of Administration Policy, the White House asserted that the global war on terrorism funding—the old OCO account, the overseas contingency account—in their words is a ''funding mechanism intended to pay for wars.'' I could not agree more, and that is why we enforce that account to provide President Obama with the funding resources he needs to lead us as Commander in Chief. Within that

account, I want to highlight two areas of critical importance—ISR and readiness.

We believe that a strong intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—ISR—capability is a critical component of the global war on terror; yet a succession of combatant commanders has testified before our committee that only a fraction of their ISR requirements is being met, in essence, leaving them blind to the enemy's activities, movements, and intentions. Accordingly, the global war on terrorism account contains an additional $500 million above the President's 2016 request to improve our ISR capabilities: the procurement of additional ISR aircraft and ground stations, the training of ISR pilots and other personnel, and the processing of that type of derived data.

Likewise, we share the concern of the Army, Air Force, and Marines about the overall erosion of readiness in the force. So, to begin to reinvest in readiness, title IX includes an additional $2.5 billion above the President's request for this purpose to be distributed to all of our services and to the Guard and Reserves. I would add that this sum must be detailed and justified to Congress 30 days before it is spent.

Again, this bill is structured to give the President the tools he needs to act. For example, when he finally does develop a long-awaited, complete, and comprehensive strategy to combat ISIL and other terrorist groups, we have provided in this bill the resources he will need to execute his plans. I think we would all agree that America must lead, and this bill enables leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I will allow myself a closing thought:

The Washington Post recently editorialized on the defense authorization bill: ''There isn't much bipartisan governance left in Washington, but if anything fits that description, it's probably the annual defense bill.''

Mr. Chairman, this bill deserves bipartisan support, and after many hours of productive debate, I look forward to a bipartisan vote. Our troops deserve it. Our national security requires it. Our adversaries need to see it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army	41,116,129	41,130,748	37,295,571	-3,820,558	-3,835,177
Military Personnel, Navy	27,453,200	28,262,396	26,711,323	-741,877	-1,551,073
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	12,828,931	13,125,349	12,586,679	-242,252	-538,670
Military Personnel, Air Force	27,376,462	27,969,322	26,226,952	-1,149,510	-1,742,370
Reserve Personnel, Army	4,317,859	4,550,974	4,463,164	+145,305	-87,810
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,835,924	1,884,991	1,866,891	+30,967	-18,100
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	660,424	706,481	705,271	+44,847	-1,210
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	1,653,148	1,696,283	1,689,333	+36,185	-6,950
National Guard Personnel, Army	7,643,832	7,942,132	7,980,413	+336,581	+38,281
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	3,118,709	3,222,551	3,202,010	+83,301	-20,541
Total, Title I, Military Personnel	128,004,618	130,491,227	122,727,607	-5,277,011	-7,763,620
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	31,961,920	35,107,546	28,349,761	-3,612,159	-6,757,785
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	37,590,854	42,200,756	40,548,338	+2,957,484	-1,652,418
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,610,063	6,228,782	5,338,793	-271,270	-889,989
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	34,539,965	38,191,929	36,094,484	+1,554,519	-2,097,445
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	30,824,752	32,440,843	30,182,187	-642,565	-2,258,656
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,513,393	2,665,792	2,644,274	+130,881	-21,518
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,021,200	1,001,758	999,621	-21,579	-2,137
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	270,846	277,036	276,761	+5,915	-275
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,026,342	3,064,257	2,815,862	-210,480	-248,395
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,175,951	6,717,977	6,731,119	+555,168	+13,142
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,408,558	6,956,210	6,605,400	+196,842	-350,810
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	13,723	14,078	14,078	+355	---
Environmental Restoration, Army	201,560	234,829	234,829	+33,269	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy	277,294	292,453	300,000	+22,706	+7,547
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	408,716	368,131	368,131	-40,585	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	8,547	8,232	8,232	-315	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	250,853	203,717	228,717	-22,136	+25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	103,000	100,266	103,266	+266	+3,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account	365,108	358,496	358,496	-6,612	---
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund	83,034	84,140	84,140	+1,106	---
Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance	161,655,679	176,517,228	162,286,489	+630,810	-14,230,739

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,216,225	5,689,357	5,336,971	+120,746	-352,386
Missile Procurement, Army	1,208,692	1,419,957	1,160,482	-48,210	-259,475
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,722,136	1,887,073	1,805,773	+83,637	-81,300
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,015,477	1,233,378	1,007,778	-7,699	-225,600
Other Procurement, Army	4,747,523	5,899,028	5,230,677	+483,154	-668,351
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	14,758,035	16,126,405	16,871,819	+2,113,784	+745,414
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,137,257	3,154,154	2,998,541	-138,716	-155,613
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	674,100	723,741	559,141	-114,959	-164,600
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	15,954,379	16,597,457	16,852,569	+898,190	+255,112
Other Procurement, Navy	5,846,558	6,614,715	6,696,715	+850,157	+82,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	935,209	1,131,418	973,084	+37,875	-158,334
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,067,703	15,657,769	14,224,475	+2,156,772	-1,433,294
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,629,662	2,987,045	2,334,165	-2,295,497	-652,880
Space Procurement, Air Force	---	2,584,061	1,935,034	+1,935,034	-649,027
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	659,909	1,758,843	253,496	-406,413	-1,505,347
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,781,266	18,272,438	15,098,950	-1,682,316	-3,173,488
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,429,303	5,130,853	5,143,095	+713,792	+12,242
Defense Production Act Purchases	51,638	46,680	76,680	+25,042	+30,000
Total, Title III, Procurement	93,835,072	106,914,372	98,559,445	+4,724,373	-8,354,927
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	6,675,565	6,924,959	7,372,047	+696,482	+447,088
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	15,958,460	17,885,916	17,237,724	+1,279,264	-648,192
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	23,643,983	26,473,669	23,163,152	-480,831	-3,310,517
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	17,225,889	18,329,861	18,207,171	+981,282	-122,690
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	209,378	170,558	170,558	-38,820	---
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	63,713,275	69,784,963	66,150,652	+2,437,377	-3,634,311
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,649,468	1,312,568	1,634,568	-14,900	+322,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	485,012	474,164	474,164	-10,848	---
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds	2,134,480	1,786,732	2,108,732	-25,748	+322,000

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program					
Operation and maintenance	30,030,650	30,889,940	29,489,521	-541,129	-1,400,419
Procurement	308,413	373,287	373,287	+64,874	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	1,730,709	980,101	1,577,201	-153,508	+597,100
Total, Defense Health Program 1/ 3/	32,069,772	32,243,328	31,440,009	-629,763	-803,319
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance	196,128	139,098	139,098	-57,030	---
Procurement	10,227	2,281	2,281	-7,946	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	595,913	579,342	579,342	-16,571	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/	802,268	720,721	720,721	-81,547	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	---	---	---	---	---
Counter-narcotics support	669,631	739,009	616,811	-52,820	-122,198
Drug demand reduction program	105,591	111,589	113,589	+7,998	+2,000
National Guard counter-drug program	175,465	---	147,898	-27,567	+147,898
Total, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense 4/	950,687	850,598	878,298	-72,389	+27,700
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	---	99,701	---	---	-99,701
Support for International Sporting Competitions 1/	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Office of the Inspector General 1/	311,830	316,159	316,159	+4,329	---
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs	34,144,557	34,230,507	33,355,187	-789,370	-875,320
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA)	507,600	530,023	507,923	+323	-22,100
Total, Title VII, Related agencies	1,021,600	1,044,023	1,021,923	+323	-22,100

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005)	(4,500,000)	(5,500,000)	(4,500,000)	---	(-1,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec.8017)	175,000	---	---	-175,000	---
FFRDC (Sec.8023)	-40,000	---	-88,400	-48,400	-88,400
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec.8028)	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec.8040)	-1,228,020	---	-869,429	+358,591	-869,429
National grants (Sec.8046)	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8050)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
Global Security Contingency Fund (O&M, Defense-wide transfer)	(200,000)	---	---	(-200,000)	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec.8067)	4,000	---	5,000	+1,000	+5,000
Revised economic assumptions (Sec.8074)	-386,268	---	-1,152,206	-765,938	-1,152,206
Fisher House O&M Army Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec.8090)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec.8094)	(146,857)	(121,000)	(121,000)	(-25,857)	---
Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund	540,000	---	---	-540,000	---
Basic allowance for housing (Sec.8114)	88,000	---	400,000	+312,000	+400,000
Military pay raise (Sec.8124)	---	---	700,000	+700,000	+700,000
Working Capital Fund excess cash balances (Sec.8125)	---	---	-359,000	-359,000	-359,000
Revised fuel costs (Sec.8126)	---	---	-814,000	-814,000	-814,000
John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&M, Navy transfer authority)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	(-1,000)	(-1,000)
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions	-803,288	1,000	-2,133,035	-1,329,747	-2,134,035

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IX					
GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM (GWOT)					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (GWOT)	3,259,970	1,828,441	5,664,570	+2,404,600	+3,836,129
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT)	332,166	251,011	1,643,136	+1,310,970	+1,392,125
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)	403,311	171,079	555,998	+152,687	+384,919
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)	728,334	726,126	2,376,095	+1,647,761	+1,649,969
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT)	24,990	24,462	24,462	-528	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT)	13,953	12,693	12,693	-1,260	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)	5,069	3,393	3,393	-1,676	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)	19,175	18,710	18,710	-465	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT)	174,778	166,015	166,015	-8,763	---
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)	4,894	2,828	2,828	-2,066	---
Total, Military Personnel	4,966,640	3,204,758	10,467,900	+5,501,260	+7,263,142
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT)	18,108,656	11,382,750	18,910,604	+801,948	+7,527,854
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT)	6,253,819	5,131,588	6,747,313	+493,494	+1,615,725
Coast Guard (by transfer) (GWOT)	---	(160,002)	(160,002)	(+160,002)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT)	1,850,984	952,534	1,871,834	+20,850	+919,300
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT)	10,076,383	9,090,013	10,799,220	+722,837	+1,709,207
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT)	6,211,025	5,805,633	7,559,131	+1,348,106	+1,753,498
Coalition support funds (GWOT)	(1,260,000)	(1,260,000)	(1,260,000)	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT)	41,532	24,559	124,559	+83,027	+100,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT)	45,876	31,643	34,187	-11,689	+2,544
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT)	10,540	3,455	3,455	-7,085	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT)	77,794	58,106	209,606	+131,812	+151,500
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT)	77,661	60,845	160,845	+83,184	+100,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT)	22,600	19,900	225,350	+202,750	+205,450
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	42,776,870	32,561,026	46,646,104	+3,869,234	+14,085,078
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT)	1,300,000	2,100,000	2,060,000	+760,000	-40,000
European Reassurance Initiative (GWOT)	175,000	---	---	-175,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT)	4,109,333	3,762,257	3,762,257	-347,076	---
Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT)	1,618,000	715,000	715,000	-903,000	---
Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT)	---	600,000	600,000	+600,000	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance	49,979,203	39,738,283	53,783,361	+3,804,158	+14,045,078

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT)	196,200	164,987	759,073	+562,873	+594,086
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT)	32,136	37,260	572,735	+540,599	+535,475
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT)	5,000	26,030	647,630	+642,630	+621,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT)	140,905	192,040	431,640	+290,735	+239,600
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT)	773,583	1,205,596	1,648,312	+874,729	+442,716
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT)	243,359	217,394	722,274	+478,915	+504,880
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT)	66,785	3,344	---	-66,785	-3,344
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT)	154,519	136,930	105,459	-49,060	-31,471
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT)	123,710	12,186	12,186	-111,524	---
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT)	65,589	48,934	234,741	+169,152	+185,807
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	481,019	128,900	1,297,726	+816,707	+1,168,826
Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	136,189	289,142	773,638	+637,449	+484,496
Space Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	---	---	452,676	+452,676	+452,676
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT)	219,785	228,874	1,673,358	+1,453,573	+1,444,484
Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	3,607,526	3,859,964	7,045,550	+3,438,024	+3,185,586
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT)	250,386	212,418	217,701	-32,685	+5,283
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)	1,200,000	---	1,500,000	+300,000	+1,500,000
Total, Procurement	7,696,691	6,763,999	18,094,699	+10,398,008	+11,330,700
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWOT)	2,000	1,500	1,500	-500	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)	36,020	35,747	217,647	+181,627	+181,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT)	14,706	17,100	1,366,242	+1,351,536	+1,349,142
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (GWOT)	174,647	137,087	199,264	+24,617	+62,177
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	227,373	191,434	1,784,653	+1,557,280	+1,593,219
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT)	91,350	88,850	88,850	-2,500	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT)	300,531	272,704	272,704	-27,827	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT)	205,000	186,000	275,300	+70,300	+89,300
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (GWOT)	444,464	493,271	443,271	-1,193	-50,000
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT)	10,623	10,262	10,262	-361	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	960,618	962,237	1,001,537	+40,919	+39,300
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec.9003)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	---	---
Rescissions (GWOT)	-1,236,580	---	---	+1,236,580	---
Unexploded ordnance (GWOT)	250,000	---	---	-250,000	---
Assistance to Ukraine (GWOT) (Sec. 9014)	---	---	200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (GWOT) (Sec.9016)	---	---	500,000	+500,000	+500,000
Readiness (GWOT) (Sec.9017)	1,000,000	---	2,500,000	+1,500,000	+2,500,000
Total, General Provisions	13,420	---	3,200,000	+3,186,580	+3,200,000
Total, Title IX	63,935,295	50,949,561	88,421,000	+24,485,705	+37,471,439
TITLE X					
EBOLA RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Procurement, Defense-wide (emergency)	17,000	---	---	-17,000	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide (emergency)	95,000	---	---	-95,000	---
Total, Title X	112,000	---	---	-112,000	---
(Emergency)	(112,000)	---	---	(-112,000)	---
Grand Total	547,753,288	571,719,613	572,498,000	+24,744,712	+778,387
Appropriations	(484,934,013)	(520,770,052)	(484,946,429)	(+12,416)	(-35,823,623)
Emergency appropriations	(112,000)	---	---	(-112,000)	---
GLobal War on Terrorism (GWOT)	(65,171,875)	(50,949,561)	(88,421,000)	(+23,249,125)	(+37,471,439)
Rescissions	(-1,228,020)	---	(-869,429)	(+358,591)	(-869,429)
Rescissions (GWOT)	(-1,236,580)	---	---	(+1,236,580)	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent)	31,000	33,000	33,000	+2,000	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent)	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund (permanent):					
Defense function	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---	---
Non-defense function	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (Sec.8102):					
Defense function	-146,857	-120,000	-120,000	+26,857	---
Non-defense function	146,857	120,000	120,000	-26,857	---
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to Department of State:					
Defense function	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Non-defense function	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
Navy transfer to John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund:					
Defense function	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Non-defense function	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Title IX O&M, Navy transfer to Coast Guard, Op.Exp (By transfer)	---	(160,002)	(160,002)	(+160,002)	---
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 5/	6,963,000	6,631,000	6,631,000	-332,000	---
(GWOT)	64,700	---	---	-64,700	---
Less emergency appropriations	-112,000	---	---	+112,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	6,954,700	6,672,000	6,672,000	-282,700	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel	128,004,618	130,491,227	122,727,607	-5,277,011	-7,763,620
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	161,655,679	176,517,228	162,286,489	+630,810	-14,230,739
Title III - Procurement	93,835,072	106,914,372	98,559,445	+4,724,373	-8,354,927
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	63,713,275	69,784,963	66,150,652	+2,437,377	-3,634,311
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	2,134,480	1,786,732	2,108,732	-25,748	+322,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	34,144,557	34,230,507	33,355,187	-789,370	-875,320
Title VII - Related Agencies	1,021,600	1,044,023	1,021,923	+323	-22,100
Title VIII - General Provisions (net)	-803,288	1,000	-2,133,035	-1,329,747	-2,134,035
Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT)	63,935,295	50,949,561	88,421,000	+24,485,705	+37,471,439
Title X - Ebola Response and Preparedness	112,000	---	---	-112,000	---
Total, Department of Defense	547,753,288	571,719,613	572,498,000	+24,744,712	+778,387
Scorekeeping adjustments	6,954,700	6,672,000	6,672,000	-282,700	---
Total mandatory and discretionary	554,707,988	578,391,613	579,170,000	+24,462,012	+778,387

1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
3/ Budget request assumes enactment of DoD's pharmacy/Consolidated Health Plan proposals.
4/ Budget request does not break out total recommended in bill language
5/ Contributions to Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375). Amount does not include Budget proposals to amend TRICARE

NOTE: In FY 2015, the amount provided for Space Procurement, Air Force was included in the appropriation for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The House reported table counts the FY 2015 amount for Space Procurement, Air Force ($2,658,789) twice--as part of Missile Procurement, Air Force and as a separate appropriation

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

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and to congratulate him on the collegial and the transparent manner in which he has crafted this legislation.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the efforts of Chairman HAL ROGERS, Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, and of all the members of the Defense Subcommittee.

This bill, obviously, could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, discerning judgment, and thoughtful input of our committee staff and personal staffs. I thank them very much.

The chairman has fully and fairly described the bill we are considering today. I believe he has accurately described the very dangerous and unpredictable world in which we live. As such, I will enter my detailed comments on the bill for the RECORD. Instead, I want to use my time during general debate to discuss the albatross around Congress' neck—the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Despite near universal disdain and plenty of buyer's remorse from the 187 current House Members who voted in favor of the Budget Control Act, it has proven to be an extremely resilient—yet utterly ineffective—piece of law. We have seen short postponements of sequestration. We have seen 2-year alleviations of the budget caps. Yet we find ourselves nearly 5 years since its enactment far from the consensus needed to repeal the law. Further, the continued halfhearted attempts to fix the Budget Control Act are almost as detrimental to the law, itself, as they add to the Nation's uncertainty.

Additionally, it is becoming increasingly difficult to point to any positive changes in our fiscal situation as a result. While intended to reduce the budget deficit through spending limits and reductions, our national debt has increased by 24.5 percent since the enactment of the legislation, mainly because the committees that are not truly constrained by discretionary spending caps continue to push politically popular legislation with little regard for its impact on the Federal budget.

For example, in April of this year, Congress passed legislation that permanently fixed the longstanding issues with Medicare's payment rates for physician services. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this fix will result in a $141 billion increase in Federal budget deficits over the next 10 years; yet the measure sailed through both Houses of Congress with very little opposition, and it was greeted by a cheerful signing statement at the White House. After 17 temporary measures, it is clear that a permanent doctor fix was long overdue. However, I believe it illustrates my larger point that we are nowhere close to having a sincere conversation about our deficits while nondiscretionary spending and a lack of revenue continue to, largely, get a free pass.

Until the President and Congress stop whistling past the graveyard and confront the continued growth and mandatory spending, while simultaneously increasing revenues, our committee—the Appropriations Committee—has no choice but to carry out the implausible mandate contained in the Budget Control Act and try to control deficits with jurisdiction over only 34 percent of one half of the Federal Ledger.

It does not help, I fear, that a majority of our colleagues have no idea when the fiscal year starts except that that is when you shut the government down. I despair that most think continuing resolutions are the norm and that sequestration is not all that bad, and that there is some delight every time a civilian Federal employee is furloughed. To me, all are symptoms of failure.

□ 1600

The time we have caused people to waste by not finishing Congress' work on time, enacting innumerable continuing resolutions, and vacillating from one top line to another is deplorable. Whether it is a Federal agency, a State, other political subdivisions, a nonprofit organization, contractors, or an allied nation all have been less efficient in recent years because of the constant uncertainty surrounding the Federal Government's finances.

To illustrate, in nearly every fiscal year since the Budget Control Act's enactment, there have been attempts to alter the caps on defense and nondefense spending. Two years ago, the House and Senate had allocations that were $91 billion apart, yet the suballocation for defense was only about $4 billion as far as a difference. Both were in excess of the caps. Needless to say, we ended up at a point somewhere between the two, but only after we wasted an incredible amount of time, and shut down the Federal Government.

While not a mirror image of 2 years ago, the fiscal year 2016 process is careening toward a similar fate. This fiscal year, the President got the process started by submitting a budget request that did not comply with the limitations mandated by the Budget Control Act across all budgeted fiscal years. The majority party's response to the President was to pass a budget resolution that purports to abide by the caps for fiscal year 2016 for defense and nondefense discretionary spending, yet evades the defense cap by proposing $38 billion above the President's budget request for overseas contingency operations—for purposes of this act, the global war on terror. Despite the objections of the Secretary of Defense, this additional funding was further entrenched by the recently passed fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

There is no question that Presidents Bush and Obama, the Department of Defense, and Congress have been complicit since 2001 in using emergency war funding to resource enduring requirements for the military. For the past few years, despite the constraints of the Budget Control Act, the Defense Subcommittee, led by my good friend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, has begun to make strides in limiting what is an eligible expense for OCO and shift activities to the base budget; and he is doing exactly the right thing. This was done because it is increasingly difficult, after 14 years, to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our great Nation and our interests.

Needless to say, I find the increased reliance on contingency funding very troubling—and not because I object to providing additional funds for the Department of Defense. I agree with the Department, and I agree with the chairman that sticking to the caps for defense spending would necessitate our forces assuming unreasonable risk in carrying out our national defense strategy.

But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we need a strong nation as well as a strong defense. We cannot continue to let our country deteriorate, with interstate bridges that collapse and kill our citizens, meaningful scientific research that atrophies, and a population whose educational attainment falls further and further behind.

Looking ahead, only the most Pollyannaish among us fails to see that we will be in the throes of another crisis in December. Our time, our staff's time, Congress' time, the country's time should not be wasted any longer. The President of the United States and the leaders of both parties of both Houses ought to start meaningful negotiations now so that they can conclude before October 1 to allow this great committee, the Committee on Appropriations, to again do the business of the country in an orderly, thoughtful, and timely fashion.

I stress, this is not an issue of process. Congress should not be searching for ways to alter the process in order to avoid making hard decisions on an annual basis. This is a matter of will, and we need to use the power of the purse to its fullest.

I expressed a number of concerns, but I would close, relative to the legislation before us, given the constraints that this committee faces, by observing that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the subcommittee have done an exceptional job in putting this bill together. In particular, the chairman has been meticulous with the $37.5 billion added to title IX of this bill. He has avoided the easy path. Rather, he has painstakingly worked to provide the needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field. Further, the chair was very thoughtful in his construction of the base portion of the bill, and

I believe it and the report provide the stability needed for our military personnel—as the chairman emphasized, its readiness—and it preserves our industrial base.

I close by indicating I look forward to the debates on the amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Defense Appropriations bill.

The demands on our military are high. We are confronted with escalating Russian and Chinese aggression, threats from ISIL and other Islamic terrorist groups, burgeoning nuclear programs in countries like North Korea, and ongoing war in Syria, Yemen, Libya, and other places. We just don't know what may sprout up next.

But in the face of this uncertainty, we can ensure that our military forces are ready and able to meet whatever challenges may arise. We can make very sure that our troops and commanders have the tools and support that they need to protect this great Nation and our way of life.

To this end, the bill provides $578.6 billion in discretionary funding. That is $24.4 billion above last year's level and includes $88.4 billion to ensure that we can meet the needs of our military as they fight the global war on terrorism.

This level of funding complies with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, as well as the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. Within this total, the bill prioritizes military readiness, providing $219 billion for operation and maintenance programs that keep our troops trained and prepared to respond quickly and decisively.

The bill also provides priority funding to ensure that our Armed Forces are supplied with the equipment and the weapons that they need to conduct successful military operations.

Mr. Chairman, our military is the best in the world, and this bill ensures that it stays that way. We invest $67.9 billion in research and development that will keep us on the cutting edge of defense technology and enable us to meet a wide range of future threats to our security.

But our military is nothing without the brave men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much in their service to this Nation. We must keep morale high and provide for the health and well-being of our warfighters and their families. So the bill includes a 2.3 percent pay raise for our troops. That is more than the President requested.

The bill contains $31.7 billion for the Defense Health Program to meet all estimated needs this year. This funding includes important increases above the President's request for things like cancer research, traumatic brain injury and psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriations bill accomplishes all of this but also takes important steps to streamline spending at the Pentagon, ensuring that no dollar goes to waste and that we live within our means.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee staff and members and his very trusted ranking member for their good bipartisan teamwork on this bill. The chairman and ranking member demonstrated ironclad commitment to our troops and to the security of this Nation with this bill. I would also like to acknowledge the hard-working staff, Mr. Chairman. They spent many, many hours preparing this bill for consideration by us today.

Mr. Chairman, above all else—above all else—we must provide for the national defense of the United States. Nothing can exist—not our domestic government, not our private enterprise, not our freedoms—without ensuring that that basic need is met.

Our national security is far too important to fall victim to political games. We can't risk having an underfunded military during these uncertain times, and our troops deserve unfailing, unanimous support as they lay their lives on the line. No political games on this bill, Mr. Chairman. This is for real.

I urge Members to support this bill. These are bipartisan priorities addressed in a bipartisan way, and I want to see that our colleagues send a strong message to our military showing our support and our willingness to sacrifice for them. I urge support of this bill on this floor.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and Chairman ROGERS for their efforts. I particularly want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for working in such a cooperative manner.

However, the two parties remain very far apart in their approach to the appropriations process. Our differences were plainly evident during consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. Not one of my Democratic colleagues supported the majority's budget because it maintained sequestration levels. As the President said: the majority has returned our economy to the same top-down economics that has failed us before and slashes investments in the middle class that we need to grow the economy.

During debate on the previous five appropriations bills, my majority colleagues argued strenuously that allocations at the sequester level were nonnegotiable. They argued our committee was hamstrung by the Budget Control Act and that we were powerless to renegotiate another sequester relief package, as had been done under the Murray-Ryan agreement 2 years ago. At the same time, others on our committee told the press that ''pressure would build'' to address sequestration or pass a continuing resolution because sequester-level bills cannot be enacted.

The Defense bill before us appears to be operating under a different set of rules, with funding over the magical sequester level, a level we were told was the law of the land. It was not cut below the President's request, as were all the other nondefense bills. By using $38 billion in overseas contingency operations funding to plug the hole created by the budget caps, this bill fully funds defense programs and avoids the inadequacies facing the other bills.

Let me be very, very clear. I am not making a case that the Defense bill is too high or advocating that it should be reduced. We live in a very dangerous world. We need to attend to our defense, but we should do so in a responsible fashion.

□ 1615

Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department's ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon's regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.

This practice irresponsibly addresses only one of the budget imperatives, creating clear losers in most of the other appropriation bills.

If this bill were to move forward as is, I fear my majority colleagues would mentally move on; the urgency facing the entire appropriations process would fade because we have ''taken care of'' our national security needs.

That, my friends, is a dangerous strategy, especially given that we know none of these bills are likely to be signed into law by the President as they are currently written.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. We can deal with that fact now or deal with it again over the holidays, but we are going to have to deal with it.

Members of the armed services and their families live in every one of our communities. They drive on crowded highways and over crumbling bridges. Most of them send their kids to public schools.

These families expect the meat and products they buy to be safe and the airplanes in which they fly to be protected. If they should ever get sick, they need to have the biomedical research in place so that safe and effective treatments are available to them.

These are reasonable expectations. What is not reasonable is to put forward several annual spending bills that mindlessly cut these priorities simply because we can't agree on a reasonable budget.

National security and economic strength are inextricably linked. Let's get back to the table and set realistic spending caps to provide what is needed both for our national security and to create jobs, improve infrastructure, fund biomedical research, and grow the economy.

Let's get together. Let's vote ''no'' on this bill and move on.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee and a member of my subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for yielding.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for the hard work they have put into bringing the bill before us today. I think, arguably, this is the most important issue we face every year.

Last year, I pointed out the fact that I think the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and we work to do that every day. We talked about the fact that the best way to keep America safe is to keep America strong. I think that, if you look back, here we are a year later, and not much has changed.

National security is still a critical element of what we do here. Back home in northeast Florida, the constituents that I represent are greatly concerned about national security. They are greatly concerned about the men and women in uniform and greatly concerned that they will have the necessary resources to accomplish their mission successfully and return home safely.

They are also concerned that we don't get caught up in the politics of the moment and lose sight of the fact that we have a constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I just want to say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that, when we look at the ever-increasing dangerous world that we live in, I think we have to meet these challenges head on.

I want to remind my colleagues that most of everything that we have accomplished as a great nation, we have accomplished with the foundation built on national security. This bill moves us forward down that path.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill.

Please allow me to acknowledge the tremendous work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and the Appropriations staff in moving this Defense bill forward.

This bill deserves better treatment by the leadership of this House than to have it cloaked in unfinished budget wrangling that could force future changes harmful to the defense of our Nation.

The bill before us funds key priorities, such as assuring the strongest, most agile and resilient military on Earth; securing base and operational independence through energy innovation; improving defense health for the lives of our military and civilian forces; advancing cutting-edge research at our defense labs to improve efficiency on the battlefield and drive technology transfer to the private sector to grow our economy; and maintaining and upgrading essential defense facilities across our Nation and globe.

Moving forward, our Nation must still address lingering veteran unemployment of over half a million Americans, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. A majority are 45 years of age or older, but over 200,000 are between the ages of 18 and 44.

The capabilities of our National Guard can be leveraged to address this imperative, engaging their talents to meet domestic needs.

Globally, too, as leader of the free world, the United States holds a special responsibility to uphold commitments made in the Budapest Memorandum to Ukraine and our allies in Central Europe. This was recently reaffirmed by President Obama and German Chancellor Merkel at the G7 summit.

A threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere. Russia's invasion of Ukraine cannot be tolerated. Tough sanctions on Russia and enforcement of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act lay the base for liberty's advance.

Those Members who in good conscience ultimately will vote ''no'' on this measure will do so to fight for a responsible budget plan that not only meets the needs of our men and women in unform, but builds up the Nation and citizenry they are fighting to protect.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a member of the Appropriation Committee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PALAZZO. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I would like to thank you and your staff for all your hard work in crafting this Defense Appropriations bill.

As a marine veteran, a current member of the Mississippi National Guard, and a former member of the House Armed Services Committee, I fully understand the importance of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the United States Navy and Marine Corps are the Nation's forward-deployed, fast-response force in times of crisis. The ability to respond to all types of conflict, as well as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, is what separates the United States Navy and the Marine Corps team from the rest of the world.

However, as a result of declining resources, the Navy has struggled to reach its own stated goal of 306 ships. A not-insignificant portion of this fleet consists of amphibious ships to support the requirements of the Marine Corps.

The current number of amphibious ships in the fleet does not meet validated national requirements to accomplish the tasks the Marine Corps is responsible to carry out in time of war or national emergency; this is the very Marine Corps that is tasked to be the most ready when our Nation is the least ready.

I know this issue also concerns you, and I request your thoughts on how we might get our Navy shipbuilding program back on track.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and concerns and for his own military service. I share his concern.

The gentleman is correct. The Navy has been struggling to maintain its shipbuilding program for many years. Despite a requirement for 306 ships, the Navy's fleet has seemed to reach a plateau of about 285 ships for the last several years.

It is our responsibility to work with you and the Navy to ensure that our sailors and marines have the finest ships and equipment this Nation can provide.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working closely with you on this important issue. I can tell you I know where the finest warships are built by the finest craftsmen, that is right there in Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his passion and his remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, for more than a decade, this House has been committed to providing our troops with the body armor they need. Body armor is essential to our deployed troops.

In order to provide our troops with modern, lightweight body armor, the Department requires a viable industrial base to produce the body armor and to continually work to improve it.

The fiscal year 2015 NDAA Defense Appropriations bill sustaining the industrial base was prioritized; $80 million was appropriated to the Army to

specifically sustain the industrial base for body armor.

Those FY15 funds have not been obligated, and as a result, the industrial base for body armor is laying off workers and about to go out of business. The Army has ignored Congress' directions and put this industry at risk.

The FY16 Defense Appropriations report makes a commitment to body armor, saying:

> The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue to develop and manufacture more advanced body armor.

Unfortunately, the supplier of boron carbide power to make armor plates will be out of business before this bill is enacted. Furthermore, this bill provides zero funds for the procurement of body armor, another blow to the industrial base.

We all share a strong commitment to our troops, fully understanding how important body armor is to soldier protection.

To the chairman and ranking member, I would like to work with you to ensure that the existing body armor industrial base is not driven out of business by the Army's inability to follow directions from Congress and mismanagement of this vital supply chain.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today to echo the concerns expressed by my colleague across the aisle from Minnesota in concern for our Nation's warfighters and our military base.

As you know, the FY15 NDAA authorized and the FY15 Defense Appropriations bill provided $80 million for a body armor industrial base initiative in the Army's operations and maintenance program. However, the U.S. Army is not properly utilizing the appropriated funds in the manner Congress intended.

Congress has been clear on this matter. Report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measure demonstrates that the importance of body armor is critical to protecting our soldiers in combat.

Because of the Army's repurposing of these funds at odds with congressional intent and the safety of our troops, the Army and the U.S. body armor industry will lose the unique capability critical for meeting high-tech U.S. lightweight body armor standards.

After the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we must rehabilitate and replace used body armor to ensure the readiness and the safety of our troops in the field if they are called to serve in another conflict.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BARR. If we do not act now to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacturing of more advanced lightweight body armor, there will not be a capable body armor industrial base left in the future to fund.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for giving me the opportunity to discuss something that will assist in our natural disaster response.

The Air National Guard employs advanced capabilities to assist in civil search and rescue operations during natural disasters and is capable of locating and rescuing people where civilian authorities cannot.

The Air National Guard uses sophisticated technology to assist in time-sensitive emergency operations, including the AS–4 Pod, which includes wide-area infrared sensors optimized for survivor detection, integrated communications, and specialized radar for maritime, flood, and swift water recovery.

Lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina, the California wildfires, and Superstorm Sandy highlight the need to outfit the Air National Guard with this important capability. I hope you will consider adding this vital piece of equipment to the list of equipment considered for priority purchasing with the use of the National Guard and Reserve equipment account, which is governed by this legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention. We look forward to working with you on this important issue as we move forward with the legislation.

□ 1630

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for the purpose of a colloquy. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, for his work to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, this legislation includes billions of dollars to programs that are vital to the Nation's security and the men and women who have volunteered to serve our Nation.

However, I do have a question regarding a recommended reduction of $61 million from the Missile Defense Agency request for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle.

Does the gentleman share my belief that this is a critically important program, and that it, and the 2020 goal for deployment of this capability, are vital to a robust and reliable national missile defense system, which is paramount to the defense of the Nation against ever more capable adversary ballistic missiles?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman, and I know the gentleman from Alabama will agree that the oversight of scarce defense dollars is important. The request for this program has spiked significantly between fiscal years 2015 and 2016. Yet, there is no real acquisition plan.

The Department owes us this information if we are to be responsible stewards of these taxpayer dollars

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for that explanation, and I hope he will let me know if there is anything the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces can do to make sure that the Department knows that the acquisition strategy needs to be delivered to the Congress without further delay.

Can the gentleman also assure me that the deployment of the Aegis Ashore site in Poland remains a priority of his and that its deployment by not later than December of 2018 will not be affected by any of the marks in the bill before the House today?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Alabama that this deployment is vital to our missile defense, and the United States should be grateful for strong allies like Poland.

Nothing in the bill today will in any way impact the one-time deployment of the European Phased Adaptive Approach Phase III.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to supporting the bill today and urge the House to do the same to get this vital bill passed and to the President for his support of our men and women in uniform.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask how much time remains for both sides, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for yielding, and for your tremendous leadership on this subcommittee.

I also want to thank the ranking member and our chair for including report language on the Department of Defense's efforts to achieve auditability by the end of fiscal 2017.

Ensuring that the Pentagon is auditable is common sense, and it is something that Congress mandated, mind you, 25 years ago. It is long past time to address the culture of unlimited spending and zero accountability at the Pentagon, and I know this issue has strong bipartisan support.

Yet, there are many provisions of this bill which I cannot support. The appropriations bill includes an additional $38 billion over budget caps in the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and that is what it is; it is a slush fund. This is simply outrageous and this fund, quite frankly, in my opinion, it should be eliminated.

We should have transparency, and the public should know how much it is costing to fight these wars.

This bill also includes $1.3 billion for DOD operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant. Mr. Chair, it has been 10 months since the war started and 4 months since the President submitted his draft authorization to Congress, and Congress has yet to act. Now we see additional troops being sent into this war zone. Again, no congressional debate, no vote.

Congress cannot continue to fund a war—and that is what this is—without a robust debate on an ISIL-specific authorization. That is why I offered an amendment in committee, which was adopted on a bipartisan basis, that simply reaffirms that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force.

It is also why I am offering two amendments to this bill that would prohibit funding for the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force. With these authorizations still on the books, Congress is allowing this President—and any President really—to wage war against anyone, at any time, anywhere.

I hope we defeat this bill because we have got to stop this policy of endless wars.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to express my support for the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill and my appreciation for the hard work of the chairman in drafting this very good bill, which will provide essential funding to our national security.

However, I have a serious concern with the proposed reduction of funding in this bill for an existing weather collection satellite called the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, or DMSP.

As early as 2017, our military is facing a critical capability gap in the Department of Defense's two highest priority weather requirements. As the Air Force continues to work through its plan for addressing weather requirements, launching DMSP will help address these issues.

Much has been spent on DMSP already, and it would be a shame to waste those dollars when the satellite could be put to good use.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that the Air Force has not properly managed the space weather program, and they must submit a better plan. However, I ask for your support in working with me in conference to ensure that our military and intelligence professionals have the tools they need to safely prosecute our missions.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And congratulations on producing a very good bill that will provide the necessary funding to properly defend our Nation.

And let me express my appreciation for providing $26 million in your bill to fund an Air Force pilot program for the acquisition of commercial SATCOM services.

Aligned with the House-passed fiscal year 2016 NDAA, the program has the potential to lower costs and increase utilization of commercial satellites.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss military satellite communications, or SATCOM. As you are aware, the demand for SATCOM has increased by a factor of 10 since the outset of our simultaneous commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it continues to grow.

Further, the need for protection against jamming, spoofing, and other interference has also increased as our adversaries deploy more sophisticated countermeasures to deny and degrade communications to our warfighters.

The government-owned, government-operated SATCOM system, Wideband Global Satellite Communications System, or WGS, cannot keep up with demand—not even close. As a result, the Air Force has sought less expensive, more protected SATCOM solutions from the commercial sector to augment national capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, the military needs more SATCOM capacity, and it needs SATCOM that is better protected. Congress can help by restoring $32.8 million for development and testing activities associated with the Protected Tactical Testbed.

We also need additional funding for the Protected Tactical Wave Form itself. This effort will help make both commercial and WGS satellites more robust and protected against jamming. Alongside the Air Force's pilot program I referenced earlier, the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form may begin to give warfighters access to a global architecture of protected commercial SATCOM.

That said, I understand the Air Force has programmatic challenges with the Protected Tactical Testbed that must be addressed. However, I urge the committee to keep an open mind in conference. If the Air Force addresses your concerns, then I hope the committee will consider restoring funding for the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form.

I thank you again for this opportunity to speak on such an important issue to our military servicemen and -women.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen from Alabama and Oklahoma, both veterans, for bringing these matters to our attention, and we look forward to working with you on these important issues.

However, in both instances you both highlight important warfighter capabilities that are stymied by poor program planning and execution by the Air Force. Their lack of programmatic and financial discipline has led directly to these weather collection and satellite communications issues.

Consequently, our appropriations bill highlighted each of these concerns and strongly encouraged the Air Force to make adjustments. None, unfortunately, were made in a timely manner.

Based on existing capability, I see no evidence that launching the DMSP is part of that plan, but I am willing to work with both gentlemen in conference if things change. I thank the gentlemen for their support and work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

I have been working to provide our World War II merchant mariners the thanks they deserve. I would prefer to offer an amendment to the Defense bill which would have provided a token thank you, but it would have been the subject of a point of order.

These brave men suffered the highest losses of any military branch in World War II and did not receive veterans benefits under the GI Bill.

Moving forward, I look forward to working with the ranking member to give our brave merchant mariners the recognition they rightly deserve. It is unfathomable that these merchant mariners who served this Nation so valiantly have never had full veterans benefits.

They were not eligible for tuition subsidies, home loan guarantees, or other provisions of the GI Bill that helps millions of veterans transition seamlessly into civilian life.

Time is running out. These merchant mariners are now in their eighties and nineties, and there are only 5,000 left. Let's act now to right this wrong.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentlewoman from California for bringing this to our attention and, particularly, given the fact that my father is a Naval veteran and 99 years old. So I understand the circumstances of what you speak, and we do look forward to working with you on this issue as we move forward with the legislation. Thank you very much.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH),

the dean of the New Jersey delegation, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding, and I rise to raise an issue of particular importance to my constituents in New Jersey.

Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst was created by the 2005 BRAC round. And while joint basing has been successfully implemented at MDL, there remains an outstanding issue of gross unfairness for some employees.

The overwhelming majority of employees at the joint base are included in the New York pay locality area; yet, the wage grade employees on the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix remain in the Philadelphia locality area. These employees work on the same installation, but they are paid 7 percent less than their counterparts for the same work.

Joint Base MDL made a formal request for realignment of the Philadelphia to New York wage survey area to OPM's Advisory Committee, FPRAC, in 2010, and the base leadership continues to believe pay parity should be a priority.

Mr. Chairman, the joint base is a critical asset to DOD and our National security. Their missions could not be carried out effectively without the skills of the men and women stationed there and those working in civilian support roles across the base.

Joint Base MDL is one installation, and the men and women who work there are part of the same workforce. It is timed to fix this outdated policy.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that you will work with me to bring about fairness to the roughly 20 percent of the workforce that does not receive equally earned pay.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank my colleague for his leadership and for bringing my attention to this important issue. And I can assure him we will look forward to working with him as we move forward with our bill into conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the chairman, for your commitment to the men and women who support our warfighters. I look forward to working with you to move the pay parity for all joint base employees forward.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

As you are aware, our Nation's Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, or FFRDCs, play a critical role in advancing national security goals and ensuring that our Nation stays at the cutting edge of technological innovation.

Mr. Chair, I wanted to engage in this colloquy to clarify Congress' intent in section 802(3)(c), which states:

''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC through a fee or other payment mechanism for construction of new buildings.''

□ 1645

Mr. Chair, I am concerned that some could take an expansive interpretation of this provision and view it as preventing the execution of critical facilities modernization projects, even when authorized by Congress through military construction projects.

I am also concerned about the provision's medium-and long-term implications for building maintenance and facility modernization projects that are necessary to continue important innovation programs for decades to come.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, is it the committee's understanding that this provision is not intended to apply to military construction projects or to advanced planning and design funds that are authorized by Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. TSONGAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. TSONGAS, yes, that is my understanding.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with you, and I appreciate that construction.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee. Is that your understanding?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is my understanding as well.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you both, and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, could you give us the time that we each have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the Vets4Warriors program, a program in my district that is operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care. This successful program has provided invaluable assistance to the military in their efforts to prevent suicide among veterans. The program ensures that those veterans who are struggling with depression or psychological concerns get the support they need: peer-to-peer.

Sadly, the Department of Defense has terminated this program without any public notice. Our nation is now faced with a crisis: since the start of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, more than 3,000 active-duty personnel have taken their own lives. Programs like Vets4Warriors help us to combat this troubling trend.

The Vets4Warriors program is unique and will be difficult to replace. It allows veterans a safe space in which they can find help apart from the DOD structure. Service members are often hesitant to reach out to their superiors regarding personal concerns like mental health. By integrating these programs into the Department's Military OneSource program, many service members will lose the sense of confidentiality provided by Vets4Warriors.

We must fulfill our responsibility to care for those who put themselves in harm's way to protect our nation. It is my hope that the DOD will reconsider their decision so that we can assure our veterans have access to the best mental health resources possible.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2685

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $37,295,571,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for

members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,711,323,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to encourage the Secretary of Defense to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking, and their impact on women and girls across the globe.

Let me thank the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense for the work they have done in the backdrop of the very overwhelming sequester, which I certainly oppose so that all of the appropriators will have the ability to provide the resources that they need.

In particular, my amendment is recognizing the new face of war and the new fight of terrorism.

I hold up these pictures of the numbers of countries who are adding women to their forces. America, of course, has had women in different parts of its military for a number of years, going back to nurses in World War I and II and in the various types of work that have been done recently in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the women are enormously proud and very effective.

My amendment simply says that, in this new war on terrorism and human trafficking, we would have the opportunity to use the women in the United States military who have achieved levels of rank that are extremely important to be able to train and to provide technical assistance to those who are just adding women to their military.

The United States Armed Forces possesses an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists, who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons—especially women, girls, and the elderly—but we must also recognize that, notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality: the Caliphate, ISIL, ISIS, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, al Qaeda, all. We are also finding that these organizations are using women, but then, of course, the institutionalized militaries are also putting more women in.

What better interface than that of the United States military and women, in particular.

I have an article that I would like to submit into the RECORD, ''Turkey's Women Expand Role in Military.''

TURKEY'S WOMEN EXPAND ROLE IN MILITARY

At the 24th International Defence Film Festival in Rome, a documentary by film director Elif Ovar of the Turkish Army's Photo-Film Center was selected for the Jury's Award.

Her documentary ''Light of Hope''—about Senay Haydar, Turkey's first female gendarmie commander and senior noncommissioned officer (NCO), against the backdrop of gender discrimination and violence against women in the small Anatolian town of Mesudiye—attracted much interest.

Haydar works closely with local officials and families and has been credited for eradicating violence against women among the 40,000 residents of Mesudiye. Thanks to Haydar's actions, there hasn't been a single case of violence against women in the last nine months in Mesudiye.

Ovar told Al-Monitor that as a woman she has been much impressed with Haydar's accomplishments in a small Anatolian town where traditional culture prevails. ''NCO Senay's success, as much as this is due to [her own accomplishments], is also the success of the commanders who believed in her,'' Ovar said. ''Appointing a female NCO as a representative of law and order to a town with 40,000 residents is truly a revolution for the Turkish army.''

Over the last three years, there have been extensive changes in the personnel policy of the Turkish army with the increase of the number of female officers and NCOs and, as was the case with Haydar, in assigning women to active field positions instead of just to administrative work at the headquarters.

In an interview with Al-Monitor Haydar said: ''I always wanted to be a field commander who takes decisions instead of working at a desk. I was encouraged by the Gendarmerie General Command. When the results [of my employment] turned out to be positive, scores of female officers and NCOs followed in my footsteps.'' According to a source at the Gendarmerie School in Beykent, Ankara, in October alone, 67 female NCOs have been assigned to Gendarmerie General Command field posts after they completed their basic training; another 90 female NCOs and 30 officers will follow.

Capt. Hulya Ercan, an instructor of the UH–60 Sikorsky helicopter at Ankara's Gendarmerie Aviation School, is the first female gendarmerie pilot in Turkey. In an interview with Al-Monitor she said: ''My husband is a captain. I raised my daughters Bensu and Beren without giving up my profession. I actually flew until the third month of my pregnancy with my youngest. My most memorable moment was one time when my husband was away on a mission and I was ordered to fly an urgent mission. I had to leave my 1½-year-old daughter with the duty officer at the base. When I returned five hours later, I found the duty officer and many soldiers entertaining my daughter. That was memorable and funny.''

A source at the Turkish General Staff who works on planning of the personnel policies told Al-Monitor that today there are 1,350 female officers in the Turkish army, which is 3.3% of the total number of officers. The target is to increase this to 5% in the next three years. The Turkish army wants to further increase the number of female NCOs, which today stands at 843 (0.9%). The aim is to also increase this to 5% by 2018, which means the employment of an additional 4,000 female NCOs. To achieve these objectives, the Turkish army has been trying to embrace more female-friendly personnel policies.

The Turkish army employs 96 female colonels, 140 female lieutenant colonels and 360 female majors.

Colonels generally work at headquarters while majors are usually unit commanders. Staff Maj. Bilgehan Bulbul is the commander of the largest transport fleet of the Air Force Command in Ankara and is also the first female fleet commander. There is a noticeable increase of Turkish female staff officers in important headquarter posts in the army and NATO. For example, naval staff officer Maj. Yasemin Bayraktutan is Turkey's current naval attache in London. Within six-seven years, she may well become the first female admiral of the country. In an email to Al-Monitor, she said she wants to return home after excelling in her current position and before becoming an admiral she wants to command a frigate.

What is behind the Turkish army's decision to increase the number of female officers and NCOs?

There are two practical reasons and one ideological one.

The first practical reason is the relative reduction in the number of personnel called up for compulsory military service, as the Turkish army is moving toward becoming a professional entity—increasing the number of females in the army makes up for this loss in man power.

The second practical reason is a need for female personnel because of a change in security issues the Turkish army is dealing with—notably, the shift from rural to urban areas of the Kurdistan Workers Party violence in Turkey's southeast. In addition, there is a need for female personnel in international missions that the Turkish armed forces are undertaking in Afghanistan, Kosovo and Bosnia, among others.

To have ranking female officers provides significant advantages in communicating with the local population, especially with women, and carrying out civil-military cooperation projects effectively in the health care and education sectors. Thus, the Turkish army is determined to establish more effective links with local populations in low-intensity conflict areas and peace support missions.

The ideological reason for increasing the number of females in the Turkish army is that the latter has always been the leading cause of modernization and Westernization of the republic. The army sees itself as a pioneer in all transformation processes in society, and more females and an increase in the visibility of their presence in the Turkish army delivers crucial messages—especially to the rural population—on equality for women and a more active participation of women in society.

A female in uniform backed by the Turkish army can better dissuade a man in rural Turkey, for instance, inclined to violence against his wife. ''Because of my uniform and as stipulated by law, I will go after anyone committing violence against his wife or any other female,'' Haydar said.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So my amendment, of course, is to provide that

pathway for the collaboration of U.S. military women with other excellent forces to be able to help these women and to be able to fight the global war on terrorism through technical assistance, counsel, and advice, which I think will add to the expertise of those militaries but, more importantly, to the work of the United States military.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe and for their work in ensuring that they have resources needed to keep our Armed Forces the greatest fighting force for peace on earth.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth.

The purpose of the Jackson Lee amendment is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Armed Forces possess an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons, especially women, girls, and the elderly.

But we must recognize that notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality and decency.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai peninsula which poses a threat to Egypt.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technologies and resources that promote the security of the American people and nation states.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as weapons of war, affecting over twenty thousand women and girls.

Looking at the history of terrorism alone highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this enables us to chip at terrorism which has plagued us here in the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical military expertise to military in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists in their country and to keep those terrorists out of our country.

Time and again American lives have been lost at the hands of terrorists.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers, schoolchildren, and members of the diplomatic corps and the Armed Services.

This is why the technical assistance offered by our military personnel is integral to promoting security operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions to empower local forces to combat terrorism.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot not be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

Mr. Chairman, from the United States to Africa to Europe to Asia and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of highest national priorities.

Collectively, through every action and effort towards empowering our neighbors and their military to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe is in our national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would like to take this moment to thank the chairman and the ranking member and their staff for working with me on this matter. I am hoping to be able to revise or to resubmit this.

At this time, if the chairman would allow me, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the withdrawal.

I thank the gentlewoman for her advocacy.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $12,586,679,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,226,952,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,463,164,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,866,891,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $705,271,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,689,333,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under sections 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,980,413,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under sections 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,202,010,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law, $28,349,761,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, providing science, technology, engineering, and math education to America's youth is critical to the global competitiveness of our Nation. The STARBASE program engages local fifth-grade elementary students by exposing them to STEM subjects through an inquiry-based curriculum and is currently active in 56 congressional districts throughout the Nation.

Today I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their strong leadership in reestablishing funding for the program over the past 2 years. I am respectfully requesting an additional $5 million to help expand the program nationwide.

Today I am offering STARBASE amendment No. 18 to H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. My amendment increases funding to the STARBASE Youth Program by $5 million, and while providing support for the program, it also reduces spending by $1 million.

The STARBASE program is carried out by the military services because the lack of STEM-educated youth in America has been identified as a future national security issue by the Department of Defense. Two years ago, both the House and Senate rejected the Office of Management and Budget's, the OMB, proposal to terminate this critical program.

As a Member of Congress, I appreciate OMB's desire to consolidate STEM's programs across the spectrum into one funding line. However, this is a national defense item and has been identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as such. STARBASE was created under the auspices of the Department of Defense to meet its critical needs in STEM-related fields.

Regrettably, the funding uncertainty caused by OMB's action during that time resulted in the elimination of all programs operated by the Navy and reduced in fiscal year 2014 the number of DOD STARBASE programs from 79 to 56. DOD currently has 25 sites on the waiting list for a program, and that is why we need a small increase in funding for a number of STARBASE programs. It is one of the most cost-effective programs across the Federal Government, costing an average of $343 per student.

Last year, 3,062 classes were conducted in 1,267 schools in 413 school districts across the country. More than 70,000 students attended the programs, bringing the total to 825,000 students since its inception in 1993.

It is one of the most effective STEM programs as well. The students demonstrate undisputed improvement in STEM.

I will conclude by reading Warrant Officer Stacey Hendrickson of the California State Military Reserve and director of the STARBASE program at the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base in my district, who said:

''Congressman LOWENTHAL, I wanted to let you know that one of our schools, 96th Street Elementary in Watts, earned their highest science standardized test scores ever last year. This is significant because the class is second-year remediation and has English language learners and special needs students. Every student's score went up, so this is a class that was very special to us. We were all very excited to hear that, as those students had all shown a big increase in our own pre and post test scores. We were happy to see that the improvement was seen on their Academic Performance Index scores as well.''

Mr. Chair, STARBASE inspires America's youth to discover technical career fields that are imperative. During this time of economic recovery we cannot lose this battle and concede our technical edge to the rest of the world. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know the gentleman is a strong supporter of it. Indeed, it is a program that does incredible things for students that has a proven record.

Unfortunately, once again, the President's fiscal year 2016 budget did not support the program. There were no funds requested. As a result, the committee provided an additional $25 million in fiscal year 2016 to restore funding for the program.

However, I can't support an amendment that would cut the Army's operations, the maintenance accounts, to pay for it. This account provides funding for critical training, operations, maintenance, and readiness programs. After over a decade of war, restoring readiness is one of the key objectives of our bill this year.

We need to have soldiers who are ready and able to respond to contingency. It is a top priority in our bill for the Army and for us. While I appreciate the gentleman's intent, I cannot support his amendment, reluctantly.

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

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

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. 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 California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $40,548,338,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,055,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $5,338,793,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance

of the Air Force, as authorized by law, $36,094,484,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $30,182,187,000: *Provided*, That not more than $15,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $35,045,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That $9,031,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, 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 with the intent of bolstering funds for a worthwhile program in the National Guard that assists with securing our southwest border.

In my State of Arizona, we are under attack. The Arizona border is a main thoroughfare for the black market and trafficking. Guns, money, drugs, and people are smuggled over the border at an alarming rate. Once the smugglers make it to Interstate 10 in Tucson, they can make easier runs to Phoenix, Los Angeles, and beyond.

Let's be clear, the Guard's southwest border mission has bipartisan support. Even President Obama supported this program during his time in the White House. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois seek recognition?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise to ask which of the three amendments I have before me is the one that we are now considering in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOSAR. 107.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I have got it.

Thank you very much.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment once again.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies, and those narrow authorizations are prescribed in title 10, chapter 18 of the United States Code. In sum, they act to support law enforcement efforts, but they do not direct them.

Finally, I will remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was offered last year by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), and the amendment was accepted by voice vote. This amendment today seeks to achieve the same goal. The amendment is offset by a reduction to the defensewide operations and maintenance account, $30.2 billion account.

Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas are all struggling. We are in desperate need of expertise and support at our southwestern border. If you support efforts to secure the border and interdict illegal trafficking in guns, money, drugs, and humans, including sex slaves, then you should support this amendment.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their tireless efforts to prioritize resources in this bill.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time, but I am in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the Representative from Arizona has firsthand knowledge of the value of the southwest border mission, and I support his amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman for accepting my 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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,500,000) (increased by $5,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for providing $212 million for suicide prevention outreach programs, $20 million above the President's request.

I am offering this amendment with my colleagues, Representatives PALLONE, SMITH, LOBIONDO, GARRETT, LANCE, SIRES, PAYNE, MACARTHUR, NORCROSS, and WATSON COLEMAN, to continue support and funding for the successful confidential peer-to-peer Vets4Warriors program, a Pentagon-funded call center operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care that provides troops struggling with depression and other psychological or emotional concerns support by veterans.

Despite the troubling increase in Active Duty military suicides after 9/11, the Defense Department announced last month it would stop funding the Vets4Warriors program, which has provided valuable assistance to reduce these incidents.

Through Vets4Warriors, servicemembers have been able to find confidential assistance from peers who share lived experiences and who can quickly connect and listen in highly effective ways. Since December 2011, the program has had over 130,000 contacts.

The Defense Department's plan to integrate these services into the Military OneSource without a public process is concerning because we know that many servicemembers are reluctant to contact superiors for assistance with mental health needs. Military OneSource is only billed as available to veterans and their families within 180 days after leaving the service.

Vets4Warriors provides a deep place for veterans to seek help outside the Defense Department. We believe removing funding for this program is shortsighted. This move will also result in the layoff of approximately 30 well-trained, talented veterans who have been providing support services around the clock. We want the Defense Department to use this funding to fully fund the Vets4Warriors program, ensuring our troops receive the best mental health resources available.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to support your amendment.

I think all of us are particularly shocked that they would shut something down in our home State that actually serves the rest of the Nation. They enjoy a good reputation. It sort of falls into the category of ''what were they thinking?''

We appreciate your standing for the Vets4Warriors.

Mr. LANCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. PASCRELL for his leadership on this issue, as he has led on so many other issues. I also thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN. It is due to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's leadership on this legislation that we stand well-equipped to keep our Nation safe and secure.

The Vets4Warriors program has saved lives in New Jersey. It has made a great difference during very challenging times for servicemen and servicewomen. Their peers offer support and a friendly ear at a time when it matters most. Their voices of encouragement, friendship, and support on the other end of the telephone remind our brave heroes of their great potential, the love of a grateful nation, and what they can accomplish in their lives.

The program has been proven effective. Thousands of veterans have received critical care and assistance. It works and it should be maintained. The statistics on veterans' suicides are heartbreaking, but programs like Vets4Warriors are the types of efforts that we can implement to make a lasting difference.

I thank Lloyd Deans of Bridgewater, New Jersey, and the district I serve for his support and leadership in this area, and for fighting for this program and for being a great friend and resource to other veterans.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

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:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Page 36, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 303, 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 too am offering an amendment to bolster suicide prevention programs. I rise to offer an amendment which would provide additional resources for mental health programs for our Nation's servicemembers. Traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder have been consistently contributing to behavioral issues with our veterans, and all too often these ongoing mental health issues result in suicide. With an average of 18 to 20 veteran suicides per day, more resources are desperately needed.

The DOD is already an expansive bureaucracy, and I appreciate the work of the committee to prioritize resources and to provide appropriation levels for the defensewide operations and maintenance that are actually lower than those in fiscal year 2015.

My amendment takes a relatively small amount from that account—$1.5 million out of a $30.2 billion budget. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the amendment would have no impact on budget authority or outlays.

Too many of our men and women in uniform are struggling with traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of serving in combat. If you support improved mental health for our servicemembers, you should support this amendment. Let's prevent future suicides amongst our troops and ensure they are getting the help they need. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I strongly admire the advocacy on behalf of suicide prevention by the gentleman from Arizona. It is very needed, but I insist on my point of order because the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the level of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,463,000)''.

Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Maryland and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I want to start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for their unwavering support of our national defense and our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the funding for a program called Fisher House from $5 million to $10 million, and it funds that increase by reducing the amount in the operation and maintenance account by $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Fisher House is a very successful and very well-regarded nonprofit with a single mission, which is to provide free housing and lodging to families of veterans. The facilities are located near veterans hospitals and military hospitals in VA facilities.

The purpose of this housing is to allow the families of veterans to be with their loved ones, the servicemen or -women who have served our country and are receiving medical care at one of these facilities. Mr. Chairman, we know how important that is for the families and for the loved ones, but we know in particular how important that is for our veterans when they are receiving care incurred in the service to our great Nation for them to have their families with them.

The Fisher House program has been in business for 25 years, and they have been a proven and exceptional steward of taxpayer money. They operate 65 facilities all around the country. Again, these facilities are near military hospitals or a veterans facility.

They operate to a very high standard. They have a deep pipeline of new facilities that they want to build. Unfortunately, there is a great need for these facilities, which is why we are proposing to increase their funding from $5 million to $10 million.

I have introduced this amendment for the past 3 years. It has enjoyed bipartisan support. This year, it also has the support of the gentlewoman from Michigan.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and for his leadership on this critically important issue. I rise in very strong support of this amendment.

For many years, I have worked with hospitalized veterans and their families who have often had to travel far from home to get treatment and have seen what the Fisher House has done. The Fisher House Foundation does wonders in being a home away from home during very difficult times for our veterans and their families.

As Congress continues to address veterans issues, it is critical that their families also have support systems in place and a safe place to stay while the veterans are receiving treatment.

We should be building more Fisher House facilities across the country. We are currently trying to put one in Michigan and, as I explored that public-private partnership, discovered that there is more than a 5-year wait in that pipeline. This bill isn't a silver bullet, but it would help reduce that timeline.

I want to thank my good friend Congressman DELANEY for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition and will use that time to say that I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Fisher House Foundation does incredible work. Both my predecessors, Mr. Murtha and Mr. Young, were strong supporters.

Just for the record, my bill already includes an additional $5 million for the Department as a grant to the Fisher House Foundation and allows each service to transfer up to $11 million for Fisher House operations, so each of our services recognizes the incredible private contribution and also the U.S. taxpayer contribution.

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

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his support and, once again, thank him for his singular leadership and for his insights into the importance of the Fisher House program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can build, as the gentlewoman from Michigan said, more Fisher House facilities to allow the family members of our veterans to be with them at this great time of need.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000) (increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me to offer this amendment to this year's Defense Appropriations bill to establish and reestablish the Commission to assess the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attack, which was authorized in the House-passed FY16 NDAA.

Mr. Chairman, as your committee knows so very well, the United States faces many threats and challenges today, perhaps more than ever before in her history. One of those threats is the reliance across all critical infrastructure sectors on an aging and highly vulnerable electric grid.

As the GAO reported, the Department of Defense relies upon that very same electric grid for 99 percent of its electricity needs within the continental United States without which it cannot effect its mission.

The previous EMP Commission stated that a collapse of large portions of the electrical system will result in significant periods of power outage and loss of significant portions of that system.

Should the electrical power system be lost for any substantial period of time, the consequences are likely to be catastrophic to civilian society. They concluded that negative impacts on the electrical infrastructure are certain in an EMP event unless practical steps are taken to provide protection for critical elements of the electrical system.

The Commission must be established, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that research into addressing these vulnerabilities continues within the Department of Defense to enable practical steps to actually secure and harden the grid. The House Armed Services Committee has already acted this year and authorized $2 million to reestablish the Commission.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that these funds are appropriated as well.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman brings up a huge issue, EMP, electromagnetic pulse. I accept the amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman very much.

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. FRANKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my amendment would transfer $1 million from the Secretary's some $30 billion general operation and maintenance fund to lung cancer research under the Defense Health Program.

I would like to begin by thanking Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for the additional funds that have already been placed into the legislation for cancer research. My amendment is presented out of the hope that we can still do better and get us back to a point where we were some years ago.

I know $1 million won't make but a dent in the Secretary's general operating fund, but it would make an enormous difference—an enormous difference—in battling lung cancer, a disease that already affects many of our military men and women and kills over 159,000 Americans every year.

As many of you know, my daughter, Katherine, a young mother of four, ages 9 to 16, was diagnosed with nonsmoking lung cancer earlier this year. I would be remiss if I didn't thank my many colleagues for their prayers and their good will and all their expressions of hope and concern and thank the committee for the money that they have provided here for medical research because, make no mistake about it, the combined prayers, good will, and medical research have provided Katherine and her family and her friends and many people throughout this country with hope for their recovery.

We have come a long way, and we are getting very close to discovering a cure for this and many of the other cancers that so tragically take the lives of our loved ones.

It is my hope that with this amendment, we can do a little bit better, get us a little bit closer to that cure, and give people going forward the same hope that my daughter, Katherine, has been able to receive as a result of these prayers and this research.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and ask for its support.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, formed in 1993, the Youth ChalleNGe is a 17-month program run by individual State National Guards. Its mission is to give troubled youth a second chance and addresses our Nation's dropout rate by providing them the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma.

Youth ChalleNGe has transformed the lives of over 120,000 young people since 1993 and has expanded to 35 sites in 27 States, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—young people like Tatiana Zambrano, a 2011 Puerto Rico ChalleNGe Academy graduate, who with the help of Youth ChalleNGe overcame much adversity to gain admission to Valparaiso University from which she graduated last month. Society may have given up on these young people, but Youth ChalleNGe hasn't.

Along with my colleague, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, we have written letters and offered amendments in support of Youth ChalleNGe and have been buoyed by its successful intervention over the last number of years, the program seeks now to expand its help into California, Georgia, North Carolina, and Texas, but that requires $25 million above the funding level.

□ 1730

Our amendment doesn't go to that level. Instead, we hope that we can ask for just a modest $5 million amount for Youth ChalleNGe to carry out its modest expansion of this program to reach at-risk children. It has proven to be a cost-effective investment.

We thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his staff for their efforts and their interest in this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), my co-chair of the Youth ChalleNGe Caucus.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my colleague who is the co-chair on the Congressional National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Caucus—bipartisan, may I add—to help our throwaway kids. They are 16- to 18-year-olds who have fallen through the cracks, so we work in a bipartisan manner to ensure that some of these youngsters have a second chance.

We thank the Appropriations Committee for the funding increase over President Obama's 2016 request of $145 million.

The 2016 Defense Appropriations will fund the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program at $150 million, with the current funding of $135 million. As my colleague has stated, this amendment increases by $5 million the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program to $155 million, and it reduces the operation and maintenance, defensewide account by the same amount. It helps to start new programs in four States. Each new program is $4 million. The California third program will cost $10 million to $15 million due to the Superfund site.

It is critical for hundreds of youth who are dropouts to have the same options to be able to have a second chance. The ChalleNGe program has graduated, as was stated, over 120,000 nationally. It is voluntary, free, with no cost to the child or to his or her family. It is a 22½-week residential boot camp program that is led by the National Guard cadre. It also prepares them to reenter society and to be successful, to build employment potential, and to return to school. A 2012 RAND study finds, for every dollar spent, it results in a return of $2.66 to the taxpayer.

It is rated as the best youth program in the Nation. It effectively addresses part of our Nation's dropout epidemic on a small level. It is beneficial to business, communities, and the Nation's ability to compete in our future economy. We need more programs, not fewer. More than 12,000 applicants are rejected due to no space, so we ask our colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is all about just trying to help these young kids get a second chance. By expanding this program as we are doing, which is a modest expansion to reach into some other States, we know we are going to reach some other lives that society has given up on. I don't want to give up on them, and I don't think our Nation wants to give up on them. This is a chance to do it, and I thank the committee for its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I would just point out to all of my colleagues that we are on page 9 of a 163-page bill. This bill deals with the national security of this country. It contains $578,656,000,000, and we have already received two amendments that have been offered on the floor that were not made available to us. I would hope that this does not continue to be a practice during the coming debate on the remainder of the bill given the gravity of the bill, the subject matter, and the amendments, themselves.

I would ask all of the Members to have the courtesy to make sure both the majority and the minority have their amendments in a timely fashion and, certainly, before we begin 5 minutes of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. I would ask for that civility on behalf of all of the Members.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,300,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $21,300,000)''.

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, we all agree that the Department of Defense has the responsibility to defend our Nation, but the Department also has a responsibility to clean up after itself when it contaminates our environment or threatens public health, and we in Congress have a responsibility to give the military the money it needs for that cleanup.

The amendment I offer adds $21.3 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program.

I plan to withdraw the amendment out of respect for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee, which actually added $25 million to the FUDS program above the President's budget request. Yet I want to make the point that we ought to keep the funding at the same level we appropriated in fiscal year 2015, which was $250 million, and that is what my amendment would do, because now is not the time for the military to backslide on its cleanup.

There are 5,000 sites—in every State and territory—that we know are contaminated, and these sites are not in someone else's backyard. There are 87 of the Formerly Used Defense Sites in Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's State of New Jersey, and there are 42 FUDS sites in Ranking Member VISCLOSKY's State of Indiana.

In the district I represent, which is the Northern Mariana Islands, there are 24 contaminated areas, dating back to World War II, that are still waiting to be cleaned up. For example, there are 17 rusted fuel tanks in the little village of Tanapag that have been leaking oil into the ground since Harry Truman was President, and, every day, there are kids who are walking by on their way to school; there are fishermen in the lagoon just a few feet away; and there are families who are living with the smell of oil in their homes.

This is not just an environmental issue. This unfinished cleanup damages our military's ability to defend our Nation. Let me explain.

In the Northern Mariana Islands today, the Defense Department wants to expand training activities—using live fire, running pipelines, building more fuel tanks—doing the very things we know contaminate the environment and threaten public health. The people I represent are saying ''no'' to this expanded military activity.

Now, restoring FUDS funding will not change anyone's mind about the military's proposed buildup in my district, but at least the military will have a little more credibility when it promises that it will clean up after itself because, if the people I represent see Congress cutting funding for FUDS, then the military's promise has no credibility at all.

This is not just about the Northern Mariana Islands. This is a national issue. We have 5,000 sites currently identified for cleanup nationwide and another 10,000 on the list of potentially contaminated sites. Even if we appropriate $250 million for 2016, it is not enough. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates a full cleanup cost of $14 billion. So, at $250 million a year, we will still be having this same discussion 50 years from now.

Again, I commend the chairman and his subcommittee for adding the $25 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program, but, ultimately, we all have to do better.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement before the floor and for his bringing the issue to the Members' attention.

As you frankly point out, not only for the constituency you represent but whether it was in any of our districts, as you also rightfully point out, this is a national problem. It tends to be forgotten because it is not seen visually by the average constituent. It is a very serious health and environmental problem, and I do appreciate your raising it during this particular debate.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote.

Veterans of the first gulf war suffered from persistent symptoms, including chronic headaches, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, debilitating fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medicine or by psychiatric diagnoses.

Research shows that, as veterans from the first gulf war age, they are twice as likely to develop Lou Gehrig's disease as are their nondeployed peers. There also may be connections to multiple sclerosis and to Parkinson's disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for this lifelong pain and affliction that these veterans must endure through this disease.

For decades, the Veterans Health Administration has downplayed any neurological basis for the disease, but recent research has shown unequivocally that this disease is biological in nature. The time has come for us to right the wrong that our servicemen and -women have had to live with now for over 20 years. In this Department of Defense Appropriations bill, we allocate more money for breast cancer, orthopaedic, and prostate cancer research than we do for finding a cure for Gulf War Illness. Equivalent funds are appropriated for ovarian cancer research.

I think if we are going to spend money on medical research within the Department of Defense, which I am in favor of, the Department must adequately fund research on those diseases that originate in war and wholly affect our servicemen and -women. Over a quarter of a million veterans display symptoms of this disease, and the time has come to find and to fund a cure for it.

The offset for my amendment today comes from the $30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the gulf war veterans, who put it all on the line and are paying for that with a lifetime of pain, are not left behind. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help find a cure for the Gulf War Illness.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for prostate cancer research by $10 million under the Defense Health Program.

Prostate cancer is the second-most commonly diagnosed cancer in men and is the second-most common cause of a man's death. In 2015, approximately 220,800 men in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer, and an estimated 27,540 will die from it.

The Prostate Cancer Research Program is a unique research program in that it prioritizes research that will lead to the elimination of death from prostate cancer while enhancing the well-being of men who are experiencing the impact of that disease.

To date, the Prostate Cancer Research Program has resulted in a total appropriation of over $1.3 billion, including $80 million last year. This unique partnership among the military, prostate cancer survivors, clinicians, and scientists has changed the landscape of biomedical study, energizing the research community in conducting high-risk investigations that are more collaborative, innovative, and impactful on prostate cancer.

This increase would result in a total funding level of $90 million, which is still $10 million below what this account was funded at in 2001, more than a decade ago. The offset for my amendment comes from the $30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account.

This amendment passed the House by a voice vote last year and as part of an en bloc amendment the year before. I hope that we will all agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his previous amendment, which I supported,

and also for this amendment, which supports greater funds for prostate cancer research.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of history, my predecessor died from prostate cancer, and, of course, around this room and around the country, we know too many men who haven't done what they should do to look after their health and, therefore, the welfare of their families.

□ 1745

I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy in this area and also remind those who are on the Hill that I think next week the House will be sponsoring a screening for all men here. It is a good way not only to look after yourself, but the people who love you. I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy on an annual basis and thank him for yielding the time. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I reclaim my time.

I want to thank the chairman for his kind and insightful words, and I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in making sure that the healthcare needs of those who serve are met.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Alzheimer's disease is a threat to our country—not a direct threat like ISIS or al Qaeda, but it is an insidious, persistent threat to the minds and bodies of our family members and to the fiscal health of our country.

The Alzheimer's Association estimates that the cost of caring for people with Alzheimer's right now through the Medicare system is $226 billion. By the year 2050, it will be $1.1 trillion. This is a genuine budgetary threat. If it grows unchecked, the cost to Medicare from a single disease will zap our ability to pay for national security. Interestingly enough and timely enough, on the front page of USA Today is a story that reads how 15 percent of seniors account for nearly one-half of Medicare spending.

We also have an epidemic among our soldiers. It is called traumatic brain injury, known as the signature wound of veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq. It affects our soldiers at a much higher rate than the civilian population, and the VA projects its 10-year costs at $2.2 billion.

TBI is also closely linked to Alzheimer's. For 30 years, we have known about a clear correlation between TBI and the risk of developing Alzheimer's disease and other types of dementia. By researching the link between TBI and Alzheimer's, we can help cure both.

I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the funding for the Peer Reviewed Alzheimer's Research Program from $12 million to its presequestration levels of $15 million, but the funding for Alzheimer's research in the United States is still underresourced.

Today, I am offering this amendment to increase the funding for the Peer Reviewed Program by $5 million, which would take it up to $20 million. This modest investment on the front end in research can eventually yield billions in savings in the future on the cost of care. That is why I urge my colleagues to support our servicemembers with TBI and Alzheimer's and vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKAI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000) (increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Hawaii and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would first like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Our bipartisan amendment would increase DOD's supplemental impact aid to $55 million, $25 million more than appropriated in the bill currently. This would benefit schools in almost every school district that hold a military installation. Schools that had 20 percent average daily attendance of military-dependent students in the preceding year as counted on their Federal impact aid application are eligible to receive funding on an annual basis.

Congress has recognized the needs faced by many school districts educating a large number of military children and has consistently provided increases in this aid; yet last year, in fiscal year 2015, this funding was dropped from $45 million to $25 million. This is not enough. With the stress put on military kids throughout the past years, this aid should be increasing, not decreasing.

The education of a military child is a military readiness issue. The men and women serving in the military today have to rely on local school districts to provide quality education and counseling programs for their students and children.

Earlier this year, a letter signed by many Members of this Congress and endorsed by multiple organizations asking for this critical program to be fully supported at $50 million for DOD impact aid, with $5 million for children of military families with severe disabilities, was sent to the House Committee on Appropriations. As we know, we have to offset any funding increase for one program with another if we play by the rules, and I have done so with this amendment.

Our amendment is fully offset by using funding from an Office of the Secretary of Defense servicewide administration account, O&M defensewide. The children are our future, and many that grow up in our military families today will be the military leaders of our future. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment is designed specifically to support the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and to dramatically improve their quality of life while they are deployed.

On a daily basis, the United Service Organizations, USO, reaches United States military members in numerous ways. They provide calling cards at deployed locations for servicemembers to call their families. They provide toiletries and necessities for deployed servicemembers and those in austere locations. They are the first persons to

welcome back redeploying servicemembers. They volunteer to run morale and welfare tents offering Internet connectivity for deployed locations. Connecting troops to their families through calling cards and the Internet is just part of the USO's 40-plus program repertoire, but it is incredibly important to our deployed men and women and to their spouses, parents, siblings, and children.

In an era where our servicemembers are fighting prolonged wars, connecting them to their families and friends back home is a service to our military that we cannot afford to underfund. In fact, 93 percent of troops surveyed in 2012 agreed that USO services boost morale, ease separation from friends and family, and convey a feeling of support to the servicemember. Unfortunately, however, our deployed servicemembers too often go to the USO tent only to find that USO provisions, including supplies and calling cards, have run out. Increasing funding to the USO will help alleviate this unacceptable problem.

In the proposed fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill, the USO is funded at just $20 million. This amendment will reduce the operations and maintenance defensewide account by less than one two-thousandths, while having an immeasurable impact on the quality of life of our servicemen and -women.

It is past time that we direct sufficient funds to the quality of life of the men and women that sacrifice everything to defend our Nation. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to salute the dean of the House for his strong support of the USO. Over 40 years ago, I was one of those soldiers, and it made a real difference in my life.

All of us want to thank the gentleman for his significant leadership here over so many years and for choosing this incredibly wonderful organization to plus up.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the chairman.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. We haven't received a copy of the amendment. We would like to see a copy of the amendment if that would be possible. That is the reason for the reservation.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to add an additional $1 million for research and development for Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Duchenne muscular dystrophy is the most common lethal genetic disorder affecting American children today.

□ 1800

It is a progressive neuromuscular disorder that affects approximately 1 in every 3,500 boys or 200,000 babies born each year worldwide. Over time, patients experience severe loss of muscle strength and control.

Most boys diagnosed with Duchenne lose their ability to walk by the time they become teenagers. There is no known cure for Duchenne, and life expectancies for individuals with this disease are significantly shortened. Many do not live past their 21st birthday.

Like many of my colleagues, I have met with many Duchenne patients and their families and have seen the impact this disease has and what it imparts on their daily lives.

There have been very promising advances in recent years, including development of a new drug which has achieved success in early clinical trials. I have had one child in my district confined to a wheelchair who, under this clinical trial, is able to walk by himself currently. However, much more work needs to be done to find a cure for this disease and to better understand what causes Duchenne in the first place.

This amendment will directly benefit the thousands of Duchenne patients throughout the United States, as well as their countless loved ones who care for them every day. By increasing funding for peer-reviewed research, institutions across the country will have additional resources necessary to make progress on eliminating this devastating disease.

We as a nation are on the cusp of historic progress in advancing critical research. Now is the time to recommit to robust support of our country's biomedical research for this disease.

In closing, I would like to thank the countless physicians, researchers, and scientists who work tirelessly to find a cure for Duchenne. I would also like to thank the Jett Foundation, which has long been a national leader in increasing awareness and providing support for patients and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I thank the chair and ranking member for their consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order. We are doing a little more homework on the amendment. Certainly, I am supportive of it.

I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I understand the gentleman's concern is the lack of the copy of the amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think we wanted to make sure we have the figures that go with what it is set against.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make sure it comports to the rule of the House. We are not against it. We just want to make sure it is in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. We had moved this with a later change to the defensewide operations and maintenance fund for the pay-for for this; that probably explains this balance, but it is coming from that portion. The $1 million, I think, is in excess, if my memory is correct, of the $3.5 million that is already there.

We are able to leverage this for a greater opportunity to move quickly on this. That is the rationale. That is where it came from.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I check the figures to make sure that it is properly offset, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. KEATING. I would just like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman, if that information is currently being analyzed now.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield, there is some consultation going on at the desk. At the conclusion of those consultations with the Parliamentarian, I will have a better opportunity to respond in, hopefully, a more positive fashion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the chairman for the effort he is going through and the consideration he is giving with this.

Many times, we have the opportunity to talk to families and deal with issues. In this particular instance, we have an opportunity. As I mentioned, we are right on the cusp of very significant research. Leveraging a small additional

amount now would have tremendous ramifications.

I was just completely struck by the fact that I saw a person—a young boy in his teens, confined to a wheelchair, like so many of those afflicted with this terrible disease have had to suffer through, and as a result of those clinical trials, to see that person no longer in a wheelchair and up and ambulatory and walking, those are the type of dramatic improvements we are on the cusp of right now.

That is why this amendment just seeks to get an incremental increase with that because I think it would be leveraged and have enormous significance as a result.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I continue to reserve, let me compliment the gentleman on his amendment, as we do further investigation on the offsets.

Medical research for diseases that affect our military members and their families are a priority of our committee; you can be sure of that. That is why our bill includes $3.2 million, again, this year for the Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Research Program.

The committee has provided, which I think would be of interest, more than $43 million for this research area since fiscal year 2003, and you have alluded to it, but research breakthroughs in this area will only help those suffering from this debilitating disease, but will also help research in other various muscular and motor neuron diseases.

I think the research is absolutely essential, and I think we are closer to a resolution of the issue that would allow me to withdraw my reservation. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

I would be happy to withdraw my reservation of the point of order and support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his indulgence and patience and the good work he has done in this respect, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,644,274,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $999,621,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $276,761,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,815,862,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $6,731,119,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $6,605,400,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $14,078,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $234,829,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and their staff because I have worked on this in past appropriations and had the privilege of receiving the support of both the chair and the ranking member on the question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I heard the chairman mention both Chairman Young and Chairman Murtha. Over the years, I have had the privilege of working with them on this question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I just want to use a little anecdote, particularly as it relates to Vietnam vets. Many of us remember Vietnam vets coming back and, some long years later, getting a better understanding of Agent Orange. I remember a Vietnam vet telling me about it, but as he indicated, they mentioned it or spoke about it or tried to explain it when they came back directly from Vietnam.

It was a long time before the understanding came about Agent Orange, and in years going forward, there was great medical care needed, medical costs needed, because those veterans had been suffering for a long time.

We now understand post-traumatic stress disorder; and, as I look over the landscape of the last years of war, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, about 11 to 20 out of every 100 veterans, or 11 to 20 percent, who served have post-traumatic stress disorder in any given year.

In the Gulf war, Operation Desert Storm, about 12 out of every 100 Gulf

war veterans who still live have PTSD in any given year. In the Vietnam war, about 15 out of every 100 Vietnam vets, or 15 percent, are currently diagnosed with PTSD. In a recent study in the late 1980s, the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study stated that it is estimated about 30 out of every 100.

Other factors contribute to it, and, if you listen to individuals who have PTSD, they seek to be part of a normal life and to work and survive and provide for their families.

My amendment is simple. It adds an extra $1 million to increase funding for PTSD. These funds will be used to outreach activities targeting hard-to-reach veterans, especially those who are homeless and reside in underserved urban and rural areas who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

I had the privilege a couple of years ago to provide a PTSD facility that was offsite of a veterans hospital in a small, community-based hospital. Mr. Chairman, the response from veterans was amazing because they were able to come to an offsite location for counseling in PTSD.

We know that the tragedies of war last with men and women for a very long time. I am hoping that my colleagues will support this amendment again to ease the trauma of the thoughts that these men and women have, the nightmares when they sleep, because they really want to be—as they are—contributing members of society.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me commend the gentlewoman for your strong advocacy.

Just for the record, our bill does provide $155 million, including a plus up of $1 million above the request level of $55 million, for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

Additionally, our bill includes $676 million in operation and maintenance funding within the Department of Health program to care for servicemembers affected by TBI and psychological health injuries.

We welcome the additional money; we accept your amendment, and I commend you for your efforts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reclaiming my time, I applaud the compassion that the chairman and the ranking member have had in the writing of this legislation, highlighting several very important points needed for our servicemen and -women, and I am grateful for the support of the additional resources, continuing the advocacy for them.

In closing, let me thank this Congress for the wounded warrior that I have in my office. He is someone who suffers from PTSD. He has been an excellent staff person in reaching out to the veterans throughout my community.

He is an example of the fact that, when you have treatment, you can be part of contributing to society, as they all want to be, even with some of the challenges they have.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is virtually identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted in last year's Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 2685).

My amendment increases funding for the PTSD by $1,000,000. These funds should be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas, who suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images that American servicemen and women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war see on a daily basis.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face. Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning. And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep. These are called flashbacks. A person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD. These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

My amendment recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human. They carry their experiences with them.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

My amendment will help ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

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

□ 1815

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $300,000,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,290,000)''.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,290,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 303, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be offering and then withdrawing this amendment because of a point of order on the timing of the budget outlays that we are not able to reconcile at this point in time.

But I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, for their leadership.

Now, this is an important amendment though. My amendment would protect from possible cancellation an innovative program that promises to provide a breakthrough capability for a very small amount of money.

Right now, if Iran or North Korea launches a ballistic missile attack on our homeland, we, unfortunately, have no enhanced way of knowing whether or not our defensive missiles actually hit the target or not.

That is why the Missile Defense Agency is executing a promising and groundbreaking space sensor system called Space-Based Kill Assessment.

The U.S. desperately needs improved sensors in space to provide tracking, discrimination, and more. A robust, multimission space sensor network will be vital to ensuring a strong missile defense program. Without this, we might otherwise waste extremely expensive ground-based interceptors, costing the taxpayer more money, and depleting our limited number of interceptors.

The Space-based Kill Assessment program cannot survive a 50 percent cut. Program cancellation may result, and it would waste taxpayer dollars already invested and would also fail to meet congressional intent to have an initial operating kill assessment capability by 2019.

This experiment, up until today, has had zero scheduling delays since it was conceived in fiscal year 2014.

Finally, this program is a great example of the cost savings and other benefits the government can leverage through commercially-hosted satellite payloads. This program, and other similar efforts, are critical to ensuring that the United States stays ahead of future ballistic missile threats.

I would hope that this amendment would have been adopted because it would take money from a lower priority fund and put it into critical ballistic missile defense against our homeland.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Allow me to commend the gentleman from Colorado for pointing up the value of what he talks about here. And let me promise to him that I am sure I will be working very closely with Mr. VISCLOSKY to see what we can do to elevate our investment and our knowledge and support for this program.

I do appreciate your willingness to withdraw the amendment and regret that the outlay issue somewhat has complicated matters on the floor this evening.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's words, and I will certainly work with him on that effort.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $368,131,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $8,232,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $228,717,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $103,266,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components, and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, $358,496,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $84,140,000.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,336,971,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,160,482,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private

plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,805,773,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000) (increased by $100,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would direct the Army to prioritize the modernization of the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet.

The Army maintains a program to modify and standardize its Bradley Fleet to two digital configurations, the M2A3 and the M2A2 ODS–SA. These two variants are the most advanced versions of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and provide our soldiers significant improvements in survivability and force protection.

These upgrades feature advanced digitized electronics to provide troops with optimal situational awareness, network connectivity, and enhanced communication hardware within the heavy brigade combat team.

Almost all units within the Active Army components and prepositioned stocks are fielded with these digital configurations. Unfortunately, there are still National Guard units that have not yet received these upgrades and are fielded with obsolete, nonstandard, nondigital M2A2 Operation Desert Storm variants.

Maintaining these outdated vehicles within the National Guard will severely restrict our servicemembers' ability to maintain proficiency in the technical requirements necessary to operate the advanced digital Bradleys utilized in combat operations.

This will result in significant degradation of combat effectiveness of these units and poses a significant risk to units who deploy with the older Bradley variant, or train on the older variant but fall in on the newer models in theater.

Furthermore, servicemembers within these units will face significant and unnecessary challenges in maintaining their Military Occupational Specialty qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, the Army has an existing program of record for the remanufacturing of Bradley vehicles to attain updated digital configurations. It exists within the President's budget under Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Vehicles: Bradley Modifications.

This year's budget request includes $225 million for Bradley modifications. Unfortunately, none of these funds were designated for the Bradley Fighting Vehicles digital upgrades. In fact, the President's budget does not provide funding for these upgrades over the entire FYDP.

So it is unclear whether or not these Operation Desert Storm-era Bradley vehicles will ever receive the upgrades necessary to make them combat effective or adequate training platforms. It is for this reason I am offering this amendment.

My amendment would designate and fence off $100 million of the $1.8 billion under the Army's procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles accounts to prioritize and upgrade the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet. This is 0.005 percent of the total appropriation.

The $100 million is less than half of what is necessary to upgrade the remaining nondigital, nonstandard variants, but it is an important step to ensuring that the combat formations within our National Guard maintain the combat effectiveness and readiness they have attained over the last decade.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I very much regret that I rise in opposition to the amendment, knowing what a strong supporter of our national defense the gentleman from Nevada is and what a strong supporter he is of the National Guard, not only across the Nation, but in his own State. And I regret even more so since we have been talking about this for several weeks. I feel badly that I have to rise.

The amendment, as the gentleman has stated, directs the Secretary of the Army to repurpose approximately one-half of the $225 million in the budget request that was requested and included for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle Upgrade Program.

The amendment would direct the Army to revise the schedule for the Bradley Upgrade Program by accelerating the schedule for providing more modern Bradley Fighting Vehicles to the 1st Squadron of the 221st Armored Cavalry of the Nevada National Guard, which I am sure is most deserving because, as he said, they have the oldest of the oldest.

Having said that, the schedule change would disrupt, as I am advised, a carefully synchronized plan for Abrams Tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle modernization and would cause production breaks at both manufacturing lines.

The production break would also add significant startup costs to the Bradley Engineering Change Proposal 2. In other words, this amendment would throw out of balance the Army-wide armor modernization plans and drive up costs in order for one squadron of one State's Guard forces to receive more modern vehicles.

As you can tell, Mr. Chairman, from my rather convoluted response, I am prepared to work with the gentleman from Nevada to assist him, but at this point, I need to regretfully oppose his amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman's offer to work with the gentleman as we proceed but would associate myself with the chairman's concerns relative to the amendment that has been offered and, particularly, with an emphasis to the break in production, which I think is a very serious issue.

So I do want to associate myself with the chairman's concerns and objection that he has raised, but again, his willingness to work with the gentleman in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I do recommend a ''no'' vote, but I certainly make a, I hope, valid offer to work with the gentleman because I know that he is going to be working on me to make sure that this occurs, and I want to be helpful to him. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Thank you both, Mr. Chairman and ranking member, for your offer to work with me to try to rectify the situation where we have an important National Guard unit that is dealing with and working with Desert Storm-era Bradley Fighting Vehicles and, yet, expected to be ready to deploy on to the newer materiel in theater should they ever be called.

With your assurance to work with me on this effort, I appreciate that.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private

plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,007,778,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,230,677,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,871,819,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $2,998,541,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $559,141,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $1,559,977,000;

Carrier Replacement Program (AP-CY), $874,658,000;

Virginia Class Submarine, $3,346,370,000;

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,971,840,000;

CVN Refueling Overhaul, $637,588,000;

CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP), $14,951,000;

DDG–091000 Program, $433,404,000;

DDG–0951 Destroyer, $3,012,904,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,347,411,000;

LPD–0917, $550,000,000;

Afloat Forward Staging Base, $635,000,000;

LHA Replacement (AP-CY), $277,543,000;

TAO Fleet Oiler, $674,190,000;

Moored Training Ship (AP), $138,200,000;

Ship to Shore Connector, $255,630,000;

Service Craft, $30,014,000;

YP Craft Maintenance ROH/SLEP, $21,838,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $80,738,000; and

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $601,008,000.

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $389,305,000.

In all: $16,852,569,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, of which $389,305,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, to fund completion of prior year shipbuilding programs: *Provided*, That amounts made available for prior year shipbuilding programs may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available for such purposes in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2020, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $6,696,715,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $973,084,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $14,224,475,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading for F-35A Joint Strike Fighter airframes and contractor furnished equipment, no more than the amount necessary to fully fund procurement of 36 airframes and associated contractor furnished equipment may be obligated until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense has accepted Autonomic Logistics Information System equipment that meets requirements to support a declaration of Air Force initial operating capability for the Joint Strike Fighter.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $2,334,165,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $1,935,034,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and

accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $253,496,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $15,098,950,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $35,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $49,000,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 303, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment, and I will later withdraw that amendment.

The amendment I am offering today is a simple, commonsense amendment that fulfills a critical need for our Air National Guard, who stand watch while performing the 24/7 Aerospace Control Alert mission as diligently today as they have after the attacks on 9/11. This mission is carried out by several Guard units across the country, including the 180th Fighter Wing in Toledo, Ohio, whom I have the great honor to represent, and by the D.C. Air National Guard, who are less than 15 miles away from this Capitol. These servicemen and -women also serve in combat theater operations overseas when they are called upon and play a vital role in fighting foreign threats.

This amendment would provide funding for an additional ARC–210 or equivalent radio in the Air National Guard's F–16s. These radios have a capability for secure line-of-sight and beyond line-of-sight communication, providing the ability to securely communicate with ground forces and command and control. However, one radio in the aircraft does not allow for the simultaneous contact with them.

Currently, Air National Guard F–16s only have one ARC–210 radio that works on an ultrahigh frequency band, and it is this band that most command and control and air traffic control agencies use. An additional second radio will simultaneously allow Air National Guard F–16s to communicate with command and control agencies and coalition troops on the ground in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and dense threat environments.

Members of the Air National Guard, along with fulfilling their duties of protecting our borders against those who wish to do us harm, also deploy with our Active Duty military, side by side, on the front lines in overseas conflicts. In fact, the request to have these additional radios comes from the combat commanders in such theaters around the world. So not only is this needed at home, but also abroad. The Air National Guard designates the need to have this capability as ''critical.''

My offset for this amendment is the Defense Rapid Innovation program, a program intended to take off-the-shelf technology and put it in the hands of the warfighter as soon as possible. My amendment would do just that. It takes low-cost existing technology and puts it to work for our warfighters today.

As I said, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment, but I want to say I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey and his committee staff and all the members of the committee for their hard work on this legislation.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to speak on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his strong support of national defense, his incredible dedication to the National Guard, and his great service to the State of Ohio.

His amendment, while it will be withdrawn, as he said, is intended to provide radio equipment for the Air National Guard F–16s but was only recently brought to our committee's attention. Should the Air Guard choose to purchase the ARC–210 radios with NGREA funding, which the committee has provided quite a lot of money for, the committee would support their decision.

We are sensitive to the need of the Air Guard, yet the committee needs to do its due diligence. Ranking Member VISCLOSKY and I look forward to working with you and your staff on this important issue, as we have already been doing, and appreciate your indulgence and willingness to withdraw the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his willingness and especially for his dedication and support for our Air National Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment is not a reflection of concern with what is a good bill under the circumstances. The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment would appropriate $25 million to fund military responses to Russia's continuing violation of the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the INF Treaty. This is the exact same amount that the House Armed Services Committee, the HASC, authorized recently in a bipartisan and noncontroversial provision in H.R. 1735, which passed the House Armed Services Committee on a 60–2 vote.

Senior DOD officials, from the Secretary of Defense to lesser Senate-confirmed officials, have testified that the United States is considering a range of military options to respond to Russia's violation of the INF Treaty. DOD defines these as countervailing and counterforce options. What do these include?

Number one, extending the range of the Army's current Army Tactical Missile System, ATacMS; land-basing Tomahawk or otherwise modifying similar capabilities; and also other capabilities per classified DOD reporting.

The emphasis should be on modifying current systems as opposed to developing brand-new capabilities, which would take longer and cost far more.

This amendment is imperative to ensuring that another year isn't allowed to go by before Russia's President, Vladimir Putin, is made to understand that he cannot profit by his violation of the INF Treaty.

As The New York Times reported on June 5, following the submission of the most recent State Department annual report on arms control compliance: ''American officials have made no discernible headway in persuading the Russians to acknowledge the compliance problem, let alone resolve it. . . . In December, the Pentagon told Congress that it had developed a range of military options to pressure Russia to remedy the violation or neutralize any advantages it might gain if diplomatic efforts fail. Brian P. McKeon, a senior Pentagon official, told Congress that . . . if a diplomatic solution was not found, 'This violation will not go unanswered.' ''

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of all Members for the Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's concern relative to Russia and his desire to make sure that they do abide by the existing treaty.

Certainly, I would acknowledge that they have invaded the country of Ukraine. They control a quarter of that country's industrial production, and as the gentleman has indicated, are very concerned about their violation potentially of the treaty that exists.

My concern is that the gentleman's amendment is premature. He is absolutely correct that the authorizing committee in this body did pass legislation that you are trying to address with your amendment. The other body has not yet acted.

Additionally, I would point out—and again, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct—that DOD is considering a range of options. You have enumerated at least three of them, I think, very correctly.

Again, I think it is premature, given the fact that we are still, as a country, considering what options should be utilized to deal with this very serious question that the gentleman raises. Given the fact that we don't have direct authorization and we are considering options, while I agree with the intent, I would have to object to the timing of the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chair, I would just argue that, while it is true that the other body has not acted on this yet, it is also true that this body has already acted in the Defense Authorization bill. It came through committee, and certainly it had overwhelming support in committee and overwhelming support on the floor of the House.

I think that the will of this body ought to be done by all of my colleagues supporting this very important amendment and to make sure that Russia understands that they cannot go unchecked when they violate a treaty of this magnitude.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I will simply conclude by again expressing sympathy for the aim of the gentleman but pointing out that to appropriate money, we need authority. We do not yet have that, given the absence of action by the Senate and signature of the authorization into law by the President. I would ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,143,095,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the staff, first, for working with Members and getting Members in order to be able to present their amendments; and then I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their understanding of this amendment and, again, make the point that this amendment that I am offering at this time I have been able to work on with the appropriators over the years.

I am a breast cancer survivor, and as I, myself, was going through that period, I met women who were experiencing triple negative, which is a very deadly aspect of breast cancer.

My amendment increases funding for Defense Health Program's research and development by $10 million, and these funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Just the fact, to take note of the point, that more than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times, 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2001.

My amendment will add additional research dealing with this question. And the good news is that, when the military research component works on this, there is a great possibility of moving forward.

Breast cancer strikes relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male servicemembers, veterans, and their dependents are at risk as well.

'' 'Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer,' says Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University. Clapp, who works for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues, says life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.''

Just a moment about the triple-negative breast cancer, when I saw firsthand a very wonderful professional in my community go very quickly, first at the diagnosis and then the short-term survival that she experienced.

It is a term used to describe breast cancer whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

So what does that mean? TNBC accounts for between 13 and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States. It is a higher grade, onset is younger, is more aggressive, and is likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer do not live more than 5 years after being diagnosed, and it impacts various ethnicities and ethnic groups in a far different way.

□ 1845

We find that African American women are more likely to be diagnosed with large tumors, but it impacts women of all backgrounds, racial backgrounds as well.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this amendment that I have had the privilege of offering in years past. Might they also take note of the fact that the amendment would not change the overall level of budget authority, and it would lower the overall level of outlays.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I add this article into the RECORD, ''A New Drug for Triple Negative Breast Cancers Seems Promising,'' dated June 5, 2015.

Again, the research that the United States military can do under the research development test and evaluation is powerful. There are many women and men in the military and many women throughout the Nation and around the world who would benefit greatly from the additional focus on this very deadly disease, deadly form of breast cancer.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted in last year's Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 4870).

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program's research and development by $10 million. These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Women in the military have had to fight battles against Triple Negative Breast cancer and far too many of them are losing the battle.

My amendment is designed to advance the study of triple negative breast cancer which is an aggressive and deadly type of breast cancer.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed. TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States.

It is essential to support research to identify multifaceted targeted treatments for this type of breast cancer.

TNBC is an extremely deadly form of breast cancer.

Unlike traditional forms of breast cancer there are no targeted treatments for TNBC.

Additional research is necessary to find the molecular cause for TNBC in order to develop an effective treatment regime.

It is only in the last few years that professionals studying breast cancer have concluded that breast cancer is not one disease, but many different forms of cancer all originating in the breast.

Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells

Triple Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC) cells: TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States; usually of a higher grade and size; onset at a younger age; are more aggressive; and are more likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than White women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26% vs. 16% in non-African Americans women.

The survival rate for breast cancer has increased to 90% for White women but only 78% for African American Women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

There continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

Depending on its stage of diagnosis, triple negative breast cancer can be extremely aggressive and more likely to recur and metastasize than other subtypes of breast cancer.

It typically is responsive to chemotherapy, although it can be more difficult to treat because it is unresponsive to the most effective receptor targeted treatments.

There is no question that researchers are increasingly recognizing the importance of TNBC as an entity and focusing their efforts on several key areas.

On June 5, 2015, it was reported that "A New Drug For Triple Negative Breast Cancer Seems Promising—Enzalutamide."

Research on effective treatment options for triple negative breast cancer is critically need to improve the survival rates of women who are diagnosed with the disease.

We must also improve upon tests that can detect triple negative breast cancer while it is in its early stages, which could increase survival rates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

[From The Inquisitr, June 7, 2015]

A NEW DRUG FOR TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER SEEMS PROMISING—ENZALUTAMIDE

Breast cancer. The two words strike fear in nearly everyone's heart, as, by far, it is the most common cancer that women can get. In fact, one-out-of-eight women will be diagnosed at some point in their lives. Early detection remains the most important tool we have against fighting breast cancer, but it's only one tool. Not at all tests reliably show all breast cancers in their early stages, and many breast cancers are not detected until they begin to metastasize, or spread to remote locations in the body, which makes them incurable. They can be treated, but it is medically deemed impossible to cure at that point in time, with various metastatic lesions having to be handled as they appear—which means more chemo, more radiation, more lost quality of life.

What many people don't realize is that there are actually several kinds of breast cancer—not all are the same or are treated the same. Many breast cancers have hormone receptors which are considered easier to treat the other types, because when biological therapy denies the tumor of the particular hormone that feeds it, the tumor dies.

Triple-negative breast cancer, however, does not respond to hormone or biological therapies—that's because the tumor does not have those receptors. It also is a particularly aggressive cancer that usually strikes women in their childbearing years and moves quickly to the brain and bones. Lumpectomies, Mastectomies, chemotherapy, and radiation have been the medical standard, but often with dismal results—the five year prognosis for triple-negative breast cancer is not good.

However, a new drug on the market seems promising in the fight against this disease that takes far too many young women. A drug used to treat prostate cancer in men seems promising—called Enzalutamide—shows promise in a subset of women with advanced triple-negative breast cancer. For women whose tumors express the androgen receptor (approximately 40 percent) the drug shrank or stopped tumor activity.

Tiffany Traina, a medical oncologist at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in New York, who specializes in breast cancer, spoke about the trial which included 118 women, 47 percent of which had triple-negative breast cancer with androgen receptors.

"Enzalutamide is an oral therapy and extremely well tolerated. We are seeing impressive improvements in progression-free survival [PFS] and in the clinical benefit rate. AR by immunohistochemistry is not perfect in predicting who is going to respond. This is not the whole story. We found that even those with really low AR expression level have had great responses [on trial. Combining AR expression with the gene signature has allowed us to enrich for the population that appears to truly benefit from enzalutamide. This is the most exciting data we have had in triple-negative breast cancer and certainly supports moving this therapy forward in development."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment. Again, I thank the staff, the chairman, and the ranking member for their commitment to the betterment of the lives of our young men and women in the United States military.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $76,680,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $7,372,047,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $17,237,724,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V–22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $23,163,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,207,171,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $250,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration; engineering, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,543,000) (increased by $3,543,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, at a time when the United States is facing constantly evolving global threats from a wide range of enemies, our military urgently needs the technology to monitor and respond to these threats.

Our military does not have the time to wait decades or even years for the development and launch of surveillance or communications satellites.

Operationally Responsive Space, or ORS, allows the U.S. to quickly respond to the emerging and often unanticipated needs of the warfighter. The program rapidly develops new capabilities, giving our military the ability to launch field-ready satellites extremely quickly.

These cost-effective satellites provide transformational advantages on the battlefield. They provide surveillance, tactical communications, countercommunications, space protection, space situational awareness, and weather data from around the world to assist our military in combating our enemies.

You don't have to take my word for it. Air Force leadership has consistently praised the program as an effective national security tool. General Schwartz, the former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said: ''ORS is exactly what we need. Innovation and greater efficiency as we contend with ongoing fiscal constraints and changing space posture.''

General Welch, current Chief of Staff of the Air Force, recently said that we ''have to look at space now as a warfighting domain,'' and he went on to say that doing so requires us to ''look at different ways of building, maintaining, and improving the assets we currently have in space and the capabilities they provide in new and different ways than the very functionally developed, large program, large investment over long periods of time that have dominated the space architecture up until this point.''

ORS plays a critical role beyond immediate response to our needs on the battlefield.

The U.S. also needs to have the ability to relaunch crucial military communication and even weather satellites that are lost to countermeasures by other countries. In 2007, China used a ground-based missile to destroy a satellite orbiting more than 500 miles in space, demonstrating their capacity to target our national security satellites and space defense systems.

The U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission's 2014 report to Congress notes that ''China, in 2014, continued to pursue a broad counterspace program to challenge U.S. information superiority in a conflict and disrupt or destroy U.S. satellites if necessary . . . China likely will be able to hold at risk U.S. national security satellites in every orbital regime in the next 5 to 10 years.''

Currently, Russia is developing a sea-based missile and space defense system capable of destroying satellites. As other countries modernize their military, the threat level to our communications, navigation, and guided munitions satellites intensifies.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including some funding for ORS in this year's bills, but I do not believe that it is fully adequate to fund this vital program. Without sufficient funds, ORS cannot produce the space systems that give our military an advantage on the battlefield. It is not in our best interest to solely focus on building satellites that take decades to develop, build, and launch, and cost billions of dollars.

While I believe that ORS is integral to maintaining our advantage in space and bringing much-needed capabilities to our warfighters, I understand the committee is not at this time able to reallocate additional funds to this very important program. I hope to continue to work with the committee as the appropriations process moves forward.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment with Congressman ROONEY, my co-chair of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force.

Traumatic brain injury continues to be the signature injury among our Nation's servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 300,000 troops have been diagnosed with mild TBI since 2000. This number continues to increase as identification and detection methods become more accurate. Despite these staggering figures, there was a decrease of 20 percent from last year's funding level. Our amendment would restore the same funding level to the TBI program.

The program supports the DOD's Psychological Health and TBI Center of Excellence in its efforts to educate servicemembers and their families, enhance clinical and management approaches, and facilitate other vital services to best serve the needs of our servicemembers impacted by TBI and psychological health problems.

In recent years, the DOD has made significant strides in improving both in-theater and post-incident assessment and diagnosis, but still more needs to be done in evaluating troops' ability to return to duty. As it is, we are not living up to our responsibility in caring for servicemembers who have already been diagnosed with TBI. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to use this time to heap compliments upon my colleague from New Jersey who heads up the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force and has been providing that leadership and support, and it is certainly bipartisan.

Just for the record, our committee has been very active in supporting this type of work and research. And for the

record, our bill provides $155 million, which includes a plus up of $100 million above the request level of $55 million for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

In addition, our bill provides $676 million in operation and maintenance funding within the Defense Health Program to care for servicemembers affected by traumatic brain injuries and psychological maladies.

There has been an issue about the slow spend down of some of the money. Of course, if we are here on the floor advocating, as we should, for such an important program, we need to ensure that the bureaucracy gets the money spent. I am sure my colleague from New Jersey would agree that if we are going to put money on the table, let's make sure they spend it rapidly to address this ever-growing problem which affects so many people who come off the battlefield. I commend the gentleman and support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $170,558,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,634,568,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $474,164,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels, including procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, $31,440,009,000; of which $29,489,521,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017, and of which up to $13,972,542,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $373,287,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,577,201,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than $8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than $597,100,000 shall be made available to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command to carry out the congressionally directed medical research programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment that would set aside $1 million for studying a neglected segment of suicides within our Armed Forces. Our brave men and women in uniform risk their lives every day to keep us safe and free, yet they often don't get the care that they deserve.

While attention has been given to the subject in the past, we have recently seen a need for research that deals with high suicide rates among our female servicemembers and veterans. This week, the Los Angeles Times reported on a recently released study which found female military veterans commit suicide at nearly six times the rate of other women.

□ 1900

This new government research released in the journal of Psychiatric Services went even further, reporting that female veterans between the ages of 18 and 29 are nearly twelve times more likely to commit suicide than nonmilitary women. We need to do better by the women who risk their lives to protect our Nation. We cannot sit idly by while our female servicemembers and veterans suffer in silence.

My amendment would set aside $1 million to study the possible causes for this level of suicides among our women in uniform. Service-related causes like traumatic brain injuries and PTSD, in addition to nonservice related factors such as adverse childhood experiences, financial troubles, and other external stressors, must be investigated if we hope to seriously confront this travesty head on.

In addition, according to the VA, the suicide gap between men and women is shrinking. Men typically have higher suicide rates than women. When military service is incorporated, the gap between the two shrinks significantly.

This is a serious problem and one that we don't know enough about to confront. Until we understand why we are seeing this horrific trend, we cannot help the women who bravely serve.

When we are faced with rising generations where female veterans are twelve times more likely than nonmilitary women to commit suicide, we need to take action. My amendment will conduct a study to understand how we get here, so we can move forward and take real action to address this crisis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $720,721,000, of which $139,098,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $50,743,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $21,289,000 for activities on military installations and $29,454,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, to assist State and local governments; $2,281,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2018, of which $2,281,000

shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $579,342,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $569,339,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, $878,298,000, of which $616,811,000 shall be for counter-narcotics support; $113,589,000 shall be for the drug demand reduction program; and $147,898,000 shall be for the National Guard counter-drug program: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $316,159,000, of which $314,059,000, shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which $2,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $514,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $507,923,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $4,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled ''Explanation of Project Level Adjustments'' in the explanatory statement regarding this Act, the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: *Provided*, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' appropriation and the ''Operation and Maintenance'' appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: *Provided further*, that except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act

shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2016, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2017.

(c) As required by section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) civilian personnel at the Department of Army Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories may not be managed on the basis of the Table of Distribution and Allowances, and the management of the workforce strength shall be done in a manner consistent with the budget available with respect to such Laboratories.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term ''manufactured'' shall include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in the current fiscal year or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M–1 Carbines, M–1 Garand rifles, M–14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M–1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8018. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8019. Of the funds made available in this Act, $15,000,000 shall be available for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over $500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8022. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $39,500,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $27,400,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) $10,400,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force''; and

(3) $1,700,000 shall be available from ''Other Procurement, Air Force'' for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2016, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2017 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by $88,400,000.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8025. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8027. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2016. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 8028. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8029. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8030. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $250,000.

SEC. 8031. None of the funds made available 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'', dated January 27, 2014.

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2017 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal

year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093) shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8035. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not less than $12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8036. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8037. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8038. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats;

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense; or

(4) an Air Force field operating agency established to administer the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Program and Mortuary Operations for the Department of Defense and authorized Federal entities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) $10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (h) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the competition or outsourcing of commercial activities.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

(1) ''Other Procurement, Army'', 2014/2016, $40,000,000;

(2) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2014/2016, $91,571,000;

(3) ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2014/2016, $888,000;

(4) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $2,300,000;

(5) ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $1,000,000;

(6) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $12,600,000;

(7) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $14,000,000;

(8) ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', 2015/2017, $30,000,000;

(9) ''Other Procurement, Army'', 2015/2017, $30,000,000;

(10) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2015/2017, $49,377,000;

(11) ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2015/2017, $15,422,000;

(12) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', 2015/2017, $8,906,000;

(13) ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', 2015/2017, $88,996,000;

(14) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $108,870,000;

(15) ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $75,000,000;

(16) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $8,000,000;

(17) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', 2015/2016, $232,228,000; and

(18) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', 2015/2016, $60,271,000.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force

Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of ''commercial items'', as defined by section 103 of title 41, United States Code, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8046. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, the Secretary shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: $20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and $24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program setasides may be taken from programs, projects, or activities to the extent they contribute to the extramural budget.

SEC. 8049. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8050. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101–510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8052. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8053. Using funds made available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern and at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks area, such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 4 that is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8053.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Each year, the Department of Defense ships coal from Tamaqua, Pennsylvania, about 3,000 miles away to an Air Force base in Germany, costing taxpayers millions of dollars more than if we simply treated this particular base like every other military base in the world.

Why do we do this?

Since 1972, each Defense Appropriations act has included an earmark requiring that the Pentagon purchase anthracite coal from Pennsylvania to heat this base in Kaiserslautern, Germany. This is wasteful spending, pure and simple.

My bipartisan amendment, which I am offering with my colleague TOM MCCLINTOCK, would finally remove this zombie earmark and save taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

At its peak, this earmark mandated that the government purchase more than a million tons of anthracite coal each year to power overseas bases and installations, but today, the Department of Defense purchases only about 5,000 to 9,000 tons of coal annually, and it is to meet the requirements of this specific base in Kaiserslautern. It costs taxpayers millions of dollars each time. According to the last study we did on this, which was way back in 1989, the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the Department of Commerce jointly concluded that these mandates had cost U.S. taxpayers $1.1 billion, and that was 26 years ago, so it is a lot more since then.

For decades, the Pentagon has urged Congress to remove this wasteful earmark and allow the use of cheaper fuel

to power our military base in Germany. President after President has urged the removal of this earmark—both Republicans and Democrats—every President since Jimmy Carter and including President Ronald Reagan. Today, we have an opportunity to finally achieve that goal.

I want to thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for his leadership in introducing this amendment with me.

The passage of this amendment would be proof positive, I think, to Americans back home that Republicans and Democrats can work together to cut wasteful spending. I urge my colleagues to support the Huffman-McClintock amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I don't support the war on coal that is waged by some of my friends on the left, but I do support the war on waste, and I support this amendment based upon that fiscal imperative.

Just a few weeks ago, so-called defense hawks demanded spending well in excess of budget caps because, they said, our defense spending had been stretched to the breaking point. In light of those warnings, I find it inexcusable that these scarce defense dollars would be so recklessly squandered to continue to fund a corrupt earmark from a disgraced and deceased Pennsylvania Congressman, an earmark that dates back more than 40 years.

That earmark, as my friend has just said, requires that one—and only one—American Air Force base must purchase 9,000 tons of Pennsylvania anthracite coal a year at the grossly inflated price that is estimated to be about $20 million. That is about 80 percent more expensive than commonly used coal, and that doesn't include the cost of transporting this overpriced coal across the Atlantic Ocean and halfway across the European continent—a cost that is absorbed elsewhere in the Air Force budget. The excuse is that we would otherwise be dependent on Putin, but that doesn't hold water. No other U.S. military base in all of Europe is required to buy this coal, only Kaiserslautern.

The Pentagon and successive Presidents have consistently protested this waste, but these protests have fallen on deaf ears in Congress even while we are told our defense spending has been cut to the bone.

If we don't change the spending trajectory of this government, the Congressional Budget Office warns, in the next 10 years, just paying the interest on the national debt will greatly exceed our entire Defense budget. That makes rooting out waste like this a national defense imperative.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert in coal, and I am not an expert in what these men describe as an earmark, but I do know that coal is reliable, that it is cost-effective, that it is domestically produced, and that it has been used at this Air Force base for a long time. This provision both promotes domestic resources of energy and ensures that our bases and that particular base have a reliable, continuous source of energy for their daily operations.

I don't think we ought to dismiss the notion that Germany is under attack by Russian aggression, and Russia would at any time cut off fuel supplies, as they have done to other countries in Eastern Europe. Europe, as an area, as a continent, remains heavily reliant on Russia for its energy, and Russia uses its leverage on an annual basis to quiet potential opposition to that aggression in Ukraine and other parts of the region. This is a stark reminder of how important it is to ensure that our military has a reliable domestic source of energy wherever it is in the world. This may be an unusual circumstance, but I see no reason to change it. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have well over 30 other defense installations in Germany and hundreds of others across the globe. To my knowledge—and I have made inquiries on this subject—not a single one of those installations operates with a congressionally mandated fuel source like the one we are talking about here. The Kaiserslautern facility is, truly, one of a kind.

This is a commonsense amendment that provides the Pentagon the flexibility to ensure that our military installations continue to have reliable, cheaper, and cleaner energy sources in the years ahead. The congressional mandate in question was added to the Defense Appropriations bill over 40 years ago to an accumulated cost of well over $1 billion to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about our national security. This is not a weapons system. This is not funding to support or protect our troops. This isn't doing anything for our country or our national security except wasting taxpayer dollars and making one particular coal company in eastern Pennsylvania a little bit richer.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' and support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8054. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide'', $20,000,000 shall be for support of high priority Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program requirements and activities, including the training and funding of personnel: *Provided*, That the funds are made available for transfer to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided further*, That funds transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which the funds are transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8056. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section XI (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8057. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any training, equipment, or other assistance for a unit of a foreign security force if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

(2) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to provide any training, equipment, or other assistance to a unit of a foreign security force full consideration is given to any credible information

available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by such unit.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the government of such country has taken all necessary corrective steps, or if the equipment or other assistance is necessary to assist in disaster relief operations or other humanitarian or national security emergencies.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish, and periodically update, procedures to ensure that any information in the possession of the Department of Defense about gross violations of human rights by units of foreign security forces is shared on a timely basis with the Department of State.

(e) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the application of any exception under subsection (b) or the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(1) in the case of an exception under subsection (b), providing notice of the use of the exception and stating the grounds for the exception; and

(2) in the case of a waiver under subsection (c), describing the information relating to the gross violation of human rights; the extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the waiver; the purpose and duration of the training, equipment, or other assistance; and the United States forces and the foreign security force unit involved.

SEC. 8058. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8059. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 45 days after a report, including a description of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8060. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8061. Notwithstanding section 12310(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8062. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nongovernmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of ''armor penetrator'', ''armor piercing (AP)'', ''armor piercing incendiary (API)'', or ''armor-piercing incendiary tracer (API–T)'', except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8065. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $76,611,750 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: *Provided further*, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8066. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to take any action to modify—

(1) the appropriations account structure for the National Intelligence Program budget, including through the creation of a new appropriation or new appropriation account;

(2) how the National Intelligence Program budget request is presented in the unclassified P–1, R–1, and O–1 documents supporting the Department of Defense budget request;

(3) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are apportioned to the executing agencies; or

(4) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are allotted, obligated and disbursed.

(b) Nothing in section (a) shall be construed to prohibit the merger of programs or changes to the National Intelligence Program budget at or below the Expenditure Center level, provided such change is otherwise in accordance with paragraphs (a)(1)-(3).

(c) The Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense may jointly, only for the purposes of achieving auditable financial statements and improving fiscal reporting, study and develop detailed proposals for alternative financial management processes. Such study shall include a comprehensive counterintelligence risk assessment to ensure that none of the alternative processes will adversely affect counterintelligence.

(d) Upon development of the detailed proposals defined under subsection (c), the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) provide the proposed alternatives to all affected agencies;

(2) receive certification from all affected agencies attesting that the proposed alternatives will help achieve auditability, improve fiscal reporting, and will not adversely affect counterintelligence; and

(3) not later than 30 days after receiving all necessary certifications under paragraph (2), present the proposed alternatives and certifications to the congressional defense and intelligence committees.

(e) This section shall not be construed to alter or affect the application of section 1623 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 to the amounts made available by this Act.

SEC. 8067. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $5,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8068. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'' and ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $487,595,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, $55,000,000 shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, subject to the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement, as amended; $286,526,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which $15,000,000 shall be for production activities of SRBMD missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures; $89,550,000 shall be for an upper-tier component to the

Israeli Missile Defense Architecture; and $56,519,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $389,305,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred to:

(1) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2008/2016: Carrier Replacement Program $123,760,000;

(2) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2009/2016: LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $22,860,000;

(3) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: CVN Refueling Overhauls Program $20,029,000;

(4) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: DDG–51 Destroyer $75,014,000;

(5) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: Littoral Combat Ship $82,674,000;

(6) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: Amphibious Transport Dock Program $38,733,000;

(7) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: Joint High Speed Vessel $22,597,000; and

(8) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2013/2016: Joint High Speed Vessel $3,638,000.

SEC. 8070. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8072. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2017 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the Procurement accounts, and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts: *Provided*, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP–5 and OP–32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8073. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8074. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to favorable foreign exchange rates, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $1,152,206,000.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC–130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: *Provided*, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8076. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: *Provided*, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8077. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 8078. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ–1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8079. Up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'' may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8081. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8082. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8083. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate, restructure, or realign Army Contracting Command–New Jersey or make disproportionate personnel reductions at any Army Contracting Command–New Jersey sites without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8084. None of the funds made available by this Act for excess defense articles, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), or peacekeeping operations for the countries designated annually to be in violation of the standards of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c-1) may be used to support any military training or operation that includes child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008, unless such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8085. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $20,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available

for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

SEC. 8086. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that—

(1) creates a new start effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of $10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations, unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying the Act unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

SEC. 8087. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8088. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 8089. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation Inherent Resolve, Operation Freedom's Sentinel, and any named successor operations, on a monthly basis and any other operation designated and identified by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 127a of title 10, United States Code, on a semi-annual basis in the Cost of War Execution Report as prescribed in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 ''Contingency Operations'', Annex 1, dated September 2005.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8090. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', and ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8091. Funds appropriated by this Act may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfers to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8092. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8093. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of $1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a ''covered subcontractor'' is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of $1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract term selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8094. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to $121,000,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–84: *Provided*, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417: *Provided further*, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8095. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more senior executive employees than are specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8096. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8097. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of sections 1661, 1662, or 1663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SEC. 8098. The Secretary of Defense shall report quarterly the numbers of civilian personnel end strength by appropriation account for each and every appropriation account used to finance Federal civilian personnel salaries to the congressional defense committees within 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8099. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $1,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act for the National Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2016.

SEC. 8100. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release,

or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARDY). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8100.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered deals with the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. I would suggest to my colleagues that the continued operation of the facility at Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material.

I do regret that the bill and other relevant appropriations acts continue this or any attempts to close Guantanamo by prohibiting viable alternatives. Also, as we are debating an appropriation bill, and this committee has to pay for things, I think it is appropriate to discuss the cost of the detention facility at Guantanamo. We are now spending approximately $2.7 million annually per inmate, which is about 35 times the cost per inmate in a supermaximum Federal prison in the United States.

The United States Government has transferred approximately 620 detainees from Guantanamo since May of 2002, with 532 transfers occurring during President Bush's administration and slightly in excess of 88 transfers occurring during the current administration.

Nearly 500 defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism have been—and I would emphasize this to my colleagues—successfully convicted in the United States since 2001. It includes one former GTMO detainee who was tried in New York City, the Times Square bomber; Richard Reid, the shoe bomber; and others. All of them are incarcerated in our Federal prisons throughout the United States, and there have been no security incidents. Further, there are six Defense Department facilities where Guantanamo Bay detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent of their end capacity.

I would ask my colleagues to adopt this amendment so we could move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. These important provisions that are already included in the law have been included in the past several appropriations bills for several years running, and there is a reason that they are there. This wording represents a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason. This is debated back and forth in agreement on both sides of the aisle.

Striking these provisions would have unknown consequences for a number of U.S. communities, and it is impossible for any of us to know how many detainees might be brought there, where they might be held, and the impacts on communities and facilities that are holding them. It is also impossible to know what the cost might be, so we are asking for this unknown to be pursued without knowing the risks or knowing the costs.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and potentially disastrous. We know former FBI Director Mueller had stated: To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.

The last thing we need today in the face of ISIS is to convert more folks to extremism. The idea of bringing detainees for trials in the United States quickly collapsed as local jurisdictions voiced their strong opposition. We heard that across the United States.

As everyone here is aware, several detainees that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals as appropriate. Any proposal that results in these detainees being sent to the United States for any reason is simply the wrong policy. We have tread this ground time and time and time again.

I therefore oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, let me thank the gentleman for his comments, and may I add emphasis to what he said.

The thought that people that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and been involved in the killing of Americans in the Middle East is repugnant and makes all of us angry. That is literally what has happened. We read about it in open sources, and we can speculate because I think sometimes these things are not reported, that a lot of these people that have been released have gone back and actually headed up efforts to ambush our soldiers and kill our soldiers and seek vengeance. In reality, I am glad these people continue to be locked away.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would simply say that the gentleman from Virginia noted that there is supposition and unknown in the future, and that is certainly correct. What is known is that we are a nation of laws, and our military protects this country so that we can continue to be governed by those laws. I, for one, happen to think that the indefinite detention of any human being without a trial is violative of those laws, and that that is a foundational principle of our Nation, and we ought to conduct ourselves accordingly. I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. 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 Indiana will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8101. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8101.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would strike the section of the bill restricting the use of funds for building and modifying facilities in the United States to house prisoners presently at Guantanamo Bay.

The argument for why we should strike this section is straightforward. The detainees at Guantanamo Bay must be brought to justice. Those who are guilty of terrorism need to be tried and punished in a swift and judicious manner. Any detainee who is innocent should, with equal speed and sincerity, be released.

Two cases exemplify this argument and underline the importance of this amendment. The first is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind behind the attack on the United States on 9/11. Since 2006, Mr. Mohammed has been detained at Guantanamo, where he has yet to be tried, convicted, or appropriately punished for his heinous actions. Justice for the victims, for the families who lost loved ones at the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and in Pennsylvania must be carried out. So far, this has not happened.

At the same time, while they haven't managed to try and convict anyone at Guantanamo, more than 400 terrorists, including the 9/11 conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui, have been tried, convicted, and sentenced in the Federal courts in the United States without incident and in a manner befitting the American justice system. No convicted terrorist has ever escaped from a U.S. prison, and no prison has ever been compromised or been subject to an attack because of the dangerous persons being held within.

The second case I want to mention is of Mr. Shaker Aamer, which came to my attention in a recent New York Times editorial or op-ed piece authored by a bipartisan group of British members of Parliament. In November 2001, Mr. Aamer, a British permanent resident, was doing charity work in Afghanistan when he was picked up by the Northern Alliance, sold to Americans for a bounty, and taken to Bagram prison before being moved to Guantanamo in February 2002. He was cleared for release by President Bush in 2007 and cleared again by President Obama in 2010. Six different U.S. agencies agreed, including the CIA, the FBI, the Departments of State and Defense, while Prime Minister David Cameron and the House of Commons unanimously have called for Mr. Aamer's immediate release and transfer to Britain.

□ 1945

So far, this has not happened. Mr. Aamer has never been charged with anything and has twice been cleared for transfer. Every American agency that has looked at this says that he has not been a terrorist and did not fight against the United States. There is no reason for him to remain in this custodial purgatory; yet he remains a detainee at the Guantanamo Bay facility.

As long as this provision remains in the bill, people like Mr. Aamer, guilty of nothing—not terrorists, not fighters against the United States—will be unjustly imprisoned, and people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed who are guilty—probably, we think—of terrorism will not be tried.

For too long, the terrible people in Guantanamo have avoided facing the consequences of answering to a U.S. court for their horrendous actions, while innocent detainees are denied recourse for continuing their detention.

The United States must not keep people in prison indefinitely for no reason, with no trial. The opponents of this amendment must not share my faith in America's courts to deliver justice. For hundreds of years, our legal system has kept Americans safe by imprisoning dangerous individuals while protecting those who are innocent of any charges.

Time and time again, Federal courts have successfully proven their ability to convict criminals and terrorists without violating the rights of due process. This amendment represents a return to our founding principles, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law.

Without this amendment, we will continue to hold terrorists and innocents alike, indefinitely and without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for.

We must close this facility, try these people, release the innocent, and restore our national honor.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in opposition to this amendment.

We see that today, Guantanamo is equipped to hold these detainees. The military tribunals there, if allowed to do so, are able to try these detainees. Again, they were captured under the rules of engagement as enemy combatants. Let's make sure that we are putting them in that situation to be tried as such.

Another element, too, is localities have spoken vocally to say, No, we do not want these detainees here, for a variety reasons. One is they are worried about security there. I know the argument is, Well, the facilities here in the United States can hold them. That is not the single issue. The issue is the communities' concern about what the outcomes of the movement of these detainees will be here today.

We see today radicalization across the United States from outside the United States by forces like ISIS. Think about the opportunity as those detainees are moved here and the notoriety that they will attain and how the press will cover it and that being used in addition to radicalize folks on the side of extremism. That is another issue that I believe needs to be addressed.

Again, GTMO is working. It is detaining these individuals, enemy combatants that have been picked up on the battlefield. It has been, I believe, the determination of this body through extensive debate that we shouldn't build facilities here specifically for that purpose and that GTMO is well suited to do the job.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. The continued repetition of untruths does not make them true.

Not all these people were captured on the battlefield. Mr. Aamer, whom I referenced, for example, was picked up doing charity work in Afghanistan. He was picked up by a faction of the Northern Alliance, which then sold him for a bounty to the United States. He was not a fighter. He was not on the battlefield. He was a victim of a kidnapping by a foreign faction.

Everyone who has looked at this—President Bush, President Obama, the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, the British Parliament—agrees on the facts with him; yet we hear that everybody was a fighter. No, they weren't. Some were; probably most were.

We are told that military tribunals will try these people. Well, Mr. Aamer has been in Guantanamo for 9 years. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed has been in Guantanamo for 15 years. They can't get their act together. Every time they try to hold military tribunals, there is another legal objection. Federal courts have tried, convicted, and imprisoned 400 terrorists.

We have to do justice. Keeping people in jail indefinitely because we repeat that they were caught on the battlefield, when some were not, hoping for a military tribunal that doesn't occur, is not American. It is un-American.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8102. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at United States Naval Station Guantanamo

Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity except in accordance with section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8102.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the three amendments that have the same purpose. This one would strike the section of the bill that makes it more difficult to transfer Guantanamo detainees to other countries.

I find it surrealistic. We have now debated two amendments tonight, and all we hear in opposition are repeated statements that everyone at Guantanamo is a terrorist—not true—and that everyone in Guantanamo is picked up on the foreign battlefield, fighting—not true. It is demonstrably not true.

These are not debatable propositions. Some of the people in Guantanamo are terrorists. Some of the people in Guantanamo are picked up on the battlefield. Some were not.

I gave you the example of Mr. Aamer, who was picked up by a foreign faction in the Northern Alliance and sold for a bounty because the United States offered a bounty for people who someone claimed was a terrorist. Everyone looked into it and said he wasn't a terrorist, he wasn't a combatant; yet he stays in Guantanamo.

It costs us $3 million per prisoner, per year. There are communities in the United States which can handle these trials. I can think of no honest reason why we would not want the terrorists to be tried.

The terrorists cannot be tried by military tribunal; let them try it, but the fact is they haven't been able to. They have been trying the military tribunals for 10 years now, and they haven't succeeded in convicting one person. They have had three plea bargains, no convictions, and no trials in the last 8 or 9 years.

The Federal courts are functioning. Why not save money, try the people we think are guilty, get a guilty verdict, put them in maximum security prisons, and not hold people indefinitely without charge and without trial? That is simply un-American.

Finally, we are engaged in an ideological war. Someone referenced radicalizing people. What radicalizes people more, what gives more evidence of the American bad faith and of anti-Islamic sentiments of terrible behavior than Guantanamo? It is a symbol worldwide. It is a radicalizing influence. Our own generals have said that nothing has recruited more enemy soldiers than Guantanamo.

Let's close it, take care of the people who are there one way or the other, and do justice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. I thank the chairman for yielding.

The gentleman from New York raised a good question. He said:

I can think of no honest reason why these terrorists have not been prosecuted in a military tribunal.

I can give him the answer to that. I don't know if my friend from New York has actually been to Guantanamo Bay, but in 2010, I went there. As the administration came into office, if the gentleman met with the prosecutor at that time, he had assembled a team that had worked for over 2 years trying and prosecuting the terrorists of the World Trade Center attack.

That prosecutor had gone through a stack of hearings this tall that he had prevailed on. His life had been threatened. His team's life had been threatened. He told all of us, Democrats and Republicans who went down there, that he would have guilty pleas on all those terrorists within 6 months.

To answer the gentleman as to why that didn't happen, it is because, when the administration came into office, they canceled that prosecution, took him off the case, disbanded that whole prosecution; and to this day, they have not allowed that prosecution to go forward.

If you want to ask the real, honest question of why we haven't prosecuted them in the military tribunals—the gentleman from Virginia said the facilities are there, the will was there, the hearings were there. The reason is because this administration has refused to prosecute them.

I hope we will defeat these amendments, keep those terrorists there, or let this administration prosecute them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, what is really surrealistic around here, to use the gentleman's word, is that we spend more time on these Guantanamo detainees than we do on Americans locked up in Iranian prisons and jails—that is unconscionable—or with Americans detained in North Korea.

Let's focus on liberty for some of the people in those countries that we are trying to work with on the nuclear deal, such as the Iranians holding Americans prisoners.

You have the right to focus on these detainees. Ninety-nine percent of them are guilty as hell, but we seem to be doing little in the public way to release Americans held in prisons in various parts of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we all obviously want to free Americans unjustly held by North Korea or Iran or anybody else. I suspect the reason that we don't spend a lot of time on the floor is because we all agree. There is nothing to debate. We obviously want them freed.

I hope our government behind the scenes is doing whatever we can to do it; we should do whatever we can publicly, but that has nothing to do with Guantanamo.

The fact of the matter is it isn't that the administration decided not to prosecute people by military tribunals. That is not the case. It is that every time the Bush administration or the Obama administration tried to prosecute—and they have continued to try—another legal obstacle comes up. They have never worked it out.

Appeal after appeal has shut the process down. I should say judicial decision after judicial decision as a result of appeal after appeal has shut the process down because they haven't managed to find a military tribunal procedure that gives enough constitutional rights to pass judicial muster, but is short of a Federal article III court. That is why 400 terrorists have been convicted in article III Federal courts—and no terrorists—let them be tried properly, and let the innocent be freed.

We can't simply stand here and say they are all guilty. How do we know that? How do we know that every single one of them is guilty? We know that some are not. By what right do we hold those who are guilty of nothing forever? It is a blot on American justice; it is a blot on our country's representation, and we should stop it.

I urge adoption 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 New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 8104. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for any agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

SEC. 8105. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this

or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense, or any other official or officer of the Department of Defense, to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport or any subsidiary of Rosoboronexport.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that it is in the vital national security interest of the United States to do so, and certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) the armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) agents of the Russian Federation have ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to a waiver issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and not later than 90 days after the date on which such a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense, the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted with respect to such waiver.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purchase or manufacture of a flag of the United States unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8107. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government for the direct personal benefit of the President of Afghanistan.

SEC. 8108. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Department of Defense, amounts may be made available, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to local military commanders appointed by the Secretary, or by an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, to provide at their discretion ex gratia payments in amounts consistent with subsection (d) of this section for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces in a foreign country.

(b) An ex gratia payment under this section may be provided only if—

(1) the prospective foreign civilian recipient is determined by the local military commander to be friendly to the United States;

(2) a claim for damages would not be compensable under chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Foreign Claims Act''); and

(3) the property damage, personal injury, or death was not caused by action by an enemy.

(c) NATURE OF PAYMENTS.—Any payments provided under a program under subsection (a) shall not be considered an admission or acknowledgement of any legal obligation to compensate for any damage, personal injury, or death.

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines a program under subsection (a) to be appropriate in a particular setting, the amounts of payments, if any, to be provided to civilians determined to have suffered harm incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces under the program should be determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary and based on an assessment, which should include such factors as cultural appropriateness and prevailing economic conditions.

(e) LEGAL ADVICE.—Local military commanders shall receive legal advice before making ex gratia payments under this subsection. The legal advisor, under regulations of the Department of Defense, shall advise on whether an ex gratia payment is proper under this section and applicable Department of Defense regulations.

(f) WRITTEN RECORD.—A written record of any ex gratia payment offered or denied shall be kept by the local commander and on a timely basis submitted to the appropriate office in the Department of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(g) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis the efficacy of the ex gratia payment program including the number of types of cases considered, amounts offered, the response from ex gratia payment recipients, and any recommended modifications to the program.

(h) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to provide any new authority to the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8109. None of the funds available in this Act to the Department of Defense, other than appropriations made for necessary or routine refurbishments, upgrades or maintenance activities, shall be used to reduce or to prepare to reduce the number of deployed and non-deployed strategic delivery vehicles and launchers below the levels set forth in the report submitted to Congress in accordance with section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8110. The Secretary of Defense shall post grant awards on a public Web site in a searchable format.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, Portugal, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on an analysis of operational requirements, that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund the performance of a flight demonstration team at a location outside of the United States: *Provided*, That this prohibition applies only if a performance of a flight demonstration team at a location within the United States was canceled during the current fiscal year due to insufficient funding.

SEC. 8113. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8114. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for basic allowance for housing for military personnel, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, $400,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8115. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty.

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or divest AH–64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the active Army in fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall ensure the continuing readiness of the AH–64 Apache aircraft and ensure the training of the crews of such aircraft during fiscal year 2016, including the allocation of funds for operation and maintenance and personnel connected with such aircraft: *Provided further*, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 115, line 2, strike ''in fiscal year 2016'' and insert ''prior to June 30, 2016''.

Page 115, beginning line 7, strike the proviso.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, since its establishment, the National Guard has answered the call to defend our Nation and respond in times of crises. They have fought bravely with the Active Component, while continuing to achieve their mission here at home.

At the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, nearly 50 percent of the Army's total force was a mix of Reservists and members of the National Guard. The Pennsylvania National Guard alone contributed more than 42,000 individual deployments.

Unfortunately, the Army's Aviation Restructuring Initiative, or ARI, will have devastating impacts on all that the National Guard has achieved. ARI will result in the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component, leaving the National Guard less combat-ready.

It will also deprive our Nation of an operational reserve for these aircraft, which is essential to the retention of talented aircrews. ARI represents a fundamental shift in the nature and role of the National Guard.

Last year, Congress wisely created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to offer a deliberate approach to addressing force structure issues such as ARI. Yet, as it stands now, many of these transfers will be long done before the Commission has

examined the proposal and reported its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, once these transfers begin, it will be all but impossible to reverse them. We need to allow the Commission time to do its work before the Army takes any harmful and irreversible actions.

In the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, the House adopted an amendment to delay some Apache transfers until June 30, 2016. This amendment extends that responsible limitation to all National Guard Apaches, while also taking important steps to ensure continued readiness of the Apache fleet.

Together, these provisions strike a proper balance between safeguarding our national security and preventing any premature Apache transfers. Only this can truly ensure that the irreparable harm is not done to the National Guard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of colleagues who want to speak, so I will be brief.

But I would point out that this amendment, if adopted, will undo last year's compromise legislation that supported the Army's critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative. Part of that compromise was to establish a commission to study the force structure of the United States Army. I believe we should await that report.

The Army has indicated that if they are restricted under the gentleman's amendment, they would have to inactivate—and I would repeat this—they would have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in States such as New York, Kansas, and Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going on into the remanufacture plant in 2016.

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my good friend, who is also an Apache pilot.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for the amendment.

Without this amendment, as he said, we will see the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component while, just last year, this Congress created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to deliberate this change in force, this restructuring issue.

You say, why should we care? I mean, isn't this a squabble between one big brother and a little brother? And it kind of is.

But we should care because the taxpayers have invested billions and billions of dollars over years to create the infrastructure within the Guard.

But more importantly, this imposes on and weakens our national security because the Guard and the Reserve component is the repository for experience in Apache pilots.

When you get tired of flying the Apache on deployment over and over again on Active Duty but want to continue to serve your country, what do you do? You join the Reserve component. You come to the Guard.

And those pilots have the most experience because they have flown on Active Duty and they have flown in the Guard for years and years and years. So when they deploy, that is who you want to fly with. That is who units want to fly with because they have the experience.

The operational depth is in the Guard.

It is not that Governors need the Apache; it is that the United States needs the Apache. And should we transfer the Apache because the Army wants to pick on its little brother and can? And that is exactly what is happening here.

I have heard the arguments. I have listened to all the arguments. I have spent 34 years in uniform. None of them make any sense, and they can't justify any of them. They talk big around this place in all kinds of acronyms that most people don't understand, but none of it is justified.

I don't understand why we would do this, why we wouldn't wait just till February to get the report from a Commission that we sponsored, that we authorized in this body. Why wouldn't we wait till then?

Why would we transfer the aircraft, and when the Commission comes back and says don't transfer the aircraft, oh, well, sorry, we already did that. Won't we look foolish.

But more importantly, isn't this important for national security to have the experience there when called upon to go fight—and as the gentleman said, make up 50 percent of the force in the fight.

Let's not do this for all the wrong reasons.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to prohibit funding for any transfer of Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

In committee, Chairman WILSON and I worked very closely to authorize a congressional review no less than 60 days following the Commission's report release.

And on the House floor, as an amendment to the NDAA, Mr. PALAZZO and I thoroughly examined and determined a fixed transfer date of Apaches no later than June 30.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is being used as a backdoor scheme and a delay tactic. This ploy places devastating impacts and potential deactivation of the Army's Combat Aviation Brigades in States like New York, Kansas, Hawaii, Arizona, and overall Black Hawk modernization in California.

As the Representative of Fort Drum, home of the 10th Mountain Division, any delay would cause this high operational tempo unit to be left without an Aviation Brigade.

Let me be abundantly clear. Any Apache delay will have grave consequences on our Army's readiness, deployment schedule, and our soldiers' dwell time. A delay would severely limit the Army's ability to meet expected operational requirements and place an even greater burden on our Nation's brave servicemembers.

So, Mr. Chairman, where I think some may be confused I want to clarify. In exchange for Apaches, the National Guard is set to receive fully modernized Black Hawks, which are essential to lift-and-rescue operations and remain critical to a State's emergency response. Derailing, delaying, or limiting Apache transfers would, therefore, halt this Black Hawk modernization.

This is merely a ploy to prevent our soldiers from receiving the equipment they need to protect American lives overseas, and it is unconscionable. I am appalled that this is even being discussed and will continue to fight for an ontime transfer of the Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I only have one more speaker left, and it is my understanding that, as a member of the committee, I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman concludes his remarks.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would just urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this important amendment to prevent the premature transfer of Apaches out of the National Guard until the Commission has had the opportunity to do its work.

This Congress created the National Commission for the very purpose of studying the impact of transfers such as Apaches out of the Guard after spending billions of dollars, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has said.

This was an investment on the part of the taxpayers to build an operational reserve. We should not take this step until the Commission has completed its work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my colleague from

the Appropriations Committee, to close the debate.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. I will enter into the RECORD a letter from General Odierno that I received, as well as others. It references the FY15 NDAA, which expressly allows for the transfer of Apaches with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter.

And it says: ''If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches, or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going in the remanufacture plant in 2016.''

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2015.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

We are writing to inform you that pending legislation may cause great damage to the readiness of the United States Army, create enormous disruption to the lives of thousands of military family members, harm our industrial base, and require us to send Soldiers into combat who may not be fully trained. Specifically, provisions in both the House and Senate versions of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), and the House version of the Defense Appropriations Act will, if enacted, undo last year's compromise legislation that supported the Army's critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative (ARI). The proposals drastically alter the statutorily permitted movement of AH–64 Apache helicopters between the Army National Guard (ARNG) and the Regular Army in 2016—a transfer authorized in the FY15 NDAA. Accordingly, as discussed below, to protect our Soldiers and their Families, we request that you continue to support our comprehensive ARI plan.

The FY15 NDAA provisions were based on the following factors, none of which has changed:

The National Guard Bureau's (NGB) alternative to ARI proposed the transfer of 72 AH–64 Apaches to the Regular Army;

The decision to transfer the remaining AH–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the Regular Army would be resolved based on recommendations by the National Commission on the Future of the Army; and

The GAO and the Office of the Secretary of Defense CAPE would conduct independent reviews of both ARI and the NGB alternative, both of which have since confirmed that the ARI plan is less costly and provides greater warfighting capacity than the NGB alternative.

With these principles in mind, the FY15 NDAA allowed the Army, with the certification of the Secretary of Defense, to transfer 48 AH–64 Apaches between October 2015 and March 2016, with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter. Nevertheless, recognizing Congressional concern, the Army specifically committed to transferring no more than 24 additional Apaches in FY16 for a total of 72, which precisely matched the number in the National Guard's alternative proposal. Our FY16 plan provided Congress with time to act upon the results the Commission's report (to be delivered in February 2016); allowed for the normal induction of aircraft into the AH–64 remanufacture line in Arizona; and preserved the Army's ability to deploy trained and equipped Soldiers and units into combat. We strictly adhered to FY15 NDAA and made critical programmatic and operational decisions based upon it.

The key points of the Army plan for FY16, which is based on the FY15 NDAA, are below:

Transferring 24 AH–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 25th Infantry Division (ID) in Hawaii;

Transferring 24 AH–1–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 1st ID in Kansas;

Transferring 24 AH–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 10th Mountain Division in New York after 31 March 2016; and

Inducting 24 ARNG and 32 Regular Army AH–64 Apaches for remanufacture in Arizona.

Should Congress now dismantle this carefully crafted plan, it would not only be disruptive, but also dangerous for our Soldiers. As you know, several proposed legislative changes either prohibit our ability to transfer any or part of the 72 aircraft or require us to count airframes, which were inducted into the remanufacture process in 2014, against the permitted transfers in FY16. The potential impacts of these provisions are stark.

If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches (24 in October 2015, 24 in February 2016, and 24 in July 2016), or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going into the remanufacture plant in 2016:

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 Soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit;

Up to three Combat Aviation Brigades (CAB) of 2,500 Soldiers each, will become combat ineffective, because they will be missing their reconnaissance units, which is half of their attack capability, thus depriving the entire brigade this crucial capability;

Nearly 30% of the entire Regular Army combat aviation force could be rendered ineffective, leaving only eight fully ready CABs in 2016—compared to the 13 Regular Army CABs that existed prior to the inactivation of two in FY15; it should be noted that the ARNG has not reduced a single aircraft or unit in this same time frame;

We will not be able to meet PACOM requirements for a ''no-notice'' Korea warfight;

We will have to send Soldiers into combat in Iraq and Afghanistan without the proper training in Joint Combined Arms maneuver from the 25th ID, 1st ID, and 10th Mountain Division; additionally, the remaining Apache Battalions would have to extend the amount of time they are deployed (note, they are already operating at a 1:1.5 deploy to dwell ratio); and

We may have to stop inductions into the AH–64E remanufacture line, because we could not, under certain provisions, process 24 Apaches from the ARNG. Additionally, the risk of losing 32 Regular Army AH–64's for a year, which are planned for induction, without the backfill transfer of the 72 Apaches from the ARNG could be too high. This stoppage could jeopardize a workforce of 4,100 employees in 22 states, including 2,200 in Arizona, 360 in Alabama, 350 in Florida, 285 in California, and lesser numbers in WA, TX, MO, IL, MS, OH, WV, PA, NY, VT, NH, CT, NC, SC, and GA.

We face an unprecedented and unpredictable global environment that continues to morph in dangerous and unforeseen ways. Now more than ever, we need a force that provides the capabilities necessary to execute the missions that we know are coming, as well as the versatility, agility and depth to handle contingencies we cannot predict. An absolutely critical component of our force is our aviation formations, and we must be able to effectively restructure them to meet current and future demands. Accordingly, we need your support to ensure that the framework created by the FY15 NDAA remains in place. We owe this to our Soldiers, their Families, our industry partners and, most importantly, the American people. Simply put, delaying or derailing ARI jeopardizes your Army, and our Nation's security.

We appreciate your time and thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. ODIERNO,
General, United States Army Chief of Staff.

JOHN M. MCHUGH,
Secretary of the Army.

Mrs. ROBY. Look, friends and colleagues, we have heard from several Members about the devastating impacts that any delay in ARI would have on our Army.

But let's take time to revisit why we are here in the first place. We are here because this Congress put the Army in the position to have to make these difficult decisions in the first place. We are here because of a thing called sequestration. And if there has ever been a time for a stronger argument to revisit this so that we can properly fund all of our military across all branches so that they are not put in this box where the Army has to make these tough decisions, now is the time.

We have got to properly fund the United States military. So here we have a letter from a highly respected Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army to Congress saying, If you do this, if you delay these helicopter transfers, you will create a domino affect that will result in the United States of America sending our soldiers to Afghanistan and Iraq who are neither fully trained or in fully equipped.

We have to do better. We have to do better. And this is the case. Again, I oppose this amendment, and I call on my colleagues to revisit fully funding our military and repealing the sequester.

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

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

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8117. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for activities authorized under section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1621) to initiate support for, or expand support to, foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals unless the congressional defense committees are notified in

accordance with the direction contained in the classified annex accompanying this Act, not less than 15 days before initiating such support: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used under such section 1208 for any activity that is not in support of an ongoing military operation being conducted by United States Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibitions in this section if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances and, by not later than 72 hours after making such waiver, notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

SEC. 8118. (a) Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to assess whether the justification and approval requirements under section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2405) have, inconsistent with the intent of Congress—

(1) negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department of Defense greater than $20,000,000;

(2) discouraged agencies from awarding contracts greater than $20,000,000 to covered entities; and

(3) been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

(b) The Comptroller General shall analyze and report to the congressional defense committees on the sufficiency of the Department's report in addressing the requirements; review the extent to which section 811 has negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department, discouraged agencies from awarding contracts, or been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

SEC. 8120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any A–10 aircraft, or to disestablish any units of the active or reserve component associated with such aircraft.

SEC. 8121. Of the funds provided for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' in this Act, not less than $2,800,000 shall be used to support the Department's activities related to the implementation of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (Public Law 113–101; 31 U.S.C. 6101 note) and to support the implementation of a uniform procurement instrument identifier as described in subpart 4.16 of Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, to include changes in business processes, workforce, or information technology.

SEC. 8122. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be transferred to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8122.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has already been supported by 375 Members of this House; yet this amendment has, 90 percent of the House. It is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has such bipartisan support; yet this amendment has.

This is an amendment not put in by just me, but by my good friend Mr. COURTNEY, by Mr. WITTMAN, by Mr. LANGEVIN, by Mr. ROGERS, by Ms. DELAURO—three HASC subcommittee chairmen, two HASC ranking members, and a Defense appropriator. It is an amendment that is supported by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

It is rare to find such different groups in support, the Navy League, the United Auto Workers, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, AFL–CIO; yet this amendment has that support.

The reason these planets are all aligning in this rare configuration is because it is also rare—in fact, once every other generation—that we have to build something like the *Ohio* class submarine; yet it falls upon this generation.

In 4 years, we will begin the procurement. In 6 years, we will start construction of 12 ships—they call boats—that will carry 70 percent of the nuclear deterrence of this country—$92 billion.

The national sea-based deterrence fund we formed last year helps us prepare for that in advance, instead of waiting until the night before to come up with $92 billion. It transfers $1.4 billion into a fund and allows the Department of Defense to find other moneys, a rare thing for the government to actually prepare in advance, instead of waiting until the last minute to prepare. It will help to purchase in bulk and save perhaps millions, maybe even billions of dollars.

Now, I know there are voices that say in this world, with all the threats we see and all the demands we have for national defense, we cannot find creative solutions, and we have to do everything the way we have always done it.

We disagree because, if we are not creative, if we don't find other solutions, CRS says we could lose—32 other ships, including as many as 8 *Virginia* class subs, 8 destroyers, and 16 combatant ships.

Those same voices will say, We can't set up a fund like that; yet they have already set up four different funds very similar to that.

We ask for your support for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, our committee strongly supports the *Ohio* class submarine. We have done it for years.

Both the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and I not only serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and provide its leadership, but we have also supported this program on Energy and Water, which is the other part of the package.

With respect, the gentleman from Virginia's amendment proposes to strike a provision of the bill, prohibits the transfer of funds to the national sea-based deterrence fund, a reserve established but not funded last year in the NDAA.

We recognize this submarine will be expensive; however, the national sea-based deterrence fund will not make the submarine any less expensive, and it will not increase resources available to the Department of Defense.

This Congress has an important responsibility to provide resources to all of our military services and the intelligence community. Under the structure of this special fund, the Secretary of Defense has the authority to divert dollars into this new fund from the Army, Marines, Air Force, Special Forces, missile defense, ISR, and other types of essential programs. This is the wrong approach. It removes, furthermore, congressional oversight from the Secretary of Defense.

Secondly, if the President determines the *Ohio* class replacement is a must-fund platform, then the Navy should buy it, just as it has every other submarine in its inventory that our committee has supported. Establishing a special fund to pay for the submarine is an attempt to have other military services pay for what is a Navy responsibility.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, could I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt for a second the sincerity of the chairman and the ranking member and their support for the *Ohio* replacement program.

This chart, which the Navy produced, showing the 30-year shipbuilding plan, if we fully fund the *Ohio* class program,

as well as a 300-ship Navy, demonstrates exactly the problem that confronts us today.

It shows, again, a red line across, which shows the modern era of shipbuilding at about $15 billion a year; and, with the yellow portion of the chart, it shows how, for 13 years, Congress, starting in the 2020s, is going to be asked to raise unprecedented amounts of money for the shipbuilding account.

The fact of the matter is this is an asset that is not just the Navy's; it is the country's. Under New START, 70 percent of the nuclear triad will be borne by the Navy through its submarine program, far greater than in the past.

The Air Force and their long-range bombers and the Army, with their ground-based systems, are not going to be bearing the same burden as a result of the *Ohio* class' planned burden under New START.

We have an opportunity to do something sensible, which is based in clear precedent, as the gentleman from Virginia indicated.

The sealift fund was funded out of the shipbuilding account. The missile-based system was funded on a separate account because these are national assets that provided assistance and national security across the board for the Pentagon.

Support this amendment if you support a strong shipbuilding account and protect the shipbuilding industrial base of this country.

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment to restore the national sea-based deterrence fund. This amendment is critical to maintaining our Nation's nuclear deterrence and ensure a robust Navy shipbuilding budget.

It makes sense now to set aside funding for the Ohio class submarine replacement program. This makes sure that, down the road, we are not forced to choose between building a replacement ballistic missile submarine or a destroyer or an aircraft carrier.

The Navy already faces challenges in building enough warships to meet the global threats our Nation faces. Funding the national sea-based deterrence fund is the best solution to maintaining national strategic deterrence without hollowing out the Navy's shipbuilding budget.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the ranking member of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee for the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the national sea-based deterrence fund is critical to the future of our national security. It provides space outside the shipbuilding fund for the most survivable piece of our national deterrence, a bill that last came due in the 1980s in the Reagan defense buildup.

Mr. Chairman, these boats are absolutely essential. This is not just a Navy issue, as Secretary of Defense Connor has said. This is a national priority. The deterrence fund allows us to treat it accordingly and avoid pressuring the Navy out of badly needed investments in other ships and capabilities.

Unless Congress acts, these boats will consume half of the projected shipbuilding funding for a decade, causing crippling shortages that would echo in our fleet for decades after.

We and many of our colleagues have worked on a bipartisan basis to rise to this challenge, and the result is this sea-based deterrence fund.

Earlier this year, this body spoke loudly and clearly in overwhelming support of the fund and its purposes.

I urge my colleagues to reaffirm that position with this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, this is where reality comes into play. We talked about this earlier. Having a fund that is set up does not evade the responsibility of providing the long-term funding.

All of these things in the Department of Defense are priorities, and our friends on the Appropriations Committee have the difficult job of trying to balance these priorities and have the big picture available to them.

I think they have done exactly the right thing. I think this needs to be subsumed within the overall budget. There is no magic money. Having something that subverts the hard work that we ask the Appropriations Committee to do, I think, is the wrong thing to do.

It is not easy to stand up and make this argument, but I appreciate what they have done. They did it last year, and it was appropriate. They have done it this year, and it is appropriate. We have to be able to deal with this in a comprehensive way and not use sleight of hand.

I appreciate what the chair and ranking member have done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in opposition to the amendment in the strongest possible terms. I certainly respect the position of my colleagues on the other side of this argument, but I do remind my colleagues that the CBO estimates that this program is going to cost somewhere between $102 and $107 billion.

You are absolutely correct. This is a very expensive program, and we ought to be very, very careful. Given the tremendous financial resources that we will be required to modernize or replace the U.S. nuclear delivery systems and weapons over the next two decades, it is imperative that Congress begin to make tough decisions now and not set up segregated funds.

Unfortunately, this fund is a means to avoid those tough decisions. Firstly, the fund in no way solves the problem of where are we going to get the money. It is not going to make the next generation of ballistic missile submarines any cheaper. It simply shifts the burden for paying for their construction from the Department of the Navy to the entire Department of Defense.

I categorically disagree with the amendment's sponsor relative to this replacement program and the suggestion that it should exist outside the existing Navy shipbuilding account.

The sponsors are correct that the funding for that shipbuilding account has been relatively flat in recent years. However, if the Ohio class replacement and the 300-ship Navy are priorities of this Nation and consistent with our national defense strategy, then we ought to pay for both in a transparent manner by increasing the resources in the shipbuilding account and not resort to setting up independent funds.

Further, the sponsors indicate that this is a national priority, and I would not argue that point. These systems play a very important role in our nuclear deterrence, so do our long-range bombers and the weapons that they carry.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, long-range bombers also provide protection for this country as well as the weapons they carry. I think they qualify as national asset distinctions. Should we then set up funds for these programs?

Let's think about other priorities within the Department. Should we set up a fund for the Army's 82nd Airborne? Should we set up a fund for the Air Force combat rescue officers? They are very deserving. Should we set up a fund for the special Marine Air-Ground Task Force? They are very deserving.

Another concern that I have is it really expands and transfers authority to the Secretary of Defense. The last time I looked, we have a constitutional responsibility to make decisions ourselves.

The fact is we already have a segregated fund that has drawn a lot of attention to this bill that is called the overseas contingency operations fund. Should we start picking between services now as to which one should receive special treatment? Should we then pick programs within particular services? I think not.

Again, I strongly oppose the amendment and am pleased to join with the chairman in opposition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

Mr. FORBES. Can I request how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers have made my point for me. Mr. BLUMENAUER made the same arguments 4 weeks ago. It was defeated by 375 votes.

The last gentleman that spoke said it is $102 billion. The question is whether we wait until the night before to come up with $102 billion or whether we start now and make sure we have it. This is a national priority. I hope we will pass this amendment and build these ships.

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

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

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

Mr. FORBES. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8123. None of the funds provided in this Act for the T-AO(X) program shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of the following components unless those components are manufactured in the United States: Auxiliary equipment (including pumps) for shipboard services; propulsion equipment (including engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8124. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for military personnel pay, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, $700,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8125. The amounts appropriated in title II of this Act are hereby reduced by $359,000,000 to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds, as follows:

(1) From ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $138,000,000;

(2) From ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $221,000,000.

SEC. 8126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to lower than anticipated fuel prices, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $814,000,000.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the end strength levels for the Army National Guard of the United States below the levels specified for the Army National Guard of the United States in subtitle B of title IV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291): *Provided*, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 8128. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

TITLE IX

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $5,664,570,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $1,643,136,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $555,998,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $2,376,095,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $24,462,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $12,693,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $3,393,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $18,710,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $166,015,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $2,828,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $18,910,604,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $80,000,000)''.

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $80,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) uses the global war on terrorism funds for the Army operations and maintenance to provide $80 million in the same account for hard body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program.

Now, every warfighter deployed or scheduled to be deployed deserves to be provided with the most advanced and the lightest hard body armor. The amendment will ensure that the deployed soldiers are protected with the modern body armor they need. Presently, this bill provides no funds for the Army hard body armor.

This amendment will also help to ensure that the industrial base producing the specialized boron carbide powder, fabricating ceramic plates, and producing finished hard body armor can stay in business and sustain production of the lifesaving soldier protection equipment.

The body armor industry is in crisis, and that puts our troops at risk.

Last year, the House and Senate appropriated $80 million to the Army for industrial preparedness body armor.

All four congressional defense committees explicitly directed the Army to ensure that the industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor.

Despite this clear and explicit direction, the Army has completely ignored Congress. The Army's failure to sustain the body armor industrial base has put a vital industry at risk and is causing layoffs among very specialized employees, which puts the entire industry at risk.

There is no doubt that our troops deserve modern, lightweight body armor that requires a strong, reliable, and fully capable industrial base.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my good friend, my colleague on this issue.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her leadership on this issue and partnership in supporting this important and critical mission of our military to make sure that the United States warfighter in combat has the most advanced, lightweight body armor available to protect that soldier in the field against the enemy, and we must act now to make sure that the U.S. Army does what is the intent of the Congress.

As the gentlewoman pointed out, despite the fact that Congress has been clear on this matter, despite the fact that report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measures recognize the importance of lightweight body armor protecting soldiers in combat, we encouraged the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base was able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor by implementing the body armor modernization through a replenishment program.

Despite all of that, despite the articulation of the clear will of this body, the Army has not used and deployed the funds appropriated properly, and the Department of Defense was at odds because the Army did not deploy the resources appropriated until, or expressed the intent of not deploying those resources until the end of the fiscal year.

What this amendment will do is make sure that congressional intent is honored, make sure that the armor industrial base is properly maintained, and most importantly and most critically, when our men and women are called into combat to defend liberty and freedom, that we give them the tools that they need to keep them safe and carry out their mission with victory and honor.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, this $80 million is to provide body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program. I ask for Members' support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but, in fact, I support the amendment put forward by a member of our committee.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her amendment, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky for his strong advocacy.

Supporting our industrial base is a strong priority of mine and our committee's. We think this amendment is a good idea. It sends another message to the bureaucracy that we mean what we say.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $6,747,313,000: of which up to $160,002,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'' account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2215 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $1,871,834,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $10,799,220,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $7,559,131,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,260,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used to support the Government of Jordan, in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense may determine, to maintain the ability of the Jordanian armed forces to maintain security along the border between Jordan and Syria, upon 15 days prior written notification to the congressional defense committees outlining the amounts reimbursed and the nature of the expenses to be reimbursed: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That the authority in the preceding proviso may only be used for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, up to $30,000,000 shall be for Operation Observant Compass: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 124, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $430,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts aid to Pakistan in half. Pakistan is the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call our allies.

Before Osama bin Laden met his maker in 2011 in one of the greatest U.S. military raids ever conducted, bin Laden was living in plain sight in a bustling military town. To think that the most senior levels of the Pakistani Government did not know that he was there requires, as Secretary Clinton said, ''the willing suspension of disbelief.''

This February, the former head of Pakistan's version of the CIA, called the ISI, said that Pakistan most likely sheltered Osama bin Laden. And just last month, three U.S. intelligence sources told NBC News that Pakistan knew where Osama bin Laden was hiding all the time. Not only did Pakistan not help us get Osama bin Laden, Pakistan threw the doctor who did help us under the bus and put him in jail for 33 years for cooperating with America.

Pakistan did not help us because Pakistan was working with Osama bin Laden. Newly released documents retrieved from bin Laden's compound show that Pakistan's intelligence service was in contact with bin Laden and was working with him to convince U.S. leaders to negotiate with al Qaeda.

There are some who say we need Pakistan to help us fight the war in Afghanistan, but Pakistan is on the wrong side. Pakistan is helping the terrorists, not us. Pakistan's intelligence service gives safe haven, resources, and training to terrorist groups, like the Haqqani network that has killed dozens of Americans.

On September 22, 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee: ''With ISI support, Haqqani operatives planned and conducted the truck bomb attack, as well as the assault on our Embassy.''

The truck bombing he mentions wounded more than 70 U.S. and NATO troops. Admiral Mullen went on to say: ''The Haqqani network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency.''

Throughout 2011, Pakistan tried to cheat the United States by filling out bogus reimbursement claims for allegedly going after terrorists when they weren't even doing that. That is the same account this money funds.

There are others who say we need Pakistan's southern supply route to help our troops in Afghanistan. But for 7 months in 2012, Pakistan closed off the supply route, and we did just fine. What we really need access to is Pakistan's tribal areas. Terrorists that kill our troops in Afghanistan run back and forth across the Pakistan border and hide in these tribal areas, but Pakistan won't let our troops chase them there. And so the terrorists kill Americans, and they get away with it.

Pakistan did do some military operations in the tribal areas last year, but they tipped off the Haqqani network before they got there that they were coming. Pakistan tipping off terrorists is nothing new. Last fall, Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense at the time of the bin Laden raid, says of the Pakistanis, ''We just can't trust them.'' I agree. We can't trust Pakistan.

My amendment does not cut money to protect Pakistan's nuclear weapons. The amendment does recognize the U.S.-Pakistan relationship for what it is. We don't need to pay Pakistan to be our enemy; they will do it for free. Pakistan has already received over $30 billion of our money since 2002. After 13 years of giving Pakistan more and more money, it is time to do something different. My amendment simply cuts the money we give Pakistan in half.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I certainly understand the gentleman's passion, and at times, I share some of the same concerns he stated in his remarks.

Just to put a little perspective on it, the coalition support fund allows the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support, including access, specialized training to personnel, procurement and provision of supplies and equipment provided by that nation in connection with the U.S. military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom.

Receipts for reimbursements are submitted by cooperating nations and are fully vetted by the Pentagon and follow strict criteria to meet the standard for reimbursement, and all payments are made in arrears and follow a notification to Congress, so there is a notification to Congress.

Regarding Pakistan, the coalition support fund remains a critical tool to enable Pakistan to effectively deal with future challenges emerging from the U.S. drawdown. At times, I wonder whether we are withdrawing.

It is also a cost-effective tool, some would say, for the U.S. to remain engaged in the region. I know all too well that our relationship with Pakistan is an uncomfortable one; I feel it, but these funds are sent to reimburse Pakistan for actions to protect our interests.

These reimbursements are made to maintain some 186 Pakistani forces along 1,600 miles of border between Pakistan and Afghanistan to deter cross-border conflict, movement, and counterterrorism-counterinsurgency operations throughout the FATA, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas.

The focus of this core level is against TTP, an al Qaeda-allied organization that conducts regional terrorist and insurgent attacks. Nearly 28,000 militants were killed, injured, or arrested due to these operations. Pakistan itself—and this doesn't get much press—has suffered a lot of casualties themselves, about 5,000, while attempting to secure this treacherous border.

Continued support of the deployment of the Pakistan Armed Forces in FATA and other areas in the future is needed for the long-term stability of the area.

I must oppose the amendment, although I understand the passion with which the gentleman has made his argument because I think it is in our long-term interest to have this relationship.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and would acknowledge the gentleman from Texas' legitimate concern.

I would associate myself with the chairman's remark, but make one important addition, and that is the chairman has been adamant that we be very, very careful about our relationship with Pakistan, and the bill recognizes difficulties we face.

I would draw the Member's attention to section 9015 that prohibits funds to Pakistan if the government is engaged in activities that present a concern to the government of the United States.

I appreciate that the chairman insisted on that language. That is included in the bill.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee.

Pakistan cannot be trusted. They lie about the reimbursements. They have not met the criteria that the ranking member has talked about the last 4 years, and they got the money anyway. They are playing us, Mr. Chairman, and we pay them; and they use that money to hurt us, to hurt Americans.

This amendment says: we are cutting the money in half because of your prior conduct that shows you can't be trusted.

That is all this amendment does.

I would hope Members of Congress would send a message to Pakistan: we are not going to pay you to hate us and pay you to kill us; we are going to cut the money off.

And that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $124,559,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $34,187,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to

section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $3,455,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $209,606,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $160,845,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $225,350,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund'', $2,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support, or facilitate counterterrorism and crisis response activities pursuant to section 1534 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall transfer the funds provided herein to other appropriations provided for in this Act to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and subject to the same authorities and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That the funds available under this heading are available for transfer only to the extent that the Secretary of Defense submits a prior approval reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall comply with the appropriate vetting standards and procedures established elsewhere in this Act for any recipient of training, equipment, or other assistance: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $3,762,257,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may obligate and expend funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title for additional costs associated with existing projects previously funded with amounts provided under the heading ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That such costs shall be limited to contract changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuation, rate adjustments, and other necessary contract actions to complete existing projects, and associated supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not use more than $50,000,000 under the authority provided in this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify in advance such contract changes and adjustments in annual reports to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan or transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $10,000,000 shall be for recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces, and the recruitment and training of female security personnel: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 130, beginning line 2, strike ''Provided'' and all that follows through line 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island that works to assure the appropriate use of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan.

This amendment is in keeping with the clear position of the House, as we have voted numerous times in bipartisan fashion to limit funds for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund, a program which has been poorly run and is lacking in oversight.

This amendment would specifically strike the language which allows $50 million in funds for the Afghanistan security forces fund to be redirected toward the Afghanistan infrastructure fund account.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has provided $1.3 billion to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund since it was created in 2011. However, funds have been slow to be spent; and, as of March 31, 2015, more than 55 percent of AIF funds remain to be expended.

Additionally, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, has repeatedly found that DOD has experienced challenges in executing large infrastructure projects and that many projects underway are behind schedule and face serious cost overruns.

SIGAR's audits have also found that we have inadequate sustainment plans and that projects lack an identifiable counterinsurgency benefit. SIGAR has also expressed reservations about the Afghans' ability to even operate and maintain these energy projects upon completion.

Now, it is my understanding that DOD requested this repurposing of funds because the budget authority on previously authorized funds is about to expire. I know we all look to our commanders in the field for guidance on what they need to finish the job in Afghanistan, but with over half of existing funds remaining to be expended, I ask: Mr. Chairman, why should we take away from other programs and give to this one?

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's deep concern over the tax dollars that have been, if you would, wasted—is probably the most polite term I can think of—in some of the infrastructure investment in Afghanistan and would not in any way argue that point.

The gentleman mentions the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. He and his office have been in mine, the chairman's, the committee, and there is no question that the gentleman makes a very, very important point about making sure that those funds we are spending, despite the best of intentions, be spent carefully.

I would note to my colleagues that we do have within somewhat recent time, the last year or so since August, a new government in place in Afghanistan. The administration has made a decision to maintain troop levels at their current position given that change of government and, if you would, after all of the loss of life, the suffering, and loss of treasury for the last 14 years, to give that nation one last good chance.

I rise in opposition, essentially, to do that for Afghanistan and to give them that last good chance for these few remaining significant projects.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the sentiments of Mr. VISCLOSKY about some of the concerns and some of the reports that have been issued by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. It should be worrisome. A hell of a lot of money has been wasted.

I do think there are some projects that need to be completed. One that comes to mind is the Kandahar bridging solution, the plan to bring electric power to Kandahar. It ends in 3 months. We need to continue that investment. This was a top counterinsurgency priority. Most road projects are completed. The second is the Kajaki Dam has less than a year's work remaining and will supply renewable electric power to the grid.

These are elements of stability that sometimes get lost in reports of empty buildings where there are no occupants and no electricity. I think we need to continue to give a helping hand to the Afghan people because, if they don't have an economy, then they are not going to have any national security. They need a stable economy, and some of these projects near completion need to be continued.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest, again, we have a new government. I certainly think their concern for ethics, as well as care in investment, is worth taking that last good chance to give them a last good chance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words, the sentiments, the compassion of both my colleagues; but this is an issue that we have addressed for quite some time. It is not new.

I am as concerned about our administration of the funds, our Department of Defense encouragement of Afghans to use the funds, and to make sure that contractual arrangements are in place so completion will take place. We have not seen that.

I think it is time that reality strikes home. While I understand the need to encourage a new government, sometimes, the best way is tough love and a clear indication that comes through finances as well.

I, again, encourage my colleagues to adopt my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

□ 2100

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'', $715,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3558), to provide assistance, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies, and services, stipends, infrastructure repair, renovation, and sustainment to military and other security forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces or other local security forces, with a national security mission, to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that prior to providing assistance to elements of any forces such elements are appropriately vetted, including at a minimum, assessing such elements for associations with terrorist groups or groups associated with the Government of Iran; and receiving commitments from such elements to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, including the Government of Iraq, and other entities, to carry out assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entities, may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated or expended until not fewer than 15 days after (1) the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees, describing the plan for the provision of such training and assistance and the forces designated to receive such assistance, and (2) the President submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees on how assistance provided under this heading supports a larger regional strategy: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, not more than 60 percent may be obligated or expended until not less than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that an amount equal to not less than 40 percent of the amount provided under this heading has been contributed by other countries and entities for the purposes for which funds are provided under this heading, of which at least 50 percent shall have been contributed or provided by the Government of Iraq: *Provided further*, That the limitation in the preceding proviso shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines, in writing, that the national security objectives of the United States will be compromised by the application of the limitation to such assistance, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days in advance of the exemption taking effect, including a justification for the Secretary's determination and a description of the assistance to be exempted from the application of such limitation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive a provision of law relating to the acquisition of items and support services or sections 40 and 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780 and 2785) if the Secretary determines such provisions of law would prohibit, restrict, delay or otherwise limit the provision of such assistance and a notice of and justification for such waiver is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' under this heading means the congressional defense committees, the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $715,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I would like to begin by taking a moment to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY. As one who served a long time ago when everything came up under an open rule, we don't see as much of that. I can't commend both of the gentlemen

and their committees enough. I wish everybody in America could see how hard they have worked in their committees and here on the House floor. The country should know that there are no two more highly regarded people who are serving in this Chamber than our chairman and our ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that will save us a lot of money and, quite frankly, end a sad chapter in American history. My amendment eliminates funding for the Iraq Train and Equip Program and applies that money to reducing the deficit. The administration, as we all know, is now urging strategic patience with Iraq. The truth is we have had a failed strategy there from the very beginning. The fact is that this is a century-old conflict. The fact is that we have no friends in this conflict. The history of it is clear.

I happened to be up in Tora Bora back in the seventies, and I learned that we were funding and training and equipping the Mujahedeen to fight against the Russians under the notion that the enemy of our enemy is our friend. We were wrong. They morphed into al Qaeda, and they were the people who bombed the World Trade Center. Then we supported Saddam Hussein in the war against Iran. We knew he had used chemical weapons, because we had the sales receipts. We had supplied them. After that, we deposed him. Then we put the Shiites in power, and the Shiites proceeded to tell all of the Christians and the Jews and the Catholics, ''Get out of town, or we will kill you.'' They shut down all of the synagogues and the Catholic churches. Then we decided we would have a Sunni awakening. That was supplying arms and weapons to the Sunnis because the Shiites were persecuting them. They ultimately morphed into what we now have as ISIL. Now here we are. We find ourselves fighting the Shiites in Yemen, and we are supporting the Shiites in Iraq. We are not sure if we are for them or against them in Syria.

The simple truth is that we have been on every side of this conflict. We really have no friends in this conflict. Inevitably, our goodwill, our good intentions have resulted in the arms and the weapons, as Judge POE just said, ending up in the hands of our enemies, and they use them against us.

The fact is we have spent $3 trillion on this conflict. Think about that—$3 trillion. For $1 trillion of that, we could have graduated debt free every kid in America from college and vocational school. Just think about it. We could have rebuilt our transportation and infrastructure system in this country. For another $1 trillion, we could have given the Americans a tax break.

Mr. Chairman, instead of 13 years of war, the administration now admits that we have no strategy. The Secretary of Defense admits that the Iraqi Army has no will to fight ISIL. When they took over Ramadi, all they did was growl at them, and they ran like rabbits. They left their Humvees, and they left their tanks, and they left all of their weapons, and we resupplied ISIL, once again, to use those weapons against us. The weapons we have supplied and the people we have trained have ended up in enemy hands time and time again and have been used against us.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, you know the old definition of insanity is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior over and over and expecting some different result. To paraphrase the old Serenity Prayer, let me say, Mr. President and colleagues: Let us change what we have the power, the wisdom, and the courage to do before we bankrupt this country.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I share quite a lot of the gentleman's sentiments.

I have said on a number of occasions, when you put the Defense bill forward, sometimes you have to support things that the Commander in Chief and the President want that you are highly dubious about. I have been very conflicted about this Train and Equip. At times, I think the enemy is doing a better job of training and equipping their own than we are, and, at times, it has been pretty deplorable. I want the gentleman to know I do support this effort. Let me just put some meat on the bones to, maybe, even make his point but, in reality, tell a little truth about the program.

The Iraq Train and Equip Program provides about $715 million in both funding and authority to assist military and other forces associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces, with a national security mission to counter ISIL. We do know in the overall mix—and the gentleman from Minnesota knows it—there are some good guys over there. Of course, a lot of the good guys have been taken over by the Quds Force and the Iranians to the south, but, in reality, we do have some good allies in the north with the Kurds, so I haven't given up on all parts of Iraq.

I think we need to continue to support the program. Evidently, our President does as well. We are sending 400 more advisers over to, shall we say, set up a new base camp in Ramadi in Anbar province to sort of respond to a huge crisis there when that city was taken over. I would hate to abandon the people of Iraq without giving it one more try.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's motivation in offering this. In a sense, the three of us are agreed given the skepticism that has been expressed here today.

I would also add that I do believe this institution needs to have a resolution that defines with some specificity what our projection of force should be as to the disposition of our military personnel and assets. Certainly, I am grievously disappointed for those countries in that region in their lack of clarity and purpose. Also, in using, if you would, a religious theme, I was taught that we should have hope in the future, and my concern is, if we cease this training program for those who want a change in government, for those who want to do the right thing in Syria, they will lose what shred of hope still exists.

Principally, for that reason, I join with the chairman in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I do appreciate the gentleman's motivation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In reclaiming my time, I have a few other comments.

Mr. Chairman, I said I do work on behalf of the President of the United States and our Commander in Chief, and I have to say I have concerns about our continued investment in Pakistan. We debated that. We have had talk about the Afghan infrastructure fund, which has been troubled with projects, and this is an ongoing area which has not been trouble free. Yet it is interesting that nobody from the White House, since the budget was introduced, has reached out to me relative to defending these programs.

I think the people of these countries deserve protection and support, but it is interesting that we carry the water on these issues and on many other issues on this committee. Do we get any reinforcements? Actually, our entire bill has been put together for all of our military services without any assistance from those military services to get us across the finish line. I think it is remarkable. The standoffishness—the ambivalence—about working with us, I think, is a total disgrace.

I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and he certainly knows more about my sentiments publicly that I have expressed in the past.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the ''Syria Train and Equip Fund'', $600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, stipends, construction of training and associated facilities, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes: defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition; protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria; and promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments and other entities to carry out activities authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entities may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may provide assistance to third countries for purposes of the provision of assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That the term ''appropriately vetted'' shall be construed to mean, at a minimum, assessments of possible recipients for associations with terrorist groups including the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusrah, Ahrar al Sham, other al-Qaeda related groups, Hezbollah, or Shia militias supporting the Governments of Syria or Iran; and for commitment to the rule of law and a peaceful and democratic Syria: *Provided further*, That none of the funds used pursuant to this authority shall be used for the procurement or transfer of man-portable air-defense systems: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances, in accordance with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment before the floor for consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $600,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start tonight by saying that my mother is gravely ill in Florida this evening, and I can't be with her, but I want her to know that I am with her right now, and I am always with her.

We all want to end U.S. involvement in conflicts where there is no long-term strategy, no vision of success in the end, and the disproportional sacrifice of our brave military forces, Mr. Chairman. U.S. involvement against ISIS in Syria fits this characterization. The administration even admits that there is no comprehensive strategy in place. Therefore, by amendment, we are proposing to defund U.S. support for the Syrian rebels and move the funds to the spending reduction account.

Last September, Congress allocated $500 million to train and arm Syrian rebels. This program, however, is fraught with uncertainties and doubts, and the launch of the program has been less than impressive. Of the 15,000 Syrian rebels we planned to train and equip over a 3-year period, so far, only about 400 have been vetted and deemed ready. Meanwhile, other Syrian rebels have either disappeared from the battlefield or have defected to extremist factions, and ISIS has expanded its ground forces, its operations, and its territories. Other jihadist factions in Syria are also gaining strength, and the Assad regime continues its atrocities.

The civil war in Syria has now resulted in 220,000 Syrian deaths and in 11.5 million people—over half the population—displaced within Syria. The U.S. continues to provide, by far, the bulk of the military might, most of it air power. It is hard to imagine defeating ISIS without substantial ground forces to combat it at this point. The Defense Appropriations bill includes $600 million to train and arm Syrian rebels as part of this needed boots-on-the-ground.

□ 2115

But whatever the number of Syrian rebels we ultimately introduce into the battlefield, they alone, I believe, are unlikely to turn the tide. Nor are these rebels expected to end the Assad government, even though that, too, is one of our stated goals.

History has shown that when we arm untested and difficult-to-vet rebel forces, the weapons we provide too often wind up being aimed at our U.S. troops. I am told that the last time our country funded a foreign war through vicarious fighters was the Taliban fighting against the Russians in the 1970s.

Please join us in saying ''no'' to additional funding for these untested Syrian rebels unless and until Congress receives clear answers to the following questions: Where is the accounting for the first $500 million? I don't have it. Why isn't the second $600 million, if appropriate, funded by other folks in the coalition? What is the objective? What does success look like in the Syrian civil war? Does victory require the end of the Assad government? What is the comprehensive strategy for defeating ISIS in Iraq and beyond?

In our view, without the answers to these questions, it makes no sense to proceed. It is our job to review and assess. I ask that defunding of the Syrian train and equip fund be accomplished by this amendment to H.R. 2685.

I acknowledge my deep admiration for the chairman and ranking member and what they have accomplished in this bill and acknowledge so many good things in the bill, but it is hard for me to accept this war that is going nowhere.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to join my colleague. I have enormous respect for the chairman and the ranking member's good and noble intentions, but, again, the fact is we have no friends in these conflicts. The weapons that we send inevitably are being used against us. I was here during the Vietnam war conflict, and the arguments that we hear today for continuing this involvement is to somehow make something good out of what hasn't been quite so good, and we finally ended that conflict by cutting off the funds for it. That is how we are going to end our wars of choice in the Middle East, wars of choice that are bankrupting this country and costly in blood and treasury.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure, on behalf of everybody on the floor, we extend to Mr. CLAWSON our sympathy and hope that his mother will recover. I am sure if she has the ability to be watching the television tonight, she is already very proud of his courageous remarks on the floor.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Heartfelt. Thanks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the sentiment of the amendment, this is a complicated issue—that is an understatement—with multifaceted policy ramifications that really can't be fully debated in 5 or 10 minutes. The situation in Syria remains highly complicated and complex and poses imminent threats to the United States and allied interests, particularly Israel, Jordan, and Iraq.

Recognizing congressional concerns regarding potential U.S. military involvement in Syria, our bill appropriates funds in the GWOT account, the title IX that I talked about several hours ago to train and equip Syrians. It also further prohibits the introduction

of U.S. military forces into hostilities in Syria except in accordance with the War Powers Act.

However, this amendment, in my judgment, goes too far, for it attempts to tie the U.S. Government's hands in navigating the complicated situation we—or, more importantly, our allies Israel and Jordan—face related to threats emanating from ISIL in Iraq and Syria every day. We have to be realistic. There are many countries, including our allies, as well as other groups already involved in Syria.

This amendment would do nothing to stop the arming of the Syrian opposition. What this amendment would do is remove the possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstances, even if such engagement would be in the best interests of the United States or allies. Even at this rate, the U.S. is paying just a portion of the costs.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member, for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to express my best wishes for the gentleman's mother. It is hard to oppose a gentleman who went to Purdue University. I know he is a very smart individual. I have my other colleague here from Minnesota.

I have spoken to our colleagues on the previous amendment. I think people understand my position. I simply would add my voice to the chairman and emphasize, this is a very tough problem, and we ought to maintain as large a degree of flexibility as we can.

I appreciate the chairman's remarks and associate myself with them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, but I certainly understand the sentiments behind it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $759,073,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $572,735,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $647,630,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $431,640,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,648,312,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $722,274,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $105,459,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $12,186,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $234,741,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $1,297,726,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $773,638,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Space Procurement, Air Force'', $452,676,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $1,673,358,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $7,045,550,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $217,701,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT ACCOUNT

For procurement of covered items for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this paragraph, the term ''covered items'' means items that— (1) are not major weapon systems, aircraft, or other items central to the mission of an organization; and (2) are useful for both missions performed under title 10, United States Code, and missions performed under title 32, United States Code, when applicable, including radios, generators, computers, trucks, and other dual-use items: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $1,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $217,647,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $1,366,242,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $199,264,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $88,850,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $272,704,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $275,300,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $443,271,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the ''Office of the Inspector General'', $10,262,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress

SEC. 9002. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9003. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $3,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 9004. Supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance or the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9005. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle; and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9006. Not to exceed $10,000,000 of the amounts appropriated in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small-scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed $2,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of $500,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9007. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9009. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other

Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 9010. None of the funds provided for the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' (ASFF) may be obligated prior to the approval of a financial and activity plan by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of $50,000,000 annually and any non-standard equipment requirements in excess of $100,000,000 using ASFF: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that the AROC has convened and approved a process for ensuring compliance with the requirements in the preceding proviso and accompanying report language for the ASFF.

SEC. 9011. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $500,000.

SEC. 9012. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', up to $140,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction, and site closeout activities prior to returning sites to the Government of Iraq: *Provided*, That to the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include non-operational training activities in support of Iraqi Minister of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training activities that they determine are needed after the end of fiscal year 2016, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2016*: Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 9013. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, to the Government of Jordan for purposes of supporting and enhancing efforts of the armed forces of Jordan and to sustain security along the border of Jordan with Syria and Iraq: *Provided*, That up to $600,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund may be used for activities authorized by this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments to carry out activities as authorized by this section and shall be credited to the appropriate appropriations accounts, except that any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall not be available for obligation until a reprogramming action is submitted to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the President and the Secretary of Defense shall comply with the reporting requirements in section 149(b)(1), (b)(2), (c), and (d) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113–164): *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances, in accordance with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 9014. For ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine'', $200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing assistance, including training, equipment, lethal weapons of a defensive nature, logistics support, supplies and services, and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, for the purposes of securing the sovereign territory of Ukraine against foreign aggressors, protecting and defending the Ukrainian people from attacks posed by Russian-backed separatists, and promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to Ukraine: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not less than 15 days prior to obligating funds provided under this heading, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Ukraine and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the military or National Security Forces of Ukraine or returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees*: Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 9015. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' for payments under section 1233 of Public Law 110–181 for reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan may be made available unless the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Government of Pakistan is—

(1) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries;

(2) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan;

(3) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs;

(4) preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise;

(5) implementing policies to protect judicial independence and due process of law;

(6) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(7) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national security interest to do so: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, exercises such waiver authority, the Secretaries shall report to the congressional defense committees on both the justification for the waiver and on the requirements of this section that the Government of Pakistan was not able to meet: *Provided further*,

That such report may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike subsection (b) of section 9015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 2130

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is very simple. It makes it so the Secretary of Defense cannot waive the conditions that are in the bill on giving money to Pakistan.

Since 2010, Congress has put conditions on our aid to Pakistan because Pakistan, frankly, can't be trusted. In 2011, Pakistan tipped off terrorists who had IED factories that the U.S. Government knew where they were. Pakistan tipped off the Haqqani network before the Pakistan military went to the tribal areas last year.

We didn't tell Pakistan before we launched the raid that killed Osama bin Laden because, according to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, ''We just can't trust them.''

This bill puts seven conditions on our aid to Pakistan. They are good conditions. Earlier this evening, about an hour ago, the ranking member mentioned these conditions for aid to Pakistan. They are commonsense things like, if Pakistan wants our money, it shouldn't support terrorist activity against the United States—imagine that—or the Pakistan Government should dismantle the IED factories run by terrorists in Pakistan. These IED factories have killed many of our troops.

Here is the problem. Each year, we put conditions on our aid. The bill also gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to give the money to Pakistan even if Pakistan doesn't meet those conditions, and this year is no exception. Once again, in this bill, we give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the conditions Congress puts in the bill.

Four of the last 5 years, Pakistan has failed to meet the conditions Congress has imposed on this type of legislation, and then the Secretary of Defense went ahead and gave the waiver, thus giving the money to Pakistan anyway.

The administration has never not given Pakistan money because it failed to meet our conditions—conditions set by Congress—normal, commonsense conditions like: you don't get this money unless you meet these conditions.

This amendment does one simple thing. It says: you meet the conditions, or you get no money from the United States; you don't give money to terrorists, or you get no money from the United States.

It does not allow the Secretary of Defense to waive Congress' conditions and give the money anyway.

That is what this legislation does. I would ask that the House support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. This amendment would strike, as he said, the waiver that is used by the Secretary of Defense and also the Secretary of State. I think it would affect our national security.

We need the cooperation of the Pakistanis. If we don't have any, we lose insight into the actions of those who would do our country harm.

I oppose this amendment as potentially damaging to our national security, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chair for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Again, I am not unsympathetic to the position the gentleman has raised, but I do not think we are in a very difficult relationship, that we restrain our flexibility to meet the moment.

For that reason, I join the chairman in his opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank both the ranking member and the chairman for their comments and their work on this legislation.

My amendment says, to quote the chairman earlier, ''We mean what we say.'' We say as a Congress that, if we are going to give American money to Pakistan to help us, they can't do certain things with that money. They can't support terrorism. They can't allow IEDs to be built that are used to kill Americans. These conditions are commonsense, good ideas.

In the past, we have done this before. If we mean what we say, then we should require these conditions before we give Pakistan American money; but the law has allowed that Secretary of Defense to waive Congress' conditions and give them our money anyway.

Pakistan has proven they didn't meet the conditions in 4 years of the last 5. They got the money anyway because the Secretary waived the rule of law or waived our conditions.

This bill does something very simple. It says: Congress says there are certain rules to get American money; you follow the rules, or you don't get the money. Nobody can waive the condition and give you a pass and give you American money anyway.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. 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.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for the work that he has done on this.

I understand that I had an amendment earlier today. There had been ongoing discussions about that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the end that the amendment stands disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9016. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act, $500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to the operations and maintenance, military personnel, and procurement accounts, to improve the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days prior to exercising the transfer authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the proposed uses of these funds: *Provided further*, That the funds provided in this section may not be transferred to any program, project, or activity specifically limited or denied by this Act: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9017. In addition to amounts appropriated in title II or otherwise made available in this Act, $2,500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and

made available for transfer to the operation and maintenance accounts of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force (including National Guard and Reserve) for purposes of improving military readiness: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 9018. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed or military forces into hostilities in Syria, into situations in Syria where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Syrian territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of that law (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10001. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the United States has been engaged in military operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) for more than 8 months;

(2) President Obama submitted an authorization for the use of military force against ISIL in February 2015; and

(3) under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to ''declare war''.

(b) Therefore, Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 10002. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, 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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 131, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—300

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
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
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—131

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brownley (CA)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Honda
Hoyer
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takai
Takano
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Keating

□ 2205

Ms. CHU, Messrs. MOONEY of West Virginia, SHERMAN, LEWIS, LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GRAYSON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. RICHMOND, SIMPSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 303 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. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2207

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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (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, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. 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. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment by Mr. VISCLOSKY of Indiana.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. FORBES of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment by Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. POE of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) 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 195, noes 237, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—195

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
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
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
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
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
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)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
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—1

Gowdy

□ 2211

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) 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 252, noes 179, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—252

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brat
Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly

Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graham
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer (MN)
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Rice (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2216

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) 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 174, noes 257, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—174

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
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
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
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)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
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
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
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
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
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—2

Gowdy
Quigley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 173, noes 259, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—173

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
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
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
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)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—259

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
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
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
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
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
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—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 251, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES—181

Adams
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
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
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
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
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—251

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
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
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
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
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
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
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
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
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
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—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) 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 321, noes 111, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—321

Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—111

Abraham
Aderholt
Amash
Bass
Becerra
Bilirakis
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brown (FL)
Buck
Burgess
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Donovan
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Fleischmann
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Israel
Jeffries

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
Lance
Lee
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Lowey
MacArthur
McDermott
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Nadler
Nunes
Palazzo
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Trott
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2230

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. PAYNE and BUCSHON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 315, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—117

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Brat
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hardy
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Perry
Pingree
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tonko
Trott
Upton
Walden
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—315

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2233

Mr. COFFMAN 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. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. 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 233, noes 199, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—233

Abraham
Adams
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kennedy
Kind
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—199

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gibbs
Gohmert
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Poliquin
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2237

Mr. RICE of South Carolina 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 MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) 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 56, noes 375, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—56

Amash
Blum
Blumenauer
Burgess
Capuano
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Gohmert
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kennedy
Kuster
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Massie
McDermott
McGovern
Moulton
Mulvaney
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Rohrabacher
Sanford
Schrader
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Watson Coleman
Welch

NOES—375

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2239

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) 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 107, noes 323, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—107

Amash
Blum
Blumenauer
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
DeFazio
Dent
DesJarlais
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Heck (NV)
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt (VA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kennedy
Labrador
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Massie
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Miller (FL)
Moulton
Mulvaney
Neal
Neugebauer
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rothfus
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—323

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Bost
Gowdy
Hultgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2242

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) 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 114, noes 318, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—114

Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hahn
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Labrador
LaMalfa
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pearce
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rouzer
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—318

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2245

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest or retire, or to prepare to divest or retire, KC–10 aircraft.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

I have an amendment regarding the KC–10 air-to-air refueling tanker.

Air superiority is critical if we are going to protect our men and women on the ground and our interests, and that requires that we have fighters in the air. It is of vital importance. It is why the Air Mobility Command is so important. It may not be as exciting as fighters and close air support, but it is every bit as essential. The KC–10 air-to-air refueler is the larger, newer of the tankers, and the KC–135 is the smaller, older version.

This is the problem. The KC–46 is a new tanker that the Air Force is introducing. It has had development problems, and it is not ready for prime time. General Welch of the Air Force confirmed that the new tanker was not intended to replace the KC–10 but that it is at risk of being replaced due to budget cuts, and he has confirmed that it would cost more in the midterm to replace the KC–10.

Just to put the difference in capabilities in perspective, the KC–10 can carry 350,000 pounds of fuel. The other tanker—the older KC–135—and the new KC–46 can only carry 200,000. It is 200,000 versus 350,000. The KC–10 carries double the payload, and it carries more passengers. The long and the short is that this tanker is essential for our ability to project force, and in this world of increased global threats, we cannot afford to deteriorate our capabilities.

The answer, I believe, is to prohibit the early retirement of the KC–10 tanker. We did that in the National Defense Authorization Act. There is no provision in the budget to replace the KC–10. I am simply looking to close the loop tonight and prohibit in the Defense Appropriations bill any funding for the early retirement of the KC–10.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacARTHUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey, my colleague, for his advocacy on behalf of the KC–10.

Mr. Chairman, none of the good work we have done in the Middle East could have been done without the remarkable history of the men and women who work on those KC–10s and these tankers, allowing so many flights to go without any problems, any issues. That is a remarkable plane. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I congratulate him for introducing it.

Mr. NORCROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacARTHUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues from New Jersey, I stand in support of this amendment, and I appreciate the fact that Congressman MACARTHUR has kept in the forefront how important this is, not just for New Jersey but for our Nation as a whole.

We are strategically located in that one area that makes it extremely efficient to refuel. More importantly, we have two ways of getting the fuel to those planes, which is so strategically important. It is over land and it is underground. That has been why McGuire-Fort Dix has been the place for this command to be joined together for years and years. I think this is not only strategically smart for our country, but this is an efficient way of spending the taxpayers' money to make sure that we get the best bang for the buck.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

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 may be used after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman

from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, 10 months ago, we entered into the war against ISIS. During the course of that war, we have put our pilots and other servicemembers at considerable risk, and we have suffered casualties. We have expended hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars, and, as yet, there is no end in sight to this conflict.

In the beginning of the conflict and our participation in it, the administration took the position that it didn't need an authorization from Congress although it desired one. The administration relied on the authorities that were passed in 2001 and 2002. The authority in 2001, passed in the hours after 9/11, authorized the use of force against those responsible for 9/11. That is al Qaeda. He also relied on the authorization passed in 2002, which authorized the use of force against Iraq. In fact, neither of those authorities is on point. The use of force that we are employing now against ISIL is being used against an organization that didn't exist on 9/11 and, in fact, is often at war with the organization that was responsible for 9/11. That is al Qaeda.

Nonetheless, the administration has asserted that it can rely on these authorities, and it asked Congress to pass a new authorization because it felt that was the preferential course. At the time and before the midterm elections, the leadership in the House of Representatives took the position that a lame duck Congress should not be voting on a new war and that a vote must wait until after the elections. So the Congress abdicated its constitutional responsibility to have a debate and a war declaration, and, instead, we awaited the elections.

The elections came and the elections went, and those of us who raised the cry that it was time for Congress to do its job were met with a new response: we couldn't vote on an authorization now because the administration had not sent us one, even though there is nothing in the Constitution that provides that Congress shall declare war only when asked by the Executive or only when asked politely by the Executive. Nonetheless, we sat, once again, derelict until the administration sent us a draft authorization.

□ 2300

Then there was a new explanation for inaction. We couldn't act on this new authorization because we didn't like the terms of it. This was irrespective of the fact that the Congress has all the power it needs to change that draft or operate under a completely new draft authorization, and still we did nothing.

Then the explanation was given we couldn't act on a war authorization because we had to have a vote on the negotiations with Iran, even though those negotiations were not yet complete. So we had a vote on the negotiations with Iran, in fact, a vote to later have a vote.

Now we are here once again with a series of shifting rationales for why we don't have a debate on this war ongoing now for 10 months. This must come to an end. The amendment that I have offered this evening would provide that no funds shall be expended for the war against ISIS after a certain date in March of next year unless Congress authorizes a war against ISIS. If this is worth fighting—and I believe it is; I believe this ought to be authorized—it is worth having Congress do its job. If we are going to ask our servicemembers to risk their lives, we ought to have the courage ourselves to make a vote on this war.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, currently, U.S. forces are conducting multiple airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Without this authority, these campaigns would stop immediately.

Should this Authorization for Use of Military Force be replaced? Perhaps it should. On May 19, Speaker BOEHNER urged President Obama to start from scratch on a measure to legally authorize the Islamic State conflict, declaring, ''We don't have a strategy.'' I agree with the Speaker, we have no strategy with regard to ISIL.

Recently, President Obama stated he still does not have a complete strategy for defeating the Islamic State. A sad commentary—shifting rationale, shifting strategy, no strategy. At a time when sectarian tensions are at their highest levels since the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom in December of 2001, the terrorists have once again succeeded in capturing control of major cities in Iraq, killing innocent citizens, causing thousands of families to flee.

What kind of message are we sending with this amendment to both the Iraqi people, to our soldiers and marines who have valiantly served and sacrificed, and even now the President suggesting sending another 400 advisers to advise and to train and equip Iraqis to recapture Ramadi?

This amendment is not about substance; it is about symbolism. Unfortunately, its effect would be much more than symbolism. Acceptance of this amendment would rob our Nation of one of the key authorities our Commander-in-Chief relies on to keep us safe. I strongly urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my colleague.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if I could make a comment. As the chairman indicated, this is a very complicated situation. Because lives are at stake, it is all the more reason, I think, to support the gentleman's amendment to force this body, if you would, to very carefully define what our purpose is, what our policy is, and how we should go about its implementation. I do support the gentleman's amendment and thank him for yielding time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman and would like to respond to my colleague's points.

First of all, the effect of this is not to end funding immediately. The effect of this would end funding in 9 months if we fail to take up and pass an authorization. Certainly, 10 months into the war and 9 months from now ought to be ample time for the Congress to do its constitutional duty.

Second, my colleague makes the point that he doesn't agree with the President's strategy. We may take issue with the President's strategy, and we all have our opinions about how this war ought to be waged, but one thing is clear: it is not going to impact the strategy if Congress does its job or not. That impacts our institution; that doesn't impact the Presidency. It is our institutional interest in having a voice in the war-making authority that is at stake here.

Finally, the gentleman asked: What kind of a message are we sending with an amendment like this? I would say the message we are sending is that we value our Constitution; we respect the requirements of our Constitution. Our Constitution says that Congress—not the Executive, but Congress—shall have the power to declare war.

My colleague says this is merely a symbolic act. I suppose that is true if you think that the constitutional clause that gives the Congress the power to declare war is only symbolic, but I think it is far more than symbolic and key to the balance of power.

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. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. 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. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by

the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would reiterate Congress' objection to a proposed policy change by the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, OFCCP, that would treat healthcare providers as Federal contractors.

In December of 2010, OFCCP quietly issued directive 293, asserting that contractual arrangements under Medicare, TRICARE, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will trigger OFCCP jurisdiction. This is absurd. This directive would reclassify a majority of hospitals in the United States as Federal contractors, subjecting hospitals in your district and mine to OFCCP's often crushing regulatory burden.

With respect to TRICARE, the agency aggressively asserted its jurisdiction in a 2009 administrative case, OFCCP v. Florida Hospital of Orlando. OFCCP argued the hospital was a Federal subcontractor by virtue of its participation as a provider of a TRICARE network of providers. The agency took this troubling position despite the fact that the Department of Defense, which regulates TRICARE, previously concluded, Mr. Chairman: ''It would be impossible to achieve the TRICARE mission of providing affordable health care for our Nation's Active Duty and retired military members and their families if onerous Federal contracting rules were applied to the more than 500,000 TRICARE providers in the United States.''

Unfortunately, the administrative law judge in the case did not heed DOD's warning and failed to see this policy change for what it is—an expansion of government power over the healthcare sector. As such, Congress acted to oppose this outreach, and in 2012 the National Defense Authorization Act clarified that a TRICARE network healthcare provider is not—is not—a Federal contractor or subcontractor.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply concerned by this attempt by OFCCP to expand its jurisdiction through executive fiat. In response, I introduced the Protecting Health Care Providers from Increased Administrative Burdens Act in the 113th Congress, which clarified that healthcare providers are not Federal contractors subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's OFCCP.

Our actions on the committee in bringing attention to this issue have been successful in prompting OFCCP to place a moratorium on the policy. However, as OFCCP has previously defied Congress and the Department of Defense, I believe this amendment is necessary. Therefore, I ask the House support my amendment that would prohibit funds to be used under this act for implementing this overreaching policy and affirmatively show the House will not support such actions by the Department of Labor and OFCCP.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan for a colloquy.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

As you know, TRICARE provides coverage to over 9.5 million people worldwide, including Active Duty, activated Guard and Reserve members, retiree survivors, and their families. To ensure coverage, they must choose between independently practicing TRICARE certified medical health counselors and/or supervised mental health counselors.

I entered my amendment and withdrew it, but it is important that we get this on the RECORD.

The independent providers must have a master's degree from a mental health counseling program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, which we call CACREP. They must also pass the National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Exam by January 1, 2017.

But this rule unfortunately has unintended consequences that require counselors to complete their education at an institution that only has been accredited by CACREP. This freezes out some of our most respected institutions, including Harvard, Columbia, and, in my home State of Michigan, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

I am extremely concerned about and would ask for the committee's support in addressing this issue. With more time, we can get this right, ensure our military members have as much access to care as possible.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for bringing this issue to the committee's attention. I look forward to working with her on it to address the unintended consequences of the existing DOD rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. 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. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the Small Business Administration interim final rule titled ''Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2012 North American Industry Classification System'' (published August 20, 2012, in the Federal Register) with respect to the procurement of footwear.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer this amendment that will ensure a fair and open bidding process to supply our men and women on the front lines with one of the most indispensable pieces of equipment that they use every day—their boots.

My amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the 2012 Small Business Administration's rule in regard to footwear preventing the Defense Logistics Agency from bidding the contract as a small business set-aside.

When SBA released this rule, there was significant concern that they did not go through the normal rulemaking and public comment process, and more specifically did not perform due diligence on how the changes would actually affect the footwear industry and military supply base, which the SBA has acknowledged.

This rule dramatically changed the competitive landscape amongst companies supplying very compliant footwear to the U.S. military. There are very few of these manufacturers here in the United States, and even fewer that manufacture Berry Compliant footwear. This amendment would ensure that all businesses capable of supplying high-quality footwear to our warfighters are able to compete for that contract.

□ 2315

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that last year, we had been able to get language inserted in that would call for a study. I just wanted to have a quick quote from that on the impact of jobs. This is from the report that was issued:

> Although the overall impact on the industrial base is low, the abrupt and drastic change in the small business size standards is likely to have an impact. The DOD footwear industry is highly capable, but also very dependent on DOD orders. It's important to consider both the short-term and long-term health of the industrial base.
>
> The industry is also a critical element to the Nation's national security because of the enduring need to meet wartime footwear requirements.

The emphasis here is mine. Given the industry's sensitive and critical position, such abrupt and drastic policy changes that impact the competitive landscape should be executed with greater moderation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the concern here today, and that is why I would urge my colleagues to support this vital amendment.

I do appreciate the opportunity for dialogue that I have been having with my colleague from Illinois and also with the Small Business Committee on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, as you may know, the reason I stand in opposition is the Small Business Administration sets these standards. As of 2012, this standard was set in place.

Though I am more than willing to work with the gentleman in the future on what might come forward actually through the Small Business Committee, the concern I have is that those that do qualify under small business inadvertently, through his language, would be removed from that.

The concern I have also is that is located in my district, with a company that has already received a contract under that.

It is a process that we have in place. We know that there may be flaws in the process, and in the Small Business Committee, we are going to be working on those. I believe that the gentleman has sincere hopes to try to straighten this problem out for his district. I understand that.

I believe that this is not the way to do this. I stand in opposition. I hope that others will join me in voting ''no'' on this, but I do give the commitment that, if a ''no'' vote does occur, I will be working with him.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I simply would add my voice to his in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

It is certainly my belief and understanding that the Defense Logistics Agency is executing an acquisition program that maximizes to every extent possible long-term contracts and multiple award strategies that limit variability to limit each vendor's economic risk.

The gentleman mentions small manufacturers. Some of the largest companies in the country are involved at the Department of Defense, which is fine. They do wonderful work for our country. We ought to make sure that we protect the prerogatives of small businesses to make sure that they are on equal footing for these contracts so that you have that limit on economic risk for all vendors, big and small.

I appreciate the gentleman's objection, and I would join him in it.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I do appreciate my colleague from Illinois and other members from the Small Business Committee who are committed to working at this.

The concern, again, would be one of our capacity and our industrial base and being able to supply that most vital of needs for our men and women in uniform, which is their footwear. When we talk about large, we talk about small at the same time because 400 is the number of west Michigan jobs that are in the balance here; but we wouldn't be able to reach the full capacity if we needed to surge again in a very unstable world, as we have been dealing with a number of crises around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. 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), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2015.

Ms. LEE (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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is really very simple. It is cosponsored by Representatives GRIJALVA and ELLISON. It prohibits any funding in this bill pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force after December 31, 2015.

This timeline gives the President and the Congress sufficient time—that is 8 months after this is signed into law—to determine what if any authorization would be needed to replace the 2001 AUMF.

This amendment is not only timely, but it really is necessary. On September 14, 2001, I could not vote for the 2001 AUMF. That was an authorization that I knew would provide a blank check to wage war any time, for any length, anywhere.

In the last 14 years, it has become increasingly clear that this authorization has essentially provided the President—this is any President—President Bush, now President Obama—the authority to wage war against anyone, anywhere, at any time, against any country, with no authorization from Congress.

In fact, the Congressional Research Service has found that the 2001 AUMF has been used more than 30 times to justify military action and other activities, including warrantless surveillance and wiretapping, indefinite detention practices at GTMO, targeted killing operations using lethal drones, and the open-ended expansion of military operations abroad, which have nothing to do with the original congressional intent.

In addition to the activities I mentioned, the AUMF has reportedly been invoked to deploy troops in Afghanistan, Yemen, Djibouti, Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia. The 2001 AUMF is now being cited as the authority for the now 10-month-long war against ISIL—and, yes, we are in a war.

We know that ISIL must be degraded and dismantled, but Congress must do our job. We should debate and vote on the use of force. That is our constitutional responsibility.

I know that, while many of us may not share a common position on how to deal with the 2001 authorization, many of us do agree that the overly broad authority is a major and concerning deterioration of congressional oversight and warmaking authority.

I think many of us can agree that a robust debate and vote is necessary, long overdue, and must take place, whatever we believe about how we should vote. The American people deserve to have their Representatives speak for them on these grave matters which the Constitution requires.

Let me be clear. With the 2001 authorization still on the books in its current form, any administration can continue to rely on this blank check to wage endless war. That is why my amendment to prohibit funding for the 2001 AUMF after December 31, 2015, is so important.

There was very little debate. I remember that very moment that we had this debate on this resolution 12 years ago. I think the debate maybe was about 1 hour—pro and con, 30 minutes. I probably was the only one who voted and said ''no'' in terms of the debate, but it wasn't a very long debate, and I am sure, if we had had more time to debate this, more Members would have realized that this was a blank check.

Let's repeal this. I have introduced this legislation once again to get this off the books. Congress cannot continue to abdicate its constitutional responsibility while the United States now is embroiled in yet another open-ended war in the Middle East.

We can begin to address this today by passing this amendment, providing Congress and the President with plenty of time to decide what measures should replace this authorization before the end of the year.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), our ranking member, and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I join in support of her amendment.

As she indicated, more than 14 years have passed. The United States withdrew their large troop presence and marked the end of combat operations in Iraq since then. Security operations for Afghanistan were transferred to the Afghan National Security Forces in June of 2013. The basic mission of U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan has been to train those forces, including the Afghan Army.

I think the gentlewoman made a very good point. She and I may not agree on what that resolution and authority should look like in the end, all the more reason for all of us collectively, both parties, to have a fulsome debate on that issue.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

In order to prosecute the global war on terrorism, one of our primary current missions, the President, our Commander in Chief, relies on this Authorization for the Use of Military Force, which he is trying and attempting to repeal.

This AUMF, better known as the 9/11 AUMF, is necessary for the Department of Defense and U.S. military forces to address conducting campaigns against al Qaeda and al Qaeda-related affiliated forces worldwide by using this authority. It has been used by both this President and his predecessor since 2001.

Granted, this amendment was written to sunset on the last day of this calendar year, but without a follow-on authority in place, killing the 9/11 AUMF would tie our Nation's hands and our Commander in Chief's hands with regard to combating worldwide terrorism in 7 short months.

This amendment cripples our ability to conduct counterterrorism operations with partner nations and our allies against al Qaeda and their affiliates.

Once again, the gentlewoman attempts to put in place a major policy change that does not belong in an appropriations bill, this Defense bill.

The terrorist threat today is no less real and, in many ways, far more dangerous than it was when Congress overwhelmingly gave the President that authority in 2001 to protect us against those who want to do us harm.

These terrorist organizations pose a real threat to United States persons and interests. It is my judgment this amendment erroneously assumes that al Qaeda and its affiliates ended their terrorist acts once major military operations ceased in Afghanistan. Obviously, they haven't.

Recent disastrous events in Yemen and, most recently, frightening developments in Iraq and Syria have shown its affiliates and new terrorist groups are on the rise.

This amendment would effectively eliminate the President's ability to address that threat or other emerging threats from al Qaeda and like-minded groups in north Africa, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere and leave our Nation and our allies more vulnerable to attacks.

Therefore, I strongly urge opposition to 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 noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. 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.

□ 2330

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, 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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1295, TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 1295, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House, one, concur in the Senate amendment to the title and, two, concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1; that the Senate amendments and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 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. 2685.

Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2331

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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (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, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY

Ms. MCSALLY. 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 divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any EC–130H aircraft.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for including funds to support our fleet of EC–130H Compass Call aircraft in this bill. The underlying legislation restores $27.3 million to support 15 EC–130H aircraft next year.

My amendment today does not cost a dime. The chairman has already provided full funding for our entire EC–130H fleet, and my amendment simply ensures that the chairman's intentions are carried out, and that the Air Force does not use backdoor means to try to retire these important aircraft.

The Compass Call is the only dedicated U.S. Air Force electronic warfare

aircraft. I can tell you in this unclassified setting that it can perform electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, and offensive counter-information operations.

It was successfully employed during Desert Storm, Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and provided electronic warfare support in operations in Kosovo, in Haiti, Panama, Serbia, and Afghanistan. It was the most heavily-tasked special mission C–130 in operations in Afghanistan.

Despite plans to divest 50 percent of the fleet, the Air Force has not identified a follow-on capability, and no other platform currently performs this mission. In fact, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff Lieutenant General James Holmes confirmed there are things that only the EC–130H does and does best.

Right now, the Compass Call is currently deployed both in Afghanistan and in the fight against ISIS. Divesting it without a replacement for the unique capabilities it offers would be irresponsible, especially given its high rate of deployment.

I restate that my amendment would not cost a dime, simply ensures the chairman's decision to fund the fleet is carried out. This is a critical capability, and we cannot afford to dispose it without a replacement.

I want to thank the chair, and urge support of my amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCSALLY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are pleased to accept your amendment. May I also say, we are proud of your service to our Nation. Thank you for the time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings on the vote on amendment No. 2 be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the vote on the amendment is vacated, and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. 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), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading 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 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funding pursuant to the 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force. And once again I am proud to offer this amendment with my colleagues, Representative ELLISON and GRIJALVA.

Now, why is this amendment necessary?

Three years ago, mind you, President Obama declared that the Iraq war was over. Since then, the President has stated a number of times that the 2002 AUMF is no longer necessary, and that Congress should work to repeal it. Yet, Congress has allowed this war authorization to remain on the books indefinitely.

Now, we all are familiar with the report, and we know what is taking place in Iraq, Syria, and across the Middle East as it relates to ISIL. We all agree that they must be degraded and dismantled.

But just as with the 2001 resolution, the 2002 AUMF is completely inappropriate to deal with this threat.

This is a new war, Mr. Chairman, not an old war. This is a new war, which the people of this country have a right to have their Members of Congress debate and vote on.

Even the President included a repeal of the 2002 AUMF in the proposed authorization he sent to Congress in February. Yet, we can't even get that authorization brought up for a debate and a vote.

So, simply put, the 2002 authorization is no longer necessary. We need to come back to the drawing board and decide, based on what this body wants to do, should we vote for a new authorization or not.

If we want to commit the United States to another war in Iraq, then Congress must have that debate and decide whether or not to authorize another war.

I am pleased that my sense of Congress resolution—it was an amendment actually—affirming this was passed on a bipartisan basis in committee and is included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is common sense, and we cannot continue to leave authorizations for the use of military force on the books indefinitely. It is time for us to reassert our constitutional prerogative to declare war or not, to debate and vote on any military action in Iraq.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will just reiterate my comments in the gentlewoman's last amendment and that is, after the passage of 13 years, things have changed. And one of the changes we ought to make in this Chamber is to have, again, that fulsome debate as to what the parameters of our military involvement overseas is going forward from this point in time, not the beginning of the previous decade. I appreciate the gentlewoman offering the amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say with regard to this amendment, Congress has a constitutional responsibility. It is our prerogative to declare war or not. It is our prerogative to debate and vote on any military action anywhere in the world. More than a prerogative, it is our constitutional responsibility.

We represent the American people. The American people deserve to have a voice in such grave matters. That is why the Constitution required that. And for us not to do our job and to continue to rely on old authorizations from 13 and 14 years ago really is an abdication of our responsibility.

People did not elect us to Congress to duck and dodge the hard questions and the hard issues. Some of us agree that we need to go to war. Some of us don't agree. But that is not the issue, and that is not what this amendment, nor my prior amendment, was about.

It was about doing our job here, laying out the pros and cons, making some heavy-duty decisions—and that is what they are, but that is why we are here—and then instructing our Commander in Chief what Congress believes should be the appropriate course of action.

Many would vote for it; many would vote against it, but, again, not to have this debate and vote when we are now 10 months into another war is downright wrong. It is almost lawless. It is something that it is hard to imagine getting away with this long.

So I hope that we get a good bipartisan vote on this. It is about time that we do debate this again. If the Speaker did not like the President's authorization that he brought forward, then let's get another authorization. Let's write one ourselves. I have one. I know other Members have one. Let's bring forth an authorization and debate what we want to do moving forward. That is the wise thing to do. That is the smart thing to

do. That is the right thing to do. We have troops in harm's way. They need to know what their Members of Congress believe, what the Constitution requires in terms of doing our job. They deserve us to do better.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few minutes ago, currently U.S. forces are conducting multiple airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Without this authority, those campaigns would stop. And certainly, much has happened since the authority was first given. As a matter of fact, things are getting far worse than they have been in the past.

Acceptance of this amendment would rob our country of one of the key authorities our Commander in Chief needs and relies on to keep us safe and to address these types of crises, which seem to occur all over the Middle East. Therefore, I strongly reject and oppose the amendment and urge others to do likewise.

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 noes appeared to have it.

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. 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 in contravention of section 2483(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code.

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 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman from New Jersey and just thank him for the wonderful job he has done protecting our troops and our people around world and making sure that the world remains a safer place than it would be otherwise without the United States there.

□ 2345

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Defense from increasing the prices paid by our troops and their families, our veterans and their families at military commissaries, especially overseas.

The commissary benefit is one of a number of benefits that our servicemembers receive upon joining the military, and it is one that our servicemembers and their families rely upon to maintain their access to wholesome, affordable, and healthy food.

The Defense Commissary Agency, or DeCA, has embarked upon a poorly researched plan to raise prices on commissary consumers as part of a move towards what they call a ''commercial'' business model.

This amendment requires the Department of Defense to continue using the existing model of produce sourcing for commissaries in Asia and the Pacific unless and until the Secretary of Defense can certify that a new sourcing model will not raise prices on the shelves. This maintains the promised benefits that our warriors and their families expected to receive when they raised their right hand and became a United States sailor, airman, soldier, or marine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

Mr. SABLAN. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in contravention of section 801 of Public Law 94–241 or section 2663 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, many of us in this Chamber share a concern that the Federal Government has so much power and so many resources that it can overwhelm and even intimidate smaller State and local governments.

The amendment I am offering responds to that concern. It requires, before any funds are expended in the Northern Mariana Islands for expanded activities by the military, that the Secretary of Defense reach agreement with the government of the Northern Mariana Islands on the nature and scope of those activities.

My amendment levels the playing field between the very powerful Federal Government and a very small territorial government.

A little history: in 1975, the people of the Northern Marianas elected to become a part of the United States, and 78 percent of the people voted for the negotiated agreement that defined our political union. Part of that agreement includes the lease of two-thirds of our island of Tinian to the U.S. military for 100 years and the lease of the entire island of Farallon de Medinilla. The cost to the United States—$175,000 a year. That is a Manhattan Island deal.

The people of the Northern Marianas committed those lands for the purpose of national defense willingly because we understood that with citizenship comes responsibility, and the United States recognized in the agreement negotiated with us that we have very little land and that any future acquisition, therefore, would be ''only the minimum area necessary.''

Today, however, the U.S. military is proposing the takeover of another entire island. It is called Pagan. One more out of only 14 islands in the Northern Marianas, when we have already given up all of Farallon de Medinilla and two-thirds of Tinian—25 percent of our total land area of only 183 square miles. The military is proposing to use these lands for live-fire ranges, training courses, and maneuver areas.

I should explain that these are public lands and that decisions about the use of public lands in the Northern Marianas rests in the hands of the Governor and our legislators.

To lease lands to the military or not, what the terms and conditions of any lease may be, those decisions are an exercise in local self-government, and I will respect those local decisions. But as the official in Congress representing the people of the Northern Marianas, I want to be sure that the Federal Government also respects the decisions of the government of the Northern Marianas.

Again, that is what my amendment would do. My amendment simply assures that none of the funds we appropriate today will be used for the activities the military is proposing for public lands in the Northern Marianas without first obtaining the consent and the agreement of the Northern Marianas government and actually obtaining an agreement for the use of that land.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue. Obviously, he is a wonderful representative of the Mariana Islands.

However, given the way this amendment is written, it is unclear to me the impact that this may have on our military's future ability to train. So, regretfully, I must oppose this amendment, but I look forward to working with the gentleman to address his concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABLAN. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN very much.

Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way. You have a piece of property, and it belongs to you in title. I come over; and without asking you if I could use your land, I come in with a yardstick. I bring surveyors. I bring architects and engineers to your land, and I start drawing up my plans.

Would any person alive allow that to happen in the United States of America? They won't. Two-thirds of Tinian they already have. They are asking for an entirely new island, Mr. Chairman, and they would own 25 percent of the Northern Marianas.

They are going to fire howitzers in our community. They have claimed that on this one island there are no inhabitants. I happen to live two doors from these people. And that they are from Pagan. They live in Pagan. They are residents of Pagan. Many of them are in Saipan for work, just like many of us, 541 Members of Congress who come to Washington to work and go home every break—except for one, the Delegate from the District of Columbia. This is her home. All of us come to D.C. to work. Some of us, even those who don't have homes in our districts, claim that we go back to our districts because that is our home.

Present Federal law says that the United States Government, the military must first seek permission and obtain access to the property. They don't have that access. And in the meantime, until they obtain that access or an agreement for the use of that land, then they should cease and desist from any plans that they are making for the use of an island that they don't own.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the compassion and his conviction and would join in wanting to work with you, as the chairman has indicated, to see if there is some resolution to your concern.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't own the land. I am just bringing out facts here and bringing out the sentiments of my constituents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

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

Mr. SABLAN. 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 the Northern Mariana Islands will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. 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 under the heading ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, since August 8, 2014, in Iraq——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The committee is prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the 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. YOHO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I have another 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 under section 9014 for ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the 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. YOHO).

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. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be expended by the Department of the Navy to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any search and rescue units from the Marine Corps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, 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 to offer an amendment which would preserve a very important component of the Marine Corps: its search and rescue units.

According to the most recent Marine aviation plan, the Corps had these units slated for a divestiture by the end of the calendar year. I was glad to see that, after some public backlash on that plan, the Corps decided to temporarily postpone those divestiture plans. But just as easily as the Marines postpone their decision, they could also recommence.

I still believe such actions would be a bad decision, and I am not alone. That is why I am offering this bipartisan amendment with my colleagues, Representatives JONES, SINEMA, and BUTTERFIELD.

After many years, there were only two remaining search and rescue units left: one at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, Arizona, and one at MCAS Cherry Point, North Carolina.

Marine Corps Air Station Yuma search and rescue unit performed 72 rescue missions to aid surrounding communities from 2010 to 2014. Last October, the Yuma unit facilitated the rescue of 28 Boy Scouts and four chaperones who were lost during a canoe trip.

MCAS Cherry Point's search and rescue unit, known as VMR–1, performs roughly 50 missions annually to help retrieve lost paddlers and hikers. Just this past March, VMR–1 rescued a man who was reported missing during a kayaking trip near Cedar Island, North Carolina. This was not only a nighttime mission, but there was a heavy fog as well, so much so that the first rescue helicopter, known affectionately as Pedro, had to abort its first landing at a hospital in Morehead and ultimately travel 75 miles to Greenville, where the man was finally admitted for treatment.

But none of us have yet heard a viable alternative to sustain the mission of these search and rescue units. Law enforcement and first responders do not have these capabilities, and, apparently, no contractor does either. This proposed divestiture would literally cost lives.

I ask: What would have happened to these Boy Scouts if these marines didn't come to help? I ask my colleagues to support this amendment which was meant to save lives.

I thank the chair and ranking member.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, respectfully, I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Arizona's amendment.

The Marine Corps has an aviation plan calling for the orderly transfer of this capability to other entities. The East Coast mission will be assumed by the Coast Guard, while the West Coast mission will be competitively contracted out, as I understand it, in fiscal year 2017.

While we respect the gentleman's concerns, this amendment takes a rifle shot approach against the Department of Defense's force structure plan, and we believe that this is not good policy. Therefore, I urge opposition to the amendment and would appreciate the gentleman making the case for his position.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I join with the chairman in expressing my opposition.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, but we have had a series of amendments like this brought to the debate limiting transfers, limiting consideration of any movement or decisions or changes at the Department of Defense. At some point, we are going to have to allow the Department of Defense to run itself as well and not to second-guess that maybe sometime they actually will make improvements because of a decision they make, and for that reason, I do support my chairman in his opposition.

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

□ 0000

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the idea that the East Coast may be absorbed may be one thing; but accordingly, from what I have heard down in Yuma, there is no viable option or contractor that has been and will be found for Yuma.

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. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on May 28, 2014, narcotics agents, assisted by members of the Habersham County, Georgia, Special Response Team, executed a no-knock search warrant on a home on a quiet street. Officers terrified the sleeping family but did not find any drugs when they entered the home.

During the raid, a 2-year-old child, baby Bou Bou, was badly burned when the officers tossed a flash-bang grenade into his playpen which was located in a darkened room. The officers justified their actions by saying that their intelligence indicated that there would be no children present.

Mr. Chairman, as an editorial in The Washington Post noted: ''A flash-bang grenade is an explosive device that emits a deafening boom and a blinding flash of light. It is designed to temporarily stun the occupants of a building so that the armed men who deployed it can clear the building. It is an instrument of war.''

My amendment is simple. It would prohibit the transfer of flash-bang grenades from the Department of Defense to local law enforcement. The Department of Defense's 1033 program has helped to sometimes distort the relationship between the police and the communities they serve by allocating over $5 billion in surplus military equipment to local police, including flash-bang grenades. Nothing in current law prevents the military from giving police, including school and university police departments, flash-bang grenades. Allowing this loophole to exist puts our communities at risk of increasing militarization.

Mr. Chairman, while we have real tensions across the country, our police and their communities are not at war. Funneling free military equipment to the police, however, helps to further deepen the divide in our communities. The same Washington Post article I mentioned earlier cited over a dozen incidents in recent years where police injured themselves or others while using flash-bang grenades.

This amendment is not about regulating what types of equipment law enforcement agencies should or should not have. Instead, it is about whether this Congress should purchase flash-bang grenades for fighting wars abroad and then allow these flash-bang grenades to be transferred by the Department of Defense back to local law enforcement agencies for use here at home.

Local governments, in consultation with law enforcement agencies that they oversee, should decide what types of equipment the law enforcement agencies can acquire. Law enforcement agencies should not unilaterally make that decision independent of civilian authority. The local government can purchase whatever equipment they deem necessary for use by the agencies under their control through the local budgeting process, and they can also seek financial assistance through Federal grants.

This amendment doesn't touch grant money or State or local governments' freedom to purchase the equipment they need. The local budget process and Federal grant programs involve making choices based on need and funding. The 1033 program is an unregulated pipeline of free equipment directly from the Pentagon to the law enforcement agency. When the equipment is free and is plentiful and civilian authority is not involved, the calculus is very simple: why not accept free gifts of military equipment. However, if acquiring this equipment militarizes our police departments beyond comprehension, what kind of community policing are we actually performing? Or are we just simply occupying?

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very common sense. We should consider whether or not we want our country to move in this direction of militarization, and we certainly need our civilian authorities to be involved in that process. So the consequences are too dangerous to keep proliferating this weaponry on our streets, and I would ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and rise in support of it. There is no question that every law enforcement officer in our country is in possession of a very dangerous job.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) to finish his remarks.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman yielding, and I do recognize the very tough and dangerous job that

local enforcement officers have, every last one of them, and what an important job they do. I certainly have been active over my career in Congress working with the Department of Defense to transfer necessary equipment to law enforcement agencies.

But I would agree with the assertion of the gentleman that we do have to make a distinction with some of these types of materials between civil law enforcement and military action.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The Department of Defense excess property program does provide valuable surplus equipment to State and local law enforcement agencies for its use in counternarcotics and counterterrorism operations and to enhance officer safety.

It has, on occasion, provided aircraft, including helicopters and small planes, four-wheel-drive vehicles, pickup trucks, ambulances, and mobile command vehicles. It has provided vests and helmets to protect officers, all sorts of important protection equipment, including binoculars, radios, clothing, and information technology.

In a time of declining budgets, at the Federal level but also at the State and local level, this program is a good example of a Federal-local partnership that ensures that we get the most out of each tax dollar spent.

This amendment would restrict the Department's ability to put equipment they no longer need to use protecting our citizens within our local communities. We think it is a good program. It obviously ought to be monitored, and things ought to be only put in proper hands.

□ 0010

On occasion, horrible incidents do occur, but all in all, this program has been a valuable thing to many communities across America.

I do rise in opposition to the amendment and urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

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), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, 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 cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016.

Last year, it was brought to my attention by numerous sources in my district that in 2009, the Department of Army fully phased out the CWU–27/P Army aviation flight uniform and moved to the Army aircrew combat uniform, also known as the A2CU.

Those constituents of mine—many of whom are Active Duty, retired, or are friends and family of military personnel—have expressed a desire for the Army to go back to the CWU–27/P model uniform. There are multiple reasons to switch back to the CWU model uniform. The most important reasons to switch back to the CWU model are safety and efficiency.

To sweeten the deal when making the pitch to me, my constituents explained that moving back to the CWU model would also save the Department millions of dollars a year in procurement costs. All these factors led me to offer this same commonsense amendment last Congress, and it passed this body by a voice vote.

The CWU model has a proven track record of safety and practicality. The CWU model is still authorized for Army special operation aviators, all of the aviators in the other service branches of the U.S. military, and most air forces and navies around the world.

Yes, these points are a testament to the safety and efficiency of the CWU model, and the safety aspects are of paramount importance to our Army aviators because the chances of a fire in an aviation crash are very high.

The CWU model flight suits have an antistatic fiber woven into them to prevent sparks which, for obvious reasons, are not that desirable when operating an aircraft with thousands of pounds of highly volatile jet fuel on board. The one-piece design of the CWU model is also extremely important as it does not, in the event of fire, leave any opportunities for exposed skin.

Speaking to the cost savings, the A2CU model costs an average of 56 percent more than the CWU model, and the A2CU was proven to wear out faster than the CWU. Further, every time the Army decides to change the camouflage pattern of the duty uniform, they have to spend millions more purchasing the new flight uniform.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment does not score as it is written, but, being that the intent is to move back to the CWU model, the effects of the policy should actually net some cost savings. Conservative estimates show that the Army could save around $5 million a year in procurement costs if it were to move back to the CWU model.

Further, it should not cost anything to reintroduce the CWU model back into the supply system, as the rest of the service branches still use them. In other words, there is no need to reboot the supply chain.

The cost savings are tantalizing for someone like me, who was sent to this town to rein in spending, but more importantly, I listen to these Army aviators and flight operators. They tell me it is safer. Being that they are the ones doing the training and flying, I am going to have to take them at their word.

Given the safety and practicality applications and given that the United States is not exactly running a budget surplus right now, saving a few millions here and a few millions there in the name of safety and practicality is something we should all strive to achieve.

I urge my colleagues to once again support this commonsense amendment which cuts costs and improves safety.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me commend the gentleman from Arizona on his interest in the safety of our Army aviation personnel.

This amendment would prohibit the Army from spending additional funds to purchase the Army aircrew combat uniform. As an alternative, the Army could resume using a previous flight suit, the CWU–27/P that has not been authorized since 2009, except for special operators.

I understand this amendment is based on discussions with flight crews during visits with airfields and tactical training sites. The old model is a one-piece design. It is said to cost less and be more durable than the current model Army aircrew combat uniform.

The committee is interested in providing our soldiers with the best equipment possible; however, conclusions based on what appear—and I want to say this respectfully—on somewhat anecdotal information and brief discussions rarely lead to wise spending decisions.

I reluctantly urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I am pleased to yield to Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would want to associate myself with the chairman's remarks and again reiterate my previous comments that at some point, we ought to trust some judgments being made down at the Department of Defense and not just say no to everything. We ought to be making some decisions.

I appreciate the chairman's explanation of the situation and join him in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the two individuals that

the one-piece has been preferred by the aviators for the safety aspects because of the woven cloth. I think sometimes we have to have the administration start looking to the people that are actually in harm's way in this regard.

With that, 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. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. 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), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I begin by thanking Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. VISCLOSKY in conducting the amendments around these important considerations.

This amendment that I propose this evening limits arms, training, and other assistance to the neo-Nazi Ukrainian militia, the Azov Battalion.

Foreign Policy magazine has characterized the 1,000-man Azov Battalion as ''openly neo-Nazi'' and ''fascist.'' Numerous other news organizations, including The New York Times, The Guardian, and the Associated Press have corroborated the dominance of White supremacist and anti-Semitic views within the group; yet Ukraine's Interior Minister recently announced the Azov Battalion will be among the units to receive training and arms from Western allies, including the United States.

Azov's founder, Andriy Biletsky, organized the neo-Nazi group the Social-National Assembly in 2008. Azov men use neo-Nazi symbolism on their banner.

□ 0020

These groups run counter to American values, and once the fighting ends, they pose a significant threat to the Ukrainian Government and to the Ukrainian people. As we have seen many times, most notably within the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan, these groups will not lay down their arms once the conflict is over. They will turn their arms against their own people in order to enforce their hateful views.

I urge the support of my amendment and to make it U.S. law that we will not equip this dangerous neo-Nazi militia.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I think I speak for the committee in suggesting that we accept the gentleman's amendment and appreciate the fact that he wants to exercise care, as we do on the committee, to make sure whoever is trained is someone who is, if you would, a person of good intent, as opposed to someone who is not. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and for his offering the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, sheriff's departments and local police departments are local peace officers. They enforce the law and maintain peace and order. Ideally, they are members of the communities in which they serve.

The Department of Defense's 1033 program has helped to sometimes distort the relationship between police and their communities by providing over $5 billion in surplus military equipment to local police, including armored vehicles and military grade weapons. Police who patrol the streets and neighborhoods in armored MRAPs, while armed to the hilt, can easily lose sight of their role, which is to protect and serve, and, instead, take on the mindset of a paramilitary occupation force. The routine showing of military authority on our streets creates mistrust that only further deepens the divide between law enforcement and the people they are sworn to protect and serve.

My amendment is simple. It would prohibit the transfer of mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, or MRAPs—for free—straight from the Department of Defense to local law enforcement agencies.

This amendment is not about regulating what types of equipment law enforcement agencies and police should not have. Instead, it is about whether this Congress should purchase MRAPs for fighting wars abroad and then allow the Department of Defense to give that equipment away to civilian law enforcement here at home, for free, to use on the streets of America.

Local governments, in consultation with the law enforcement agencies they oversee, should decide what types of equipment their law enforcement agencies can acquire. Law enforcement agencies should not unilaterally make that decision independent of civilian authority. The local governments can purchase whatever equipment they deem necessary for use by the agencies under their control through their local budgeting process, and they can seek financial assistance to purchase necessary equipment from Federal grant programs.

This amendment doesn't touch grant money or the State's or local government's freedom to purchase the equipment it needs. The local budget process and application for Federal grant programs involve making choices based on need and funding, while the 1033 program is an unregulated pipeline of free equipment directly from the Pentagon to the law enforcement agency.

When the equipment is free and in plentiful supply and civilian authority is not involved, the calculus is very simple: Why not accept free equipment? Why not obtain equipment based on desire rather than need? However, if acquiring the equipment required the use of local funds or involved applying for grant money, the decision would be more deliberative and inclusive of civilian authority. Other factors would be considered, including whether there is a need for such equipment, how the equipment would be used, and whether the community consents to being policed with such equipment.

This amendment simply shuts off the pipeline of military equipment from the battlefield to our main streets. This amendment forces us to consider whether MRAPs, designed and purchased for battle in the Iraqi desert, are suitable for our local police. It forces us to consider whether an ordinary American citizen would truly feel

comfortable in approaching an officer for help if the officer were behind the wheel of a 15-ton armored vehicle that had just been returned from combat in Afghanistan.

This amendment would end the transfer of these armored vehicles to school systems and to universities across the country. Are our children so unruly that order can only be maintained with the use of an MRAP?

Unless this amendment passes, a vote for the underlying bill will ultimately fund the purchase of MRAPs, which will, one day, be transferred back home for use against our constituents. The consequences are too dangerous to continue this indiscriminate flow of weaponry to the streets of this Nation. I urge support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Rather than repeat myself, I think the Department of Defense excess property program does provide some very valuable equipment to local law enforcement. Of course, it is invaluable if it is used properly and with care. As a consequence, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. 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 a furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) that—

(1) includes in the notice of the furlough made pursuant to section 752.404(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, ''sequestration'' as the reason for the furlough; and

(2) is of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is paid from amounts in a Working Capital Fund Account pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

I am offering a bipartisan amendment which prohibits the furlough of civilian employees while funds remain in the defense working capital fund. The services provided by working capital fund employees are already fully funded apart from the appropriations process. In fact, imposing furloughs actually costs the taxpayers more through delayed production, overhead increases, and the need for overtime or the transfer of workload to more expensive sources of work. The amendment will prevent that from happening again as it did in 2013.

□ 0030

If working capital fund employees are furloughed, as they were in the last government shutdown, there will be no direct savings. Indeed, it will actually cost the taxpayers more money.

The furloughs delay production, increase the overhead, and in some cases transfer workload to more expensive sources of work. Indeed, senior military officials have expressed publicly that working capital fund employees, such as depot and shipyard workers, should be considered for exemption from furloughs because the furloughs actually hurt readiness and increase costs associated with production delays.

It is important to note that under this provision, DOD still has the authority to furlough working capital fund employees for disciplinary purposes. Further, working capital fund employees could be furloughed if funded workload dried up due to budget cuts or downsizing. Therefore, ending the threat of furloughs for these employees will save money, improve military readiness, and prevent needless delays and cost overruns from work that has already been funded.

I urge the support of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend and a member of our subcommittee, puts me in a very difficult position.

I complained in my opening remarks that some of our colleagues in the Congress, as I said earlier in the day, delight every time a civilian employee is furloughed. So I certainly appreciate the gist of the gentleman's amendment. We have a much larger problem that we and the administration need to address, and I know he feels the same way.

My concern with the particular amendment is we have other departments as well, whether it be the Department of Labor, Internal Revenue Service, EPA, Housing and Urban Development, and the list goes on, and ought not to select one agency over the other. I don't think it is the proper way to go.

We ought to collectively understand that the government actually does many good things to help the people of this country. We ought to value the work of each of our Federal employees, and we ought to block the furlough of any of them in any agency, not a particular one.

So I certainly do not disagree with the intent of the gentleman. I realize we are talking about the Department of Defense, but do believe that we ought to be looking at the broader question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to quickly respond to my friend. I share many of his sentiments. I certainly don't like to see anybody furloughed. I was not in favor of previous government shutdowns. I thought they were quite counterproductive.

This is, however, a unique case. The funds are already in existence. There is no savings. We are literally taking people out of work when we have funds set aside outside the appropriations process for them to continue their work. So in this case they really deserve to be excepted if we happen to make a mistake and stumble into a process like this again.

Again, I don't disagree with my friend's sentiments about the larger workforce. I have never found these things to be particularly productive. Indeed, as I recall, in every case we have always gone back and made everybody whole, so really the ultimate loser has usually been the taxpayer because we paid for work, created uncertainty that our Federal employees didn't deserve, but ultimately compensated them.

In this case, the funds are available. We should just keep people at work. They are doing an important job for the national security. So again, I would urge the passage of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. 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 enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principal—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission

of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading, please.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, the chairman of the committee has shown a great deal of courtesy and kindness and consideration, so I am going to try to keep this as short as possible.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment because it is so incredibly reasonable.

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

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

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 new section:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Government Travel Charge Card expenses by military or civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for gaming, or for entertainment that includes topless or nude entertainers or participants, as prohibited by Department of Defense FMR, Volume 9, Chapter 3 and Department of Defense Instruction 1015.10 (enclosure 3, 14a and 14b).

Mr. GOSAR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, 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 to offer one final amendment to the DOD Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2016.

Let me express again my sincerest thanks to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their dedication.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we will be pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. 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), add the following new section:

Sec.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g3(c)(1)(A).

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the reading, please.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed the House by voice vote. The amendment seeks to prohibit the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST. I urge continued support for this amendment by both sides of the aisle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, we don't know its full impact. It could have some unintended consequences. This amendment could hamper legitimate communications between the intelligence community and NIST regarding security standards. This amendment is very broadly drafted. It could prevent NIST from consulting with other intelligence community agencies about that agency's internal computer system.

I know it was reported that the 2006 NIST cryptographic standard had a NASA back door. I want to make it clear that NIST says they did not deliberately weaken cryptographic standards at the behest of other government agencies. They assure us they will not do so in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, given that assurance.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and would associate myself again with his remarks and objection to the bill. We go to great pains on the subcommittee to protect the privacy of the American people, and I would agree with the assertions the chairman has made. I appreciate him yielding to me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can try to allay some of the concerns that have been expressed.

My amendment seeks to address a serious problem. A year-and-a-half ago it was revealed that the National Security Agency deliberately subverted American cryptographic standards. Cryptographic standards for the national security community and the commercial software industry are developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST. These standards are intended to protect Americans from foreign intelligence agencies, from cyber criminals, from industrial espionage, and from privacy violations by those who wish us harm.

□ 0040

They are embedded in software products which are used and sold widely—in fact, almost universally—in this country and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, media reports have confirmed that the National Security Agency successfully and deliberately weakened encryption standards promulgated by NIST to further NSA surveillance goals at the cost of privacy of ordinary U.S. citizens. This is extremely dangerous. It leaves users of those standards vulnerable to anybody who is familiar with those weaknesses, friend or foe.

As World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee put it:

It is naive to imagine that, if you deliberately introduce a weakness into a system, you will be the only one to use it.

My amendment would seek to address this issue and resolve it once and for all by prohibiting the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST.

To be clear about it, the intelligence community can continue to provide advice. What the intelligence community

cannot do is deliberately set out to weaken cryptographic standards because whatever it does in that regard will certainly be understood and exploited by our enemies, as we saw just last week when we witnessed the decryption of information regarding classified information and U.S. employees.

It is only common sense that we should not want taxpayers' dollars that are appropriated to one agency to be used to deliberately and actively subvert the work of another agency.

Therefore, I respectfully request support for this amendment on both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk replacing amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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 any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Sections (3)(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(g), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of Executive Order 13963.

(4) Subsections (c)(4), (c)(9), (c)(10), (c)(12), or (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(6) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(7) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, 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 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment forbids scarce defense dollars from being allocated to fund three executive orders and several other provisions of law that require our military to squander billions of dollars in so-called green energy. The House adopted this amendment by a voice vote last year.

I would again remind the House that, just a few weeks ago, the so-called defense hawks warned that our defense budget has been strangled by sequestration, that every dollar wasted long ago had been wrung out of the Pentagon budget, and that our national security was directly imperiled as a result.

That argument carried the day, even though it will add billions of dollars to the national debt; yet, although we were told we didn't have enough money to adequately pay and supply troops in the field, it seems that we do have plenty of defense money to indulge the ''green energy'' mandates that are imposed on our Armed Forces.

What truly troubles me is that this was all aired during debate on the DOD Appropriations bill last year. The limiting amendments were adopted by voice vote; yet we see the same waste being allowed in this year's bill.

Let me refresh memories about the green energy mandates. The GAO reports that these mandates have cost the Navy as much as $150 per gallon for jet fuel. In 2012, the Navy was forced to purchase 450,000 gallons of biofuel for its so-called green fleet at the cost of $26.60 per gallon, when conventional petroleum cost just $2.50 per gallon.

These mandates forced the Air Force to pay $59 per gallon for 11,000 gallons of biofuel in 2012. That is 10 times more than regular jet fuel costs.

It is not just biofuels. Last year, the Pentagon was required to purchase over 1,000 Chevy Volts at a subsidized price of $40,000 each. As Senator Coburn's office pointed out: ''Each one of these $40,000 Chevy Volts represents the choice not to provide an entire infantry platoon with all new rifles or 50,000 rounds of ammunition that cannot be used for realistic training.''

These green energy mandates have required the Army and Navy to install solar arrays at various facilities. At Naval Station Norfolk, for example, the Navy spent $21 million to install a 10-acre solar array which will supply a grand total of 2 percent of the base electricity.

According to the inspector general's office, this project will save enough money to pay for itself in just 447 years. It is too bad solar panels only last about 25 years.

We don't know exactly how much these mandates waste because, as the GAO reports: ''There is currently no comprehensive inventory of which Federal agencies are implementing renewable energy-related initiatives and the types of initiatives they are implementing.''

Outside estimates are as much as $7 billion for the Department of Defense last year, a figure that is expected to grow in the future.

We are told this program is necessary for flexibility. Really? Shouldn't ''flexibility'' free us to get cheaper and more plentiful fuels, not more expensive and more exotic ones?

We are told the military should do its part for the environment as if it is possible to fight an environmentally sensitive war. That, I fear, is the real reason for this wasteful spending, to sacrifice our military budget on the altar of climate change.

This is part of an ideological crusade imposed on our military that will pointlessly consume billions of defense dollars mainly to keep money flowing to politically well-connected ''green energy'' companies that can't get anyone else to buy their products.

There is a reason that Admiral Mullen warned us that, in his professional military judgment, the greatest threat to our national security is our national debt. We just increased that debt because of assurances that we had stretched the defense budget to the breaking point.

As long as this program continues to consume billions of our defense dollars, that claim cannot be taken seriously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would start my remarks by saying the gentleman from California has me at a disadvantage because we just received a copy of the final amendment that was offered in the House. Lines 7 and 8 are new to the amendment and refer to Executive Order No. 13963, which is in addition to other items that I am opposed to.

I am told that those sections in that executive order refer to planning for sustainability, but I cannot confirm that to the Members of the House.

I do rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. He talks about exotic items—exotic items. The Department of Defense would be blocked from purchasing recycled paper. Let's not buy recycled paper at the Department of Defense. Now, there is a great idea.

The Department would be blocked from generating renewable energy that might include using tents with photovoltaic materials that generate solar power onsite for our troops in God-forsaken places on this planet with no other access to energy sources.

The Department would be blocked from considering sites for new Federal facilities that are pedestrian friendly and accessible to, God forbid, public transit. Perhaps we should move the Pentagon because it is near a Metro stop.

The Department would be blocked from cooperating with the Department of Energy's efforts to maximize the use of alternative fuels for our Federal fleet.

The Department of Defense is the largest purchaser of energy in the United States of America. As a former member of the Congress, I have a profound respect for Senator Dick Lugar from Indiana, as he characterized energy. It is not an energy problem so much as it is a national security issue, given where and how much energy we import.

The Department would also be blocked from advancing sustainable acquisition by trying to procure either less toxic or more water-efficient alternatives. My sense is that, in some portions of the State of California and

other areas, they are desperate for a couple of extra drops of water, but that might just be too exotic.

□ 0050

These are programs and initiatives that make sense, both for the environment and for fiscal responsibility. Moreover, the Department has been a leader in spurring new technologies, and I thought that is what drives the economy in America.

This amendment is terribly ill-advised, and I would strongly urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right. The military is the largest purchaser of energy in our economy. That is exactly the point.

They should not be forced to purchase energy at vastly inflated prices to soothe the ideological itch of the environmental left.

No one in his right mind would pull into a gas station to pay $26.60 per gallon for fuel when the gas station next door is selling it for $2.50. That is exactly what these executive orders are requiring our military to do. It is squandering billions of our dollars and making a mockery of any claim that we are stretching our defense dollars to the utmost.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. GUINTA) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, 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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–146) on the resolution (H. Res. 305) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 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. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0053

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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOST (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 California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. 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 in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act'' and such disposition is listed as ''willful'' or ''repeated''.

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, no hard-working American should ever have to worry that her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or takes money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. This practice is known as wage theft.

Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are allowed to apply for Federal contracts. This amendment will ensure that funds may not be used to enter into a contract with a government contractor that willfully, and this is important, Mr. Chairman, willfully or repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Other iterations of this amendment have simply identified any violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This one identifies only those contracts wherein the violator has been found to have been willfully or repeatedly in violation.

Now, I hope that both Republicans and Democrats can agree that willful and repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act are unacceptable; that we can find other contractors who do not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act willfully and repeatedly. And this amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support.

It also ensures that honest, good contractors who do not willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act can have contracts.

Why shouldn't the Federal Government work with contractors who have some modicum of respect for their employees and who do not willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act?

This amendment relies upon the violations reported to the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.

Again, when a contractor applies for a Federal contract, there is documentation they have to fill out, including the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, and that system looks back to look at the prior 5 years worth of criminal, civil, or administrative agency actions which have a final disposition.

None of these things are pending. None of these things are under appeal. They have been decided.

And this amendment says that wherein violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act have been decided and determined conclusively, and only in the category of those that have been willful and/or repeated, then those particular contractors are contractors whom the U.S. Government shouldn't be doing business with, at least for 5 years, until they clean their act up.

Now, I hope that no one in this body would want to stand on the side of the willful and repeated violators of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is impossible to me that any Member would want to do that, particularly when we are trying to promote and do business with honest, decent contractors, or at least average and mediocre contractors.

This one has gone to the, again, willful and repeated violators. Very difficult to stand next to them, and I hope

no Member of this body would do such a thing.

The amendment would ensure that a single inadvertent violation would not disqualify a contractor. And that is important. I have had some people say, well, what if somebody just messes up one time?

Well, no, that particular individual wouldn't be hit by this amendment. But the willful and repeated ones would.

So I think taxpayer money should be spent wisely. I think that as the largest purchaser of goods and services, the Federal Government must find a way to make sure funds are going to companies that treat their workers fairly and give American families a chance to succeed.

This is a serious problem, Mr. Chairman. The Economic Policy Institute found that ''In total, the average low-wage workers lose a stunning $2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing as much as 15 percent of their earned income.''

A report by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee of the U.S. Senate revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

This is a problem. This is a situation that must be remedied.

□ 0100

Similarly, the National Employment Law Project study found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime, and 11 percent have been forced to work ''off the clock.''

Upholding the rule of law is a bipartisan issue. I think that we may disagree on many things; taxes, spending, we disagree on that. There have even been people in this body who disagree that any violator of the Fair Labor Standards Act should get a contract, but I certainly hope that those people who are repeated—let me repeat—repeated and willful violators should be excluded at least for 5 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we all agree that bad actors who deny workers basic protections, including wage and overtime pay, shouldn't be rewarded with government contracts funded by taxpayer dollars, but this amendment is unnecessary.

There is a suspension and debarment process already in place under the current law. If an employer has a history of bad behavior, including ''willful'' and ''repeated'' violations of FLSA, the Fair Labor Standards Act, Federal agencies know about it and have the authority to deny that employer Federal contracts.

A report by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office found that litigation stemming from such claims continues to be a significant problem.

These aren't all bad actors. Often, they are employers trying to do the right thing, but are simply tripped up by an overly complex regulatory system.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, this amendment was voted down in the Transportation-HUD, Commerce-Justice-State, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittees; and likewise, it should also be on this floor.

I urge a ''no'' vote and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to provide for defense counsel for any individual described in section 8101(c).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from being used to provide defense counsel to foreign terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay.

Simply put, Mr. Chairman, our tax dollars should not be going to defend foreign terrorists. Hard-working taxpayers should not foot the legal bill of noncitizen terrorists who plotted to kill innocent Americans.

I recently visited Guantanamo Bay and learned firsthand of the outrageous amount of time these detainees spend with their taxpayer-funded counsel. I have asked the Department of Defense to provide me with the exact amount they have spent in legal defense services for detainees, but I have received no response. Mr. Chairman, I am sure millions of dollars have been spent defending these foreign terrorists.

Legal resources provided by the Department of Defense should be prioritized for American servicemembers. The pool of judge advocates that represents detainees at Guantanamo is a stand-alone unit. They are only assigned to act as defense attorneys for suspected terrorists. Meanwhile, there is another pool of military lawyers to represent all other American servicemembers.

Why should the DOD resources be assigned to defend foreign terrorists when they could, instead, be used to defend our own men and women in uniform? I am confident most Americans would agree that this money could be better spent within the Department of Defense, perhaps by making sure that our servicemembers are provided their legal counsel ahead of noncitizen terrorists.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

We have a Constitution in this country. It contains language talking about the right to be assisted by counsel, and there are many other provisions relative to the protection of individual human beings from the State.

We are a very large country with approximately 2 million people in the military. I think one of the great foundational issues in the United States is to protect any human being from that incredible amount of power so that you avoid abuse.

We have seen enough instances of abuse because of allegations of terrorists, many of whom are very real, mean, despicable people; but to now say that no one should have protection to make sure that that incredible power of the state is used justly and wisely is absolutely wrong.

We have had any number of Members, our colleagues here yesterday and today on this bill, offering amendments because they believe the Department of Energy made a mistake on uniforms for airmen, the Department of Defense made mistakes as far as whether or not we should move helicopters from one base to another, we have made mistakes as far as how we should have life-saving rescue missions for various aspects of the Department of Defense positioned throughout our great country.

What if, God forbid, all these allegations that the Department of State may make mistakes from time to time would actually have an impact on a human being, whoever they are, and that in the last instance, we don't give them one iota of protection that we give to murderers and rapists and burglar and arsonists in this country?

I think it is absolutely wrong for the gentleman to offer this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it simple.

This amendment is quite clear. If you don't want American tax dollars being spent to protect foreign terrorists who plotted to attack and kill innocent Americans, then vote ''yes.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that, if we are talking about the protection of taxpayers dollars, we should be talking about the protection of a human life and to make sure that that life, no matter whose life it is, is protected from the arbitrary use of power.

I again strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment that I think is just contrary to the foundational principles of the United States of America. We don't torture people. We protect people's lives in the United States, and now, to withdraw any protection for them is absolutely wrong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. 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 Indiana will be postponed.

□ 0110

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 authority of the President pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of the President and the responsibilities of the Defense Department continue in this new climate to grow. This has been a long journey in the Defense Appropriations process and amendments on the floor, and I would like to at this hour thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for their patience and their participation in the list of amendments that we have had the opportunity to present.

I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee. Therefore, I see a lot of the new approaches.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I believe the committee would be delighted to accept your amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am delighted, and I will finish up.

I thank the chairman and ranking member. The amendment deals with countering violent extremism. I look forward to working on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the security of our country and the world.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward:

SEC._____. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to contravene the authority of the President under article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment 177 is to affirm the President's authority under the Constitution.

Countering violent extremism and preventing the recruitment of American youth into violent extremism and preventing them from becoming foreign fighters for dangerous groups such as ISIL and other radical groups around the globe is a national imperative.

Earlier this year, I introduced the "No Fly For Foreign Fighters Act," legislation that will help keep foreign fighters and terrorists out of our country.

In introducing this legislation, I was particularly concerned about terrorist groups recruiting our youth.

In fact, I was part of a special roundtable along with DHS Secretary Johnson, in Houston, Texas on "Youth Engagement and Countering Violent Extremism".

During the discussion, Secretary Johnson and I addressed the importance of community engagement in preventing the recruitment of young Americans into terrorist groups.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help to prevent the recruitment of American youth as foreign fighters, a phenomenon that is unfortunately already taking root.

In March 2009, two-hundred schoolchildren in Britain (some as young as thirteen) had been identified and reported by community members—including parents, imams, and teachers—as being at risk of extremism or of being "groomed by radicalisers."

At least six boys between the ages of 13 and 16 were captured by U.S. Forces in Afghanistan in the initial fighting there.

In Iraq, U.S. forces detained more than 100 juveniles in the first year following the invasion, and more than 600 to date.

In the last few years a number of Somali-American young men have traveled to Somalia, possibly to train and fight with al-Shabaab.

At least one of these young men was killed during a suicide bombing attack in northern Somalia in October 2008, which is the first known instance of a U.S. citizen participating in a suicide attack.

Moreover, over 140 United States persons have traveled to Syria or Iraq to fight alongside ISIL, the Nusra Front, and other terrorist organizations.

Although there are no known instances of a U.S. person attempting to return from the region after participating in conflict, we must be vigilant against this prospect.

The Jackson Lee Amendment 177, seeks to protect youth and combat the actions of terrorist groups like Boko Haram and others who are using social media to bring them to their side.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is important because data shows that individuals recruited as foreign fighters from nations in Africa, Europe, and the Middle East have crossed borders and wreaked havoc and committed terroristic acts including kidnapping of youth similar to what Boko Haram has done.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to protecting our youth, preventing and combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism and violent extremism.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will do just that.

Jackson Lee Amendment 177 prevents terrorism by ascertaining that American youth are not seduced into becoming terrorists.

The Jackson Lee Amendment promotes the United States military's unparalleled expertise and technological capability to combat and defeat terrorists who hate our country and prey upon our children, innocent persons, women and the elderly across the globe.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai Peninsula are all global and national security threats that must be stopped.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will support the Department of Defense's efforts to prevent the recruitment of American youth into terrorism and the recovery of the still missing Chibok girls from Nigeria.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

Mr. GUINTA. 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), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Hampshire and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill to prevent any funds from being used to conduct a new round of military base closures through a process known as Base Realignment and Closure, also known as BRAC.

While President Obama continues to discuss the possibility of another round of BRAC as a way to reduce defense spending, we know all too well the negative impacts closing military bases have on our communities, States, national security, and military preparedness.

For more than 200 years, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has provided thousands of Granite Staters with jobs and contributed millions in revenue and military equipment for the United States Navy.

Today, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has roughly 100 naval officers and enlisted personnel assigned to the facility. In addition, the shipyard employs roughly 4,700 civilian employees and offers an active apprentice and engineer recruitment program in the communities surrounding the facility. This base is more than just helpful to our local economy and our military readiness. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is absolutely essential to New Hampshire. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is one of only four shipyards remaining in the country. Each of these facilities has a mission to overhaul, repair, and modernize our Nation's submarine fleet. These services are vital toward maintaining fleet readiness.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment to show our unwavering support for our men and women in arms.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, while I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, I wouldn't express it, if you would, that I will oppose his amendment, but I do want to express some very serious concerns.

The concern I have is that we do need to begin to think about future budgets for the Department of Defense; and as I have mentioned repeatedly tonight, we are going to have to start making some hard decisions, and changes will have to be made and cuts will have to be made. I am very concerned about Congress' continued failure to confront the challenges that we face at the Department of Defense and simply saying no, no, no, and that we shouldn't even consider any possible changes.

The Department of Defense has continuously proposed significant initiatives to provide for future flexibility to meet our national security strategy, and Congress has said no, no, no. I simply do not think we should foreclose any options to consider in order to possibly, God forbid, save money in the outyears.

A BRAC round is a reasonable approach that provides Congress a chance to say yes or no, and I would make the observation again that we have got to stop saying no to everything that the Department of Defense considers. In this case, I am not even aware there is a proposal for a BRAC, but let's say no anyway. I think we have to stop doing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concerns. While I certainly hope that there is no BRAC round, there are concerns expressed by Members relative to the President's comments in this area as a method of reducing defense spending.

We have gone through sequestration. I have seen firsthand the concerns expressed by the civilian employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. They are the best and the brightest in the business, and I feel very strongly that this is important to New Hampshire and important to the defense of our Nation.

I certainly share the concern and welcome the opportunity to look at the Department of Defense to try to find efficiencies and effectiveness to make sure that our men and women are properly prepared, but I feel that a BRAC realignment would be inappropriate at this time. I hope that Members would support this amendment.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the rest of the committee for their hard work on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. 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.____. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by an officer or employee of the United States to query a collection of foreign intelligence information acquired under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) using a United States person identifier.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to queries for foreign intelligence information authorized under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805; 1842; 1881b; 1881c; 1881d), or title 18, United States Code, regardless of under what Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authority it was collected.

(c) Except as provided for in subsection (d), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 101(m) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(m))) alter its product or service to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1801(f))) of any user of such product or service for such agencies.

(d) Subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the American people don't want to be spied on by their own government. Our Founding Fathers included the Fourth Amendment for a reason: to require probable cause and a warrant before the government and government agents can snoop on anyone.

During the 113th Congress, the House of Representatives passed the bipartisan amendment I am offering today by a 293–123 vote. This year, our bipartisan group is reuniting once again to shut down unconstitutional surveillance that does not meet the expectations of our constituents or the standards required by our Constitution.

Our amendment shuts one form of backdoor surveillance by prohibiting warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens.

The Director of National Intelligence has confirmed that the government searches vast amounts of data, including the content of emails and telephone calls without individual suspicion or probable cause.

□ 0120

At this time, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the Director of National Intelligence, which confirms this warrantless spying.

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2014.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: During the January 29, 2014, Worldwide Threat hearing, you cited declassified court documents from 2011 indicating that NSA sought and obtained the authority to query information collected under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence and Surveillance Act (FISA), using U.S. person identifiers, and asked whether any such queries had been conducted for the communications of specific Americans.

As reflected in the August 2013 Semiannual Assessment of Compliance with Procedures and Guidelines issued Pursuant to Section 702, which we declassified and released on August 21, 2013, there have been queries, using U.S. person identifiers, of communicatons lawfully acquired to obtain foreign intelligence by targeting non U.S. persons reasonably believed to be located outside the U.S. pursuant to Section 702 of FISA. These queries were performed pursuant to minimization procedures approved by the FISA Court as consistent with the statute and the Fourth Amendment. As you know, when Congress reauthorized Section 702, the proposal to restrict such queries was specifically raised and ultimately not adopted.

For further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Deirdre M. Walsh in the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. CLAPPER.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the Director of the FBI has also confirmed that he uses the information to build criminal cases against U.S. persons, but the Director of National Intelligence and the FBI are not above the Fourth Amendment, and this practice should end.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding in

support of the Massie-Lofgren amendment.

As mentioned, the declassified FISA court decision has indicated that substantially more warrantless communications are collected through 702 than 215.

We had a bill up to recently, the USA FREEDOM Act, that alleged that we were stopping bulk collection, but we didn't. During the markup of that bill in the Judiciary Committee, we offered this amendment; and everyone on the committee, including the chairman of the committee, said they were for this provision, but it wasn't the right time. Well, this is the right time.

That is why we have this broad support. It is the Massie-Lofgren-Sensenbrenner-Conyers-Poe-Gabbard-Jordan-O'Rourke. It is broad; it is bipartisan. It is supported by groups like the American Civil Liberties Union, as well as the Campaign for Liberty, Demand Progress, as well as FreedomWorks. This has broad bipartisan support.

The American people deserve this. When we have an interest in querying the 702 database for American citizens, get a warrant. That is what the Fourth Amendment requires.

Finally, this closes the opportunity to require backdoors on technology. As has been mentioned earlier by technologists and scientists, to do that just opens a door wide open for the bad guys and the hackers to break in.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague stated, my amendment also prohibits NSA and the CIA from placing backdoors into commercial products.

This is important because, in December of 2013, it was reported that a U.S. security company had received $10 million from the NSA to use a flawed encryption method. Our government should strengthen technology that protects our privacy, not take advantage of it.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restricts the use of section 702 of FISA, which is not currently up for reauthorization.

The law does not sunset until December of 2017. Any reform to this authority should be fully vetted by the authorizing committees and not inappropriately attached to our spending bill.

This amendment would impose greater restrictions on the intelligence community's ability to protect national security and create an impediment to our government's ability to locate threat information already in our government's possession. Such an impediment would potentially put American lives at risk of another terrorist attack.

Colleagues, the House recently passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, with overwhelmingly bipartisan support. It was signed into law last week. This amendment seeks to relitigate an issue fully litigated in the drafting of that legislation. A similar amendment was offered and rejected by the House Judiciary Committee during its markup of that bill.

The USA FREEDOM Act does include two reforms related to section 702 collection. These were reforms properly considered during the authorization process, not slapped on an appropriations bill without consideration and deliberation.

The first limits the government's use of information about U.S. persons that is obtained under section 702 that the FISA court later determines to be unlawful. The second provision requires the Director of National Intelligence to report annually the number of U.S. person queries under section 702.

Under current law, a U.S. person can only be the target of an intelligence gathering under FISA pursuant to an individualized court order based upon probable cause. The intelligence community is allowed to query communications it legally collects from foreigners for information about a U.S. person, so long as the query itself has foreign intelligence value.

This is no different from traditional criminal law. If the government has a legal wiretap on a drug dealer's cell phone and records a conversation where a second drug dealer talks about committing a murder, police can use that phone call as evidence against a second drug dealer in a murder trial. What matters is that the initial wiretap—or, here, the initial targeting of the foreign terrorist—was legal.

Colleagues, this is an issue critical to our national security, and it is complicated. Any changes to section 702 should be fully evaluated and voted on using the authorization committee process, which is the appropriate channel for considered review and debate on this critical issue.

Unfortunately, this amendment has not benefited from the work of the authorization process and would potentially put American lives at greater risk for another terrorist attack. That is not a risk many of us or certainly I am willing to take.

For this reason and many others, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. At this time, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The unclassified FISA court reported that the 702 search had, in fact, scooped up vast amounts of wholly domestic information. How does this work?

The upstream communications are tapped into by the NSA. In the digital world, your digital information, your domestic information is stored throughout the world. It is scooped up, and it is used.

The FBI has indicated it is used and the DNI has indicated it is used for wholly domestic purposes without a warrant routinely thousands, tens of thousands of times. It is in violation of the Fourth Amendment, and it must stop.

I would just say, on the Judiciary Committee, every member of the committee who declined to support this amendment said they were for the amendment and said we should offer it to the DOD appropriations bill.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, now, it has been said here tonight that this is not the time or the place to address these problems with 702, but, look, we have a constitutional crisis, and this was the excuse we were given in the Judiciary Committee when my colleague tried to get the amendment allowed there.

It was the same excuse I was given in the Rules Committee when we had an opportunity to address this, and I would maintain that 2017, 2 years from now, is too long to go in this constitutional crisis situation where we recognize something that illegal and/or unconstitutional is occurring; yet we don't do anything about it. This is the time to do something about it; this is the place to do something about it.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. 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 Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

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 appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to deactivate the 440th airlift wing, or to move the personnel or aircraft of the 440th airlift wing, or to otherwise degrade the capabilities of the 440th airlift wing.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

□ 0130

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue my fight against the Air Force's misguided decision to shutter the 440th Airlift Wing.

As I have stated time and time again, the removal of the 440th Airlift Wing at Pope Army Airfield injects avoidable and unreasonable risks to our military readiness. Given the instability and uncertainty in the Middle East and around the world, I find it baffling that the Air Force has chosen to close such an efficient airlift wing that provides critical training to special operations forces and units such as the 82nd Airborne's Global Response Force.

I have failed to see the true cost savings and any benefits associated with this shortsighted proposal, and I will continue working with my colleagues to pursue every option possible in order to prevent the closure of the wing. Furthermore, I find it troubling that the Air Force has made a concerted effort to hollow out this wing before allowing congressional efforts to come to fruition.

Mr. Chairman, I simply lack the confidence that there will be no negative impacts to the training of Fort Bragg paratroopers and special operations forces. I will, therefore, continue to work with my North Carolina colleagues to prevent its closure.

I believe that this is a necessary effort to preserve the 440th Airlift Wing because of the vital and unique training mission that it has at Fort Bragg with our paratroopers. Our paratroopers have to be packed and ready at any given moment for their Global Response Force. I have paratroopers who simply live day-to-day, ready to leave at a moment's notice—within hours—around the world.

I believe that this is, again, a shortsighted, myopic decision on the Air Force's part, and I believe we need to be protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law, and it constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill. Therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant Federal official of which actions would degrade given capabilities.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 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), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2685, which would prevent any funds in this bill from being provided to Pakistan.

Over the last 15 years, the United States has provided Pakistan with over $25 billion, the vast majority of which has gone to its military and security services. With this money, which we are giving them at a time when we are borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars, Pakistan is using it to subsidize terrorists, some of whom are targeting Americans.

Just as bad, our largess enables Pakistan to repress its own citizens. Our military aid is being used to murder and brutalize the Baloch and Sindhi peoples, who are citizens of Pakistan. The Baloch people are being slaughtered as part of a campaign by Pakistan, in partnership with China, to steal the natural resources of the Baloch people. With our money, the Pakistanis are, in fact, murdering and repressing their own people, and they are aggressing upon their neighbors in Afghanistan and in India.

They also have, as we have heard, a much hyped cooperation against terrorism. I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a charade. This is the same Pakistan establishment that gave shelter to Osama bin Laden for years—Osama bin Laden, the mass murderer of Americans on 9/11. The establishment of Pakistan gave him shelter and gave him a place to hide all of those years, making a fool out of us as we provided them money.

In case there is any doubt that they knew about Osama bin Laden's hiding next-door, they rubbed our noses in their arrogance and hostility when they arrested Dr. Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who helped us find Osama bin Laden and bring him to justice. As we talk tonight, Dr. Afridi still painfully languishes in a Pakistani dungeon. While Dr. Afridi is imprisoned, Pakistan should not get 1 cent of aid from our country. This is an insult to us, and it is an insult to the victims of 9/11 that we are even considering giving money to the country which hid Osama bin Laden from us, much less giving them borrowed money, perhaps, from China.

Now we see we borrow money from China and give it to Pakistan, which then gives it to China. In exchange, of course, China is getting the natural resources of Pakistan, of the Baloch people, and they are, in fact, getting a pork facility in Qatar.

Our aid to Pakistan does not make us safer or the world more peaceful. The Pakistanis and other enemies of ours see it as a weakness on our part. This payoff we hope, of course, will bring more peace and will pay the Pakistanis off. No. It emboldens the Pakistani establishment in their criminal violence against their own people and in their destabilizing violence against Afghanistan and India. Let us note: if we want to have a peaceful situation in Afghanistan someday, we cannot keep subsidizing the ISI and the military in Pakistan, which is primarily responsible for that mayhem that is going on in Afghanistan.

□ 0140

The people of Afghanistan know that, and our own specialists know that. We are just hoping if we pay people off, things will settle down. It hasn't accomplished that mission. We have emboldened our enemies by being stupid by giving money to a country like Pakistan, which obviously hates our guts, when they hide the man who murdered thousands of people on 9/11 and then suggest they didn't know it, and then arrest the person who helped us find that murderer.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in prohibiting any more of our money—especially borrowed money, as we are borrowing it today—from going to these people in Pakistan, the leadership who are committing crimes against us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. 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 retire conventionally armed air launched cruise missiles (AGM–86 C/D).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a very simple amendment that would help keep America's strategic forces strong and robust. My amendment would make sure that the U.S. Air Force keeps the air-launched cruise missile in their arsenal. That is the AGM–86 and its variants C and D.

The replacement missile, which I agree needs to happen, the long-range standoff weapon, has faced continuous delays. At this point, the replacement missile still remains years and years away from fielding.

I would like to applaud Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the committee for taking action in light of the numerous setbacks and delays of this program by appropriately rephasing funds in the underlying bill.

With such development uncertainty, I am disappointed to say that further delays are almost guaranteed.

In this high-threat environment, with heightened Russian aggression, their violations of the INF Treaty, which are now public, and also hostile Chinese adventurism in the South Pacific, we need to ensure that this Nation's defense is without a gap.

We simply can't afford to take these weapons out of the arsenal at this current moment until a replacement is up and operational. It is critically important that we maintain our existing inventory.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Let me say, we admire his strong conviction and advocacy for this program. We are prepared to accept his amendment with the understanding that we will need to study and discuss it with the Air Force to understand its full impact.

Mr. NUGENT. I absolutely appreciate the chairman doing that and would love to work with him.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. 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. ____ (a) Notwithstanding section 8005 and 9003, of the unobligated funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2016 and made available in this Act, $3,500,000,000 is available to transfer to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by subsection (b) of section 1022 of Public Law 113–291.

Mr. FORBES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, this is the second part of a two-part amendment that deals with the sea-based deterrence fund. We began this 4 weeks ago when the Armed Services Committee put in this fund. We, at that particular point in time, transferred $1.4 billion to the fund. In addition to that, we gave authorities for additional moneys to be transferred by the Department of Defense. Four weeks ago, we had 375 Members who voted in favor of that provision. When it was challenged on the floor a few hours ago, we had 321 Members who have supported that. All of the same individuals are supporting this fund that did so earlier.

I could repeat all that, but we have already done that, so I would just say all of the arguments we had earlier and all of the people who supported it then continue to support it now. I hope the will of the House will prevail and that the amendment will be accepted. If not, I hope it will be adopted by the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. FORBES) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, 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. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE TO THE UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
Mr. DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
Ms. FRANKEL, Florida
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 611. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 653. An act to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 11, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1772. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael T. Linnington, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1773. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criterion —— First in the World Program [Docket No.: ED-2015-OPE-0001; CFDA Nos.: 84.116F and 84.116X] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1774. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Clarification for Energy Conservation Standards and Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1775. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Synthetic Iron Oxide; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2013-C-1008) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1776. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Postmarketing Safety Reports for Human Drug and Biological Products; Electronic Submission Requirements; Delay of Compliance Date; Safety Reporting Portal of Electronic Submission of Postmarketing Safety

Reports for Human Drugs and Nonvaccine Biological Products [Docket No.: FDA-2008-N-0334] (RIN: 0910-AF96) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1777. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Banned Devices; General Provisions; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0011] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterinary Feed Directive [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0155] (RIN: 0910-AG95) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Grain Vacuuming Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Rescission Rules [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0358; FRL-9928-90-Region 7] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0246; FRL-9928-09-Region 9] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Decommissioning of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems and Amending Stage I Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0818; A-1-FRL-9928-86-Region 1] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard and Repeal of Cement Kilns Rule [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0821; FRL-9928-80-Region 6] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1783. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0938; FRL-9928-79-Region 6] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1784. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0423; FRL-9928-78-Region 3] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1785. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-24; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1786. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that the President has directed the Secretary of State to inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his intent to exercise his authority to designate Tunisia as a Major Non-NATO Ally, pursuant to Sec. 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, (FAA), (22 U.S.C. 2321k); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1787. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting for consideration, draft legislation to extend, by 15 years, the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1788. A letter from the Chairwoman, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014, to March 31, 2015, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1789. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1790. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the 2014 Statement on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106, and the Bank's 2014 audited financial statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1791. A letter from the Director of National Intelligence, Intelligence Community, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 103H of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1792. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2014, to March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of Pub. L. 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1793. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the ''Fiscal Year 2014 Naval Petroleum Reserves Annual Report of Operations'', prepared by the Office of Fossil Energy, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7431(c); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1794. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lakeside July 4th Fireworks, Lake Erie; Lakeside, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0388] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1795. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones, Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1796. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in the Sector Columbia River Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0300] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1797. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage Rates — 2015 Annual Review and Adjustment [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0481] (RIN: 1625-AC22) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1798. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Loading and Outbound Transit of TUG THOMAS and BARGE OCEANUS, Savannah River; Savannah, GA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0280] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1799. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Biscayne Bay, Miami Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0719] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1800. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Detroit Belle Isle Grand Prix, Detroit River; Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0389] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1801. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Special Local Regulation, Annual Dragon Boat Races, Portland Oregon [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0453] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1802. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0415; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-18152; AD 2015-09-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 305. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to

an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory (Rept. 114–146). Referred to the House Calendar.

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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants for career support for skilled internationally-educated health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 2710. A bill to revise various laws that interfere with the right of the people to obtain and use firearms for all lawful purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2711. A bill to delay the provision of the Affordable Care Act premium and cost-sharing subsidies until the eligibility verification process for such subsidies is completed, and for other purposes; 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 Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2712. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the health care premium tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy, and for other purposes; 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 Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 2713. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2714. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2715. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 2716. A bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Budget, 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. FARR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2717. A bill to modify the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2718. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian tribes to further achievement of tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2720. A bill to require institutions of higher education to report annually on the use of race, color, or national origin in the admissions process; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2721. A bill to strengthen and expand proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, 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 Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BERA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. LEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HARDY, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TROTT, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HILL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOOLENAAR,

Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YODER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BLUM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2722. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2723. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Arthur Schneier in recognition of his pioneering role in promoting religious freedom and human rights throughout the world, for close to half a century; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to expand the use of telehealth under the TRICARE program and in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. POSEY (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 2726. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the first manned landing on the moon; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2727. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving Fort Hood, Texas, and the City of Copperas Cove, Texas, to support the city's efforts to improve arterial transportation routes in the vicinity of Fort Hood and to promote economic development; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all trade agreements the United States enters into, should provide reasonable access and collaboration of each nation involved in such an agreement, for the purpose of search and recovery activities relating to members of the United States Armed Forces missing in action from prior wars or military conflicts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 304. A resolution electing certain Members to standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 306. A resolution recognizing the centennial of the wreck of the U.S.S. Memphis and encouraging the commemoration of such wreck with appropriate events and activities; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H. Res. 307. A resolution condemning the Republic of the Sudan for its actions to pardon Mubarak Mustafa, who was responsible for the escape of two men convicted of the assassination of John Granville on January 1, 2008, and calling on the United States Department of State to continue to include Sudan on the list of state sponsors of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 308. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Wisconsin Idea and the University of Wisconsin System for the benefit they have brought and continue to bring to the State of Wisconsin, the United States, and the world; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

53. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, urging the United States Congress and United States Fish and Wildlife Service to take certain actions to reduce the impact of common ravens on the greater sage grouse and desert tortoise populations in this State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

54. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, expressing support for the 2014 Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan developed by the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council and urging the United States Fish and Wildlife Service not to list the greater sage-grouse as an endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Second Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2713.

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. CONYERS:

H.R. 2714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DeSANTIS:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 2717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18; the Commerce clause and Necessary and Proper clause, which grant Congress the power to make laws that regulate commerce.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I of the Constitution of the United States of America:

''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

14th Amendment, U.S. Constitution; Article 1, U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2721.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. ''The Congress shall have Power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;''

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clauses 12

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 167: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 210: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 213: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 217: Mr. CARTER of Texas and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 232: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 276: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 287: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 335: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 427: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 448: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 449: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 465: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 472: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 492: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 525: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 528: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 563: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 653: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 676: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 686: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 692: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 699: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 702: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 721: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 746: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 766: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 767: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 794: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 825: Mr. DOLD and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 829: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 835: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 842: Mr. HARDY and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 846: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 868: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 885: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 912: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 918: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 920: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 923: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 940: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 953: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 994: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 999: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1002: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 1057: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1157: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1174: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1180: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1194: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1197: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1199: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1271: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1278: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1310: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1321: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1333: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1338: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1340: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1384: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1388: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1399: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1427: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1453: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1462: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1516: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1537: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1553: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1567: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1571: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1600: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1610: Mr. RUIZ and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1635: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1665: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1674: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1676: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1725: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1728: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1737: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1766: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1779: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1786: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1804: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1817: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1844: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1855: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1856: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1875: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1877: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1941: Mr. WOODALL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1943: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1969: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. JONES, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1977: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1994: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 2010: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2016: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2019: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2031: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2050: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2061: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 2072: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2133: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2142: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2152: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2170: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2177: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2191: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2212: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2216: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2233: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2238: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2251: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2255: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2259: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2280: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2303: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2304: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2309: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2315: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2350: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2355: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2358: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2366: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2378: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2398: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2400: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2404: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2406: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2407: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2410: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2429: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2477: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2505: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2513: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2524: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2530: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2560: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 2563: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2603: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 2607: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2611: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2639: Mr. JONES and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2646: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2652: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2653: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2663: Ms. TITUS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HARDY.
H.R. 2675: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2680: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2689: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2692: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 2698: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. YODER.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. ROSS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. HARDY.
H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 12: Mr. POMPEO.
H. Res. 54: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 110: Mr. SALMON.
H. Res. 183: Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 207: Mr. PERRY and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 233: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 294: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 297: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1295

OFFERED BY: MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO.1: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Findings.
Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.
Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.
Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.
Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.
Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.
Sec. 110. Reports.
Sec. 111. Technical amendments.
Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.
Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.
Sec. 402. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.
Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. Customs user fees.
Sec. 602. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.
Sec. 603. Elimination of modification of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.
Sec. 604. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.
Sec. 605. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.
Sec. 606. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''11 succeeding'' and inserting ''21 succeeding''; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''SEPTEMBER30,2015'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER30,2025'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.''.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol ''D'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol ''A'' or ''A*'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''If the President'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

''(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

''(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

''(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

''(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

''(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

''(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

''(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

''(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

''(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

''(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''for men and women'' after ''rights''.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as ''AGOA utilization strategies'');

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest'' and inserting '', through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have''; and

(B) by striking ''and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States'' and inserting '', complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''20'' and inserting ''30''; and

(B) by inserting after ''from those countries'' the following: '', particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.''.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have a expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) TERMINATION.—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African country'' means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED ARTICLE.—The term ''covered article'' means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms ''enter'' and ''entry'' include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.''.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''October 1'' for ''July 1'' each place such date appears.

(b) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4) and (5)'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''Footwear'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

''(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

''(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

''(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking ''succeeding 11 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(II) by striking ''December 19, 2018'' and inserting ''December 19, 2025''.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2020'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking ''For the purposes of subheadings'' and all that follows through ''6211.20.15'' and inserting ''For purposes of this chapter'';

(B) by striking ''garments classifiable in those subheadings'' and inserting ''a garment''; and

(C) by striking ''D 3600-81'' and inserting ''D 3779–81''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

''3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term 'recreational performance outerwear' means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

''(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

''(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

''(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

''(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

''(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

''(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

''(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

''(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

''(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

''(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

''(xi) Odor control technology.

The term 'recreational performance outerwear' does not include occupational outerwear.

''(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

''(i) The term 'treated with plastics' refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

''(ii) The term 'sealed seams' means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

''(iii) The term 'critically sealed seams' means—

''(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

''(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

''(iv) The term 'insulation for cold weather protection' means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

''(v) The term 'venting' refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

''(vi) The term 'articulated elbows or knees' refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

''(vii) The term 'reinforcement' refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

''(viii) The term 'weatherproof closure' means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

''(ix) The term 'multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar' means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

''(x) The terms 'adjustable powder skirt' and 'inner protective skirt' refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

''(xi) The term 'arm gusset' means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

''(xii) The term 'radial arm movement' refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

''(xiii) The term 'odor control technology' means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

''(xiv) The term 'occupational outerwear' means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

''(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as 'recreational performance outerwear'.

''(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.''.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:

	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	...
		Other:				...
	6201.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	...
		Other:				...
	6201.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	...
	6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6201.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	

	6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.30	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	".

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				

	6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%
		Other:			
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%

6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.40	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.45	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				

6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO,IL, JO,KR, MA,MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.41.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.20	Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	''.

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6203.43.15	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.25	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.35	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
	6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
	6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				

6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.49.15	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	''.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.61.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	''.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.20	Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.30	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
	6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	".

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6204.63.12	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				

6204.63.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	Other:				
6204.63.30	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	''.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.69	Of other textile materials:				
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
	6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Of silk or silk waste:				
	6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
	6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.40.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	

	6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.50.30	Having an outer surface impreg- nated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.32	Of cotton:				
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
	6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%	
	6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%	”.

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.39.10	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM)	58.5%	
	6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.42	Of cotton:				
	6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	
	6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	".

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	
	6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	".

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.49.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	".

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

"6. For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term 'protective active footwear' means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over $24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.".

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

"	6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	".

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

"	6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	".

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2024'' and inserting ''July 7, 2025''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2021'' and inserting ''June 30, 2025''.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than $1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. ELIMINATION OF MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking ''0.25 percent'' and inserting ''0.0 percent''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted and if the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, such amendment shall be executed as if this Act had been enacted after the date of the enactment of such other Act

SEC. 604. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.''.

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.''.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

''(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.''.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual's TIN.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 606. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(2) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$30'' and inserting ''$50'',

(B) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(C) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$60'' and inserting ''$100'',

(B) by striking ''$100'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$250'', and

(C) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN $5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000'',

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$175,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$500,000'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''$250'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500'', and

(2) by striking ''$1,500,000'' in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$30'' and inserting ''$50'',

(ii) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(iii) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$60'' and inserting ''$100'',

(ii) by striking ''$100'' (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting ''$250'', and

(iii) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN $5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000'',

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$175,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$500,000'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$250'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500'', and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. DELANEY

AMENDMENT NO.6: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,463,000)''.

Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. NOLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SABLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,300,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $21,300,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. TAKAI

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000) (increased by $25,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used on the ground-based strategic deterrence unless the annual report that is submitted in 2016 under section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1576) includes a 25-year cost estimate of modernizing and sustaining the nuclear enterprise.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not more than $500,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used on the research and development of the long-range strike bomber until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the justification for procuring both the long-range strike bomber and the long-range standoff weapon.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,543,000) (increased by $3,543,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 18: 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 enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3(c)(1)(A).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 20: 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 by any department or agency of the United States other than the Armed Forces to operate an armed unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 21: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 22: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under section 9014 for ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deploy United States troops on the ground of Iraq or Syria (other than deployment of such troops for purposes of protecting United States embassies and consulates) unless Congress has enacted a specific authorization for the deployment of such troops.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SABLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in contravention of section 801 of Public Law 94–241 or section 2663 of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 25: 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 any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Sections (3)(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(g), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of Executive Order 13963.

(4) Subsections (c)(4), (c)(9), (c)(10), (c)(12), or (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(6) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(7) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHIFF

AMENDMENT NO. 26: 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 after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. ROHRABACHER

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2015 No. 92

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.

O God, who rules over humanity and nations, we ask You to support the Congress in its manifold tasks. Uphold our Senators, that their daily work may be performed with diligence and fidelity to our heritage under You.

Lord, raise up those who will unite in serving You with their whole heart and mind and strength. May our lawmakers fear only to be disloyal to the best they know, as You make them forgiving and forbearing. Teach them to value a conscience void of offense and the royalty of self-respect above all the pedestals, prizes, and preferments Earth can give.

We pray in Your Holy 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. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the President put forth a mighty ObamaCare spin effort yesterday. We have to give him credit for trying to salvage a law that only one—one—out of every nine Americans thinks is actually working. But I don't think condescending to ObamaCare's victims was the best approach for him to take.

Consider this cringe-inducing assertion: Americans who already had health insurance ''may not know that they've got a better deal now [under ObamaCare] . . . than they did, but they do.''

In other words, he knows what is best for you, so quit complaining.

It is the very mindset that led this partisan law being forced through over the objections of the American people in the first place. It is the very mindset that said it was OK to cut a few corners and tell a few white lies to sell the country a law it didn't want.

So what, the Obama crowd seems to think, if Americans couldn't keep the plan they had and liked—so what. So what, ObamaCare's defenders must reason, if Americans see costs rise after being told they would fall.

To our friends on the left, it is just the cost of doing business. These days they have all but given up the ghost of empathy. They just talk past the middle class instead.

Consider some of the statements we have heard from top Democrats. ''ObamaCare has been wonderful for America.'' ''None of the predictions about how [ObamaCare] wouldn't work have come to pass.'' The implementation of this is ''fabulous.''

We have heard all of that from Democratic leaders.

These are the kinds of statements that raise our blood pressure all across America. But quotes such as these betray more than just a certain incongruence from reality. This is also a signal of a party that has lost confidence in the force of its own arguments—one that seems more intent on reassuring itself than convincing others.

Why else would they be saying things they know aren't true?

Now, I have spoken broadly over the past week about how ObamaCare has failed Americans in terms of higher costs especially, but allow me just to touch on the assertion that ObamaCare's implementation has been ''fabulous'' too.

Fabulous? That is certainly one way to describe how ObamaCare has been plagued by failure since day one. Consider the disastrous rollout. Many Americans won't forget the crashing Web sites, the hours on hold, the instructions to ''fax in'' their applications while at the same time seeing reports of ObamaCare contractors sitting idle, waiting for work to come through the door.

The White House tried to spin it all away as nothing more than a glitch—just a glitch—on the Web site. But the American people knew it pointed to broader systemic challenges in an unworkable law.

Consider the many pro-ObamaCare States that launched exchanges with great enthusiasm. These true-blue administrations did everything they could to make ObamaCare work, but they often ended up exposing ObamaCare's tragic realities instead.

Take deep blue Vermont. Many on the left looked to Vermont's extra-ambitious ObamaCare experiment as the crown jewel in their ideological crown, but it turned out to be little more than ''an unending money pit,'' as one Vermonter put it.

In Oregon, officials spent over $300 million taxpayer dollars to launch an ObamaCare exchange and marketing campaign. That is a big investment. But ObamaCare has been an even bigger flop. Millions of dollars down the tubes and Oregon has little to show for it beyond a couple of bizarre marketing videos and a criminal investigation.

Hawaii just announced it will be the latest State to shutter—close, shutter up—its faltering exchange.

In Kentucky, a Democratic administration poured one-quarter of a billion dollars into an exchange that placed nearly 80 percent of the enrollees into an already broken Medicaid system. Many of the remaining 20 percent or so now find themselves stuck with unaffordable ObamaCare coverage, such as a constituent from Ashland,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

who wrote to let me know that his monthly premium increased by more than 30 percent.

So it is hard to disagree with the top Vermont health official who said: ''Good God, this just wasn't set up for success.'' That is from the top health official in Vermont. Given the spectacular flop in his State, he would certainly know, and he certainly seems to have a point. Of the 17 original ObamaCare exchanges, some have failed outright, and half of those that remain are struggling financially.

So the truth is this: ObamaCare never had a Web site problem; it had an ObamaCare problem.

No amount of wishful thinking or fast talk is going to change that reality. It is not going to change the failures I just mentioned, and it is not going to change the failures I haven't, such as the failed CLASS Act, the troubled co-ops, the debacle of giving people the wrong amount of subsidy or what we just learned yesterday—that the IRS may not even be able to verify that many of the people who received the tax credit for health insurance actually bought the health insurance.

I am asking ObamaCare's defenders in the White House and in Congress to redirect their efforts away from the spin and toward the reality instead. We all know that ObamaCare is a law filled with broken promises, higher costs, and failure. So let's work together to start over with real health care reform instead.

That is the kind of health care outcome that actually would be ''fabulous'' for our constituents. It is something that really would be ''wonderful for America.'' And it is what we can work together to achieve once Washington politicians move past the failure of ObamaCare.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the massive cyber attack Americans just read about reminds us all of the need for action on this issue. Building America's public and private cyber defenses won't be easy. But the bipartisan cyber security measure that passed out of the Intelligence Committee with the support of every single Republican and every single Democrat but one, 14 to 1, will increase the ability of the public and private sector to share information and to make us safer. That is why we are going to take it up as part of the Defense authorization bill now before us.

I hope Senators of both parties will come together to support that bipartisan amendment when it comes to a vote, just as we saw the Senate come together to keep the Defense authorization bill intact and consistent with the budget resolution by standing against the Reed amendment yesterday. It keeps us on track to pass bipartisan legislation that will support the men and women who keep us safe every day.

There is something else worth noting about the vote, too. It means we have now taken twice as many amendment rollcall votes on this year's Defense authorization bill as we were allowed on the last two bills combined. Again, it means we have now taken twice as many amendment rollcall votes on this year's Defense authorization bill as were allowed in the last two bills combined. It is just the latest reminder of a new majority that is getting the Senate back on track and back to work.

Unfortunately, some leaders of the previous majority seem bound and determined to get us back into their gridlock comfort season. At a time of grave threats to our Nation, these Democratic leaders think it is a good idea to hold brave servicemen and brave servicewomen hostage to partisan demands for more waste at the IRS and bigger congressional office budgets for themselves. Let me repeat. At a moment of dangerous and gathering threats, here is the position of these Democratic leaders: They want to hold hostage the funding needed to make our troops combat ready so they can spend more on bureaucracies such as the IRS.

These Democratic leaders just can't seem to kick the gridlock habit, even on legislation with the exact same level of funding President Obama asked for in his own budget. They just can't shake their passion for partisanship, even on a bill that sailed out of committee on a hugely bipartisan vote of 22 to 4. That is how the Defense authorization bill came out of the committee: 22 to 4.

That doesn't mean the rest of their party has to go along with it. I am appealing to every commonsense Democrat—every Democrat uncomfortable with the thought of holding our troops and our families to ransom for unrelated partisan demands—to keep working across the aisle in good faith, instead, because many of our colleagues understand the true sacrifice and unparalleled value of the nearly 1.5 million Active-Duty men and women who proudly wear our country's uniform, the 1.1 million members of the Reserve and National Guard, and the more than 700,000 civilian officials who stand in support, not to mention the many veterans and families who enrich our country and our communities.

We certainly understand their value in Kentucky. We are proud to host several important military bases across the Commonwealth. I wish to tell my colleagues about just one of them today.

Fort Campbell is home to approximately 30,000 Army personnel, including vital Special Operations units and the famed 101st Airborne Division. Units from Fort Campbell have bravely served as the tip of the spear in executing the U.S. global war on terror, with the 101st Airborne deploying as the first conventional unit in its support.

It was soldiers from Fort Campbell who proudly answered the call to assist with the delicate Ebola mission in West Africa, and it is Fort Campbell's unrivaled aviation infrastructure that provides the Army with the critical ability to rapidly deploy servicemembers to volatile regions.

It is obvious that Fort Campbell means a lot to our country, and I can't tell my colleagues how much it means to Kentucky. It means a lot to its local community, too, especially considering the fact that it has an annual economic impact of $5 billion to the surrounding area.

This, of course, is hardly a unique story in America. From coast to coast, there is no end of examples of how our troops and our military enrich the fabric of our communities while at the same time keeping us safe. They are our neighbors. They are our friends. They are our daughters. They are our sons. They are not chess pieces for Democratic leaders to wield in some partisan game.

If Democratic leaders are really that worried about fattening up the IRS or adding a new coat of paint to their congressional offices, we can have that discussion, but let's leave our troops out of it and leave their families out of it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is very difficult to respond to fiction, and that is what we just heard. We heard a speech based on fiction, a speech based on no facts, a speech based on made-up facts.

It is so hard to comprehend the different areas the majority leader spoke of with no basis in reality. On the subject of health care, it is as if he doesn't realize that 16.5 million people have health insurance.

He denigrates people who aren't insured. Because of Obamacare, they now have the ability to go to a doctor or a hospital when they are sick because of Medicaid. Is there anything wrong with that? In America everyone is not rich. In America not everyone is middle class. Some people are falling through the cracks, and the fact that in the State of Kentucky a lot of people there now have the ability to go to doctors when they are sick or hurt shouldn't be anything that people make fun of.

Health care has changed dramatically. I walked into a drugstore near my home here in Washington—CVS. As a result of ObamaCare and other reasons, you can go into that drugstore now and have a test for strep. If you need medicine, they can give it to you. That is progress in medicine in America.

My friend the Republican leader talks as if he would like to return to the time prior to ObamaCare, when insurance companies defined the people

who have preexisting disabilities. Let's go back to that system. Let's go back to the system where if you have a child who has diabetes, you can't get that kid insured. If you have been in an automobile accident and you broke your neck—even if you are doing fine now, but from the doctor's reports it shows that you broke your neck—you can't get insurance. People with debilitating diseases now can get help.

The overwhelming majority of Americans, statistically, who enrolled in health care plans under the new law are satisfied with the coverage. The majority leader continues to misstate the facts on the Affordable Care Act. The latest poll shows that the majority of Americans support the law, as they should. So I don't know why my friend has to come here and make up things.

ObamaCare has been an important program for American families in Nevada and all over America. So I am very disappointed with the state of nonreality of my friend from Kentucky, who has come here each day this week to talk about ObamaCare and what is wrong with it. Before this law came into being, patients and the American people were subject to premium increases without any notice, cancellations without notice, denials for preexisting conditions, which I have already mentioned, and arbitrary limits on how much care insurance companies would cover.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. REID. The majority leader also came here and talked about how Democrats don't care about people in the armed services in America—that we don't care. In Nevada, I would compare our military installations and their contributions to a stellar military. Nobody surpasses what we do in Nevada. We have the finest Air Force training center in the world for people who fly fighter aircraft. They are all there. We have 10,000 civilian employees, and about 10,000 troops are stationed there. It has been in existence since it was called the Gunnery School in World War II. We are very proud of that. It is an important part of our community, and we protect it.

If you go north 350 miles, there is the Fallon Naval Air Training Center, which is a great installation, where if you want to fly on an aircraft carrier in America, that is where you train, at Fallon. TOPGUN is there. It is a wonderful facility, and we are proud of that facility. It doesn't have as many civilian personnel as Nellis. It is not as big and does not have as many active military, but it is an outstanding operation. People come from all over the world to train at Nellis—from all over the world. We have such a vastness in Nevada, and people train there. They can't do it anyplace else in the world.

So I would put my support of the military—I would certainly compare it to my friend the Republican leader. I am sure he cares. I care also, and all 45 Members of the Democratic caucus care about the military. We care about it in a way that is not denigrating to the Internal Revenue Service that he keeps bashing.

One reason that the Internal Revenue Service has a tough time doing its job is because the Republicans keep cutting their budget. The head of the IRS came to see me a couple months ago, and said: We made it through the tax season. There were very few problems, but he said that if anyone wanted to call the IRS 2 months prior to the tax season ending, they couldn't answer the phones. They didn't have enough staff to do it.

The bill came out of the Armed Services Committee, and at that time, our leading member of that committee, JACK REED, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy said that the bill was flawed. It was flawed because he hoped we could fix the funding mechanism that the Republicans put in this—another unbelievably fictitious way of taking care of our government.

The chairman of that committee is somebody with whom I came from the House of Representatives 33 years ago. We came to the Senate together. He has been someone who has stood on this floor and berated phony spending. Where is he now? How could this man be in favor of deficit spending? How can he be in favor of OCO? He has spoken out openly against it in the past, but suddenly he is in favor of it.

The President said the minute that bill was taken up in the committee: If you don't change that, I am going to veto the bill—as he should. What we have said is we are going to support that. We believe what is in this bill is as fictitious as his account of what ObamaCare is all about. But my friend the Republican leader keeps talking about the leftwing: The leftwing is trying to kill this bill. We are not trying to kill the bill. We are trying to make sure we have programs in America that support the middle class, that support medical research, that support funding the FBI, and our court system. My friend the Republican leader seems only to care about the military. We care about the military, but we care about other things that lead to the security of this Nation.

We are not a secure Nation when we don't fund the National Institutes of Health. We are not a secure Nation when we don't fund the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security. We are not a secure Nation when we don't fund the Immigration and Naturalization Service. But my friend the Republican leader is saying: Don't worry about them. Just take care of the military. All this other stuff will work out.

The military is not secure, our government is not secure, and our homeland is not secure, when we have all these other agencies that are being, in effect, cut back in funding.

Now, on cyber security, we know the Presiding Officer of this body led the Senate through some very important debates in recent days, and one of the things that was underlying everything done by the Presiding Officer was cyber security—maybe sometimes not directly, but that is in the background, always.

What does the Republican leader now come and say?

Look how much I am on cyber security. Look at me. I lifted weights this morning.

But what he has done is that now he is going to put cyber security on the bill the President said he is going to veto. We are stuck. We have 400 amendments filed, and we are not going through these amendments. He wants to be able to check off the box, saying: Well, we did cyber security.

He hasn't done cyber security. I have a quote here from him on cyber security, just a short time ago: ''Any issue of this importance deserves serious consideration and open debate.'' This is what the Republican leader said. He says: Oh, we have done double the amendments that were done in the last couple of bills.

It takes two sides of the Senate to have amendments heard. The Republicans would not let us have open debate on the armed services bill the last two Congresses. We never even had a debate here. What happened is the two chairs of the committee met in secret and came up with a bill that came up to the Senate floor, and we were able to get that done. But for people to come here and say this is the 53rd year we have done the bill is a little fictitious itself.

I hope that my friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, will get in touch with reality on ObamaCare, on the Defense authorization bill before this body, and on cyber security and stop making things up, because that is it. It is fiction, and it is not appropriate.

I was so disappointed yesterday to see my Republican colleagues vote against the amendment proposed by the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island. His amendment would have done what no Republicans have even tried to do, which is to adequately address sequestration.

Sequestration was supposed to be so absurd and so foolish that it would force Congress to reduce the deficit in a sensible, balanced manner. On the floor now—I have said this before and I will say it again—I asked the senior Senator from Illinois who came to this House with me and with JOHN MCCAIN 33 years ago: Would you do me a favor? We have this committee that the President has set up, and I need somebody that represents maybe a little bit left of center on this committee. Would you do it? He had many other obligations, but he agreed to be on the Bowles-Simpson Commission, and he did a stunningly important good job. He supported the financing of that. Quite frankly, that surprised me because of all the people yelling for all these

budget cuts, and many of those voted against it in the committee. Now, no one in this body understands sequestration any better than my friend from Illinois.

Sequestration was supposed to be so absurd—I repeat—so foolish, that it would force Congress to balance in a sensible manner. Yet what the Republicans considered lunacy a few years ago is now the preferred form of legislating, the preferred form of budgeting. That tells you everything you need to know about today's Republican Party. They are beating their chests about how great sequestration is. Isn't it great that all of these Federal agencies are being cut.

The Reed amendment would have allowed the Democrats and Republicans to negotiate a balanced budget and would have rescinded sequestration, while ensuring adequate funding to the Department of Defense and nondefense programs. Instead, by rejecting Senator REED's legislation, the Republicans have effectively said spend first, budget later. Here is what they have come up with. They are saying: Ready, fire, aim. Or they are saying: Fire, ready, aim. We know they are not saying: Ready, aim, fire. They have it all backwards, like everything they have done here legislatively—like ostriches with their heads buried deep in the sand.

The majority leader and Republicans continue to deny the need for a bipartisan budget. They deny the need to fix sequestration, just as they deny the urgent need to authorize the Export-Import Bank, which employs 165,000 people in America, as we speak. It expires at the end of this month.

They deny the urgent need to fix our roads, rails, and bridges. That program is going to expire in 6 weeks, which creates millions of jobs—millions of jobs.

Regardless of what Republicans tell themselves, they cannot wish these important issues to just disappear. It is our job to address these matters that affect working Americans.

Here we are in June, months before funding for the government runs out. We have plenty of time to sit down and work out an agreement that both sides can work out. It appears to me what the Republicans are doing is that we are heading for another shutdown. They did it once; they are going to do it again. They want to do nothing now. They want to wait until the fiscal year ends and then lock it up—close up government. There is no reason for this to become yet another manufactured crisis, and that is what we have here.

We can, I repeat, months before the funding for government runs out, do something about it. Do they desire another closed government? I hope not. But it appears that is where we are headed. The Republicans are unwilling to do things that are real. So I urge my Republican colleagues to change course, instead of barreling ahead with bills they know are going to fail.

The Defense authorization bill, the President is going to veto. The veto will be upheld. We will do it over here. But the House already has enough votes to sustain the President's veto. It is just moving forward for reasons that I do not fully understand. I urge them to change course, work with us to forge an agreement that can get signed into law.

The majority leader's party can continue to ignore and procrastinate all they want, but eventually we will need to negotiate a budget free of sequestration, a budget that protects our military and also nondefense, our middle class. Eventually, we will need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, I repeat, which sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs and is responsible for billions of dollars in U.S. exports.

Now, eventually we need to find a lasting way to fund on a long-term basis our American highways. Fifty percent of our highways are deficient, 64,000 bridges—50 percent of those are structurally deficient. Not far from here, over the great Memorial Bridge, they are closing two lanes. Why? Because it has rotted away. Hundreds of thousands of people go over that every day—or they used to. So why wait? Instead of waiting for the President to veto their sham funding mechanism and then scramble to craft some last-minute, hastily wrought continuing resolution, the Republicans should work with us on a bipartisan solution now. We are ready to cooperate with Republicans to pass legislation that keeps America safe and protects the middle class. But to do that, my Republican colleagues will first have to pull their heads out of the sand.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half.

The assistant Democratic leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are considering this bill, and you can see by the size of it, it is a major undertaking. It comes up every year. It is the Department of Defense Authorization Act. It is an extraordinarily important bill. It literally authorizes programs for the defense of America.

We have two able leaders who brought the bill to the floor. One is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, JOHN MCCAIN, a man with whom I entered the House many years ago and a man whose reputation and service to America is well known. He is someone who has served in the U.S. Navy, was a prisoner of war during the Vietnam war, and has been a leader in speaking out on behalf of the military throughout his life. It is built into his family. It is built into his soul.

On our side, we have Senator JACK REED from Rhode Island. Senator REED is a graduate of the West Point Military Academy. He served as well in the Active Army. He brings that service, that part of his life to his work on the Democratic side of the aisle. When it came to putting this bill together, I do not think we could have picked two more able leaders from the Senate, a Republican and a Democrat, to bring this bill to the floor.

They have their differences. But for the most part they agree on this bill. It was troubling this morning to hear the Republican majority leader suggest that the differences we have over this bill suggest a lack of commitment by Democrats to the military of the United States. That is not true. It is not fair. We are as committed on our side of the aisle as those on the other side of the aisle when it comes to the men and women in uniform—committed to making certain that they have what they need to be trained, to fight effectively, and to come home safely.

We are also committed to bringing them home to a welcoming America, preparing veterans programs for the rest of their lives, so they can have productive lives, happy lives after having risked their lives for America.

So to suggest that the Republicans are for the military and Democrats are against it, I regret that the majority leader made that suggestion. Both sides are committed—both the chairman and the ranking member are committed. But what is the issue that divides us when it comes to this bill? It is basically an issue of funding. Here is what it comes down to: We have a Budget Control Act, and if we do not hit the numbers in spending, in comes sequestration. What is sequestration? It is an across-the-board cut.

We do not want to see that happen. We have seen it. We know what it does. It was devastating to the Department of Defense when we went into sequestration. I know because I chaired the Appropriations Committee and I listened to the Secretary of Defense and the leaders from our branches and services tell us: It is impossible for us to budget an effective national security if we have to wonder whether we are going to face an across-the-board cut. I can understand that, not only in readiness, which is essential to the survival of our troops, but also in the procurement of substantial, expensive, important, and necessary technology.

So Senator MCCAIN on the Republican side brings to the floor this authorization bill and says: We will solve

the problem of sequestration by inserting about $38 to $40 billion in wartime emergency funding into the Department of Defense. Well, we don't believe that is the right way to go, neither does the Secretary of Defense, neither does the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff because it is a 1-year fix.

We need a fix that has some continuity and predictability to it. Therein lies the difference in approach between Democrats and Republicans. Is one side patriotic and the other side not patriotic because we disagree on a budget reform? Of course not. We happen to believe there is a better way to do this and so does the President.

But there is another element I want to make a reference to. The Republican majority leader came here and said: Well, the Democrats are fighting to put more money into the rest of government—nondefense. It is true, we are. He used his two examples: Well, they want to hire more people at the Internal Revenue Service and maybe they want to put another coat of paint on their offices. That is what the majority leader said.

Well, it could not be further from the truth. I will argue for adequate funding for the Internal Revenue Service. The overwhelming majority of Americans who pay their fair share of taxes and are honest people and try to follow the law should be respected. Those who don't, those who try to cheat our tax system should be held accountable. I do not think that is a radical idea. It takes employees at the Internal Revenue Service to make sure that is true. Right now we have cut back on their spending.

But let me go to another issue which I think really tells the story about why we think we not only need to make sure the Department of Defense is adequately funded, but we want to make sure other areas of government are adequately funded. Once every 67 seconds in America someone is diagnosed with Alzheimer's—once every 67 seconds. It is a disease which is now growing at a rapid pace because of the aging of our population. It is extraordinarily expensive. Under Medicare and Medicaid, $200 billion were spent last year in the care of those with Alzheimer's.

That number is projected to grow dramatically in the years to come. Well, it is a heartbreaking disease, as you see someone whom you dearly love, someone in your family, and their mind is not as responsive as it once was. It is extraordinarily devastating to these families, and it is extraordinarily expensive to taxpayers.

So what will we do about it? I hope we will be committed, on a bipartisan basis, to medical research. Medical research, through the National Institutes of Health, is part of the nondefense budget that we are trying to help by resolving this whole question of sequestration. It is not about putting a coat of paint on my office. That is not why I am fighting to make sure the nondefense part of the budget is not victimized by sequestration. I am fighting for the National Institutes of Health.

How important is it that they not face sequestration? They have done it. They faced it. Let me tell you just one example of what it meant. Dr. Frank LaFerla is at the University of California in Irvine. He is a medical researcher. He and his team have created mice that develop Alzheimer's disease in the same way humans do. Now, his research team can study that disease in these mice, but the mice need to age 18 months before research on potential Alzheimer's disease treatments can be done.

In 2013, when we faced sequestration, across-the-board cuts in the budget, Dr. LaFerla was faced with the prospect of having to sacrifice these laboratory animals and close his lab. If that had happened, months of research would have been wasted. That is what happens when you do something as mindless as sequestration in the Department of Defense and in the National Institutes of Health.

We even have an amendment, which I hope will not be offered but is pending—has now been filed, I should say, in the Senate, which would cut medical research in the Department of Defense. I wonder what my colleagues are thinking; that we in America should cut back on medical research as a way of balancing our budget. I am praying for the day that Dr. LaFerla or someone like him will find a way to delay the onset of Alzheimer's and, God willing, find a cure. If they do, the investment in the National Institutes of Health will be paid off over and over and over again, and human suffering will be avoided.

So when I hear the Republican majority leader dismiss the idea of funding outside the Department of Defense, when I hear him suggest that the Democrats are trying to work toward a budget solution that is fair to the Department of Defense and all other agencies so that we "have enough money to paint our offices"—that is what he said—I am troubled by that. There is much more at stake.

When it comes to medical research, I would hope the Senator from Kentucky feels, as all of us do, this is not partisan at all. The victims of Alzheimer's are of both political parties and people who never vote. They are just across the board. We ought to be committed to making certain that medical research makes a difference and that we believe in it. I hope this amendment that is being offered to cut Department of Defense medical research is not offered, because if it is, I plan to come to the floor and tell the story about what that medical research has meant over the last 20 years.

For example, the second largest investment in breast cancer research is in the U.S. Department of Defense. There are dramatic stories to be told about what they have discovered and what they have been able to do in the Department of Defense. The suggestion that we should eliminate this research to me is a very bad one. It does not reflect the reality of the fright and concern that come with a diagnosis of breast cancer.

I am prepared for that battle, not just on breast cancer but on all of the other areas of medical research in the Department of Defense, as well as medical research in the National Institutes of Health. If there is one issue that should unite us, Democrats and Republicans, it is medical research. I will tell you, the people I represent in Illinois, regardless of party affiliation, believe that we in both political parties should be making this commitment.

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. COATS. 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. COATS. Mr. President, I know we are in morning business time, and if I could speak on the Republican time, reserving the time remaining for the Democrats, I would be pleased to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise today, the 13th time, for the "Waste of the Week." So far, we have identified waste in many areas, ranging from the familiar, such as the duplication of government programs and outrageous spending and lack of control, to the bizarre, such as the government-funded massages for New Zealand rabbits. I have received more responses on that than I have for some of the major items I have listed. Every once in a while, I throw in a "Can you believe they do that?"

To date, we have estimated nearly $67 billion of fraud, abuse, and waste. This is taxpayer money. These are taxpayer dollars that are coming in for programs that the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and other special investigators have looked at and said: Why are we spending this money in the first place? It is a total waste, it is fraud, and it has been abused.

So we are at the level of nearly two-thirds of our goal of $100 billion and moving forward.

And so today, I wish to talk about yet another fiscal situation we have come across that is costing the taxpayers the hard-earned dollars. They're sending them to Washington and they want accountability. Since we are doing debate on the Defense bill this week, I thought I would look at the defense issue. I will use contracting accountability as an example of the need for another effort to save the taxpayers' dollars because they are being wasted.

Now, it is not uncommon for every agency of the Federal Government to use contractors. The Department of Defense uses contractors. They do necessary work. They provide services for our troops overseas. We owe our troops, we owe them, given the sacrifices they are making to provide those needed services in an effective and efficient way, but we also owe the taxpayer clear oversight in terms of how their money is spent to make sure that these services that are provided, these tasks that are undertaken by defense contractors as well as all Federal contractors are done so in an accountable way.

The issue today arises out of a report by the Special Investigator General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. That report identified a total of $135 million of questionable costs spent by one specific contractor between October 2011 and March 2014. He said that in most cases the funds that were spent were not supported with adequate documentation or did not have prior approval. In another instance, this same contractor also overcharged the government by over $1 million. The government lost about $37,000 in interest payments. That is a little bit of change in a total of billions of dollars being spent, but nevertheless it is not all that small of an amount to a number of Americans who work awfully hard to pay their taxes, and they want those taxes to be used wisely.

Again, this same contractor in three other cases violated Federal procurement law in securing contracts totaling almost $5 million.

So here we have one contractor that has been singled out among many but put in place $135 million of questionable costs, and the American taxpayers have every right to know how and where their tax dollars are spent and particularly those tax dollars which are spent on providing our Armed Forces, men and women in uniform, with the necessary services they need.

This was compounded when in 2012 headlines showed that two former employees of this particular contractor, in a video, were drunk or under the influence of narcotics during parties that were allegedly thrown ''every other day'' at the contractor's operations center in Kabul. So to compound the problem, not only were the costs questioned, but also the character and behavior of the employees were something we certainly are not proud of.

All of this happened, as the video shows, while weapons were present. Bonfires were also lit, and employees would often throw live ammunition rounds and fire extinguishers into the flames.

Some might say: Well, OK, that is a one-off. That is an aberration. That surely doesn't happen all the time. There is a bad apple here, and there are a bunch of good apples in the barrel.

Yes, there are contractors that are providing services to our men and women who are doing it in a responsible and legal way, but the special inspector for Afghanistan has also found multiple examples of similar types of waste. In fact, since its creation, the special inspector for Afghanistan has undertaken 324 investigations—he is a busy man—and has accounted for over $571 million of misspent taxpayer dollars, and this is just in Afghanistan. As you know, we have operations around the world, and when we total everything, who knows what that final number will be.

I am pleased to report that while these numbers are disturbing, there is also progress being made. The special investigator for Afghanistan whom I have referred to has made over 200 recommendations for reforms and over 160 of those recommendations have been adopted by the Department of Defense in trying to help safeguard Federal dollars. So I don't want to leave the impression that something isn't being done about this. Nevertheless, it is important that we bring these things to light so that we can put procedures in place that will prevent them from happening again.

Also, I am pleased that title VIII of this bill we are now debating on this floor, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, directly addresses defense acquisition policy and management and would make several reforms to the contracting process. So action is being taken. For instance, the bill that calls for the Department of Defense to establish a preference for fixed-price contracts when developing new programs is a needed reform that is part of this legislation we are debating now. Entering into fixed-price contracts helps eliminate the kinds of questionable costs and cost overruns seen in many previous contracts.

We need to make sure, Congress needs to make sure, all of us need to make sure that our service men and women have the support they need to defend our Nation. That is why it is so frustrating when we hear about these instances of contractors that are supposed to be supporting our troops but instead are wasting money, whether intentionally or through error or through simply misbehavior.

So what we have done today is add another $571 million to our taxpayer savings gauge. As you can see, we are pushing toward the goal of $100 billion. We hope to go past that. There is no end of issues that need to be addressed so that we can tell the American people that we are running an efficient and effective shop in Congress and that we are being careful with their taxpayer dollars.

I look forward to returning to the floor next week for my next installment of the ''Waste of the Week.''

With that, I yield the floor.

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. COATS. 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. COATS. Mr. President, given the fact that no one has come to the floor, I wish to speak on another matter. I will do so, and when other Members come to the floor to speak, I will try to wrap up and save that time for them.

OBAMACARE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, last week I chaired a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee entitled ''Examining the Employment Effects of the Affordable Care Act.'' The purpose of the hearing was to discuss how the Affordable Care Act has affected the ability of Americans to earn and do business, particularly for small businessmen.

The impact of the Affordable Care Act—better known as ObamaCare—is particularly important to discuss at this point this year now that the delayed employer provisions are in effect and employers are feeling the pinch. Frankly, ''pinch'' is the wrong word; they are feeling the hammer blow of the burdens imposed on them, both from regulatory and a tax standpoint that are directly affecting their ability to grow, to provide jobs, and to expand their business.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the law, ObamaCare, will reduce the total number of hours worked by as much as 2 percent from the years 2017 to 2024.

People said: Two percent—is that a big deal?

Yes, it is a big deal. It is equal to 2.5 million full-time-equivalent jobs—for workers who are looking for those jobs.

The CBO reasoned that this would result from new taxes embedded throughout the ObamaCare program—not talked about when this was passed. In fact, nothing was talked about that was passed in terms of the way people could understand it, as acknowledged by the former head of the House of Representatives.

With new taxes and measures that employers will face and the financial benefits that some will be imposed, the CBO estimates a 1-percent reduction in total pay over the same timeframe as a result of ObamaCare.

This was something that was sold to the American people without credibility. All the promises that were made, some so defiantly made by the President. He said: Take my word for it, period, not one penny of increase in your premium cost. Keep your doctor. If you like your doctor, keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, keep your health care plan. What a misrepresentation of the bill this has been.

I have received many stories in my office, by email, by regular mail, by phone calls with descriptions of the impact this law has had and the broken promises that have imposed higher premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles, and higher costs for the American people. So we anxiously

await the decision of the Supreme Court, which will be coming in several weeks or less, to see where we go.

I want to take this opportunity to share just one story of one company and the head of that company and what that one small company—providing needed and good jobs for Hoosiers in my State—has had to endure under this particular law. I think this was expressed so well by the head of that company. His name is Dr. Joseph Sergio, president of the Sergio corporation.

He came before our committee, and we heard some of the most clear and defined discussion of the impact, the personal impact on families and workers of the ObamaCare act and what it has done to his small business, which I think is representative of millions of small businesses across the country.

Dr. Sergio is a first-generation American citizen whose family business was founded 36 years ago. His father was an Italian immigrant who came to America to realize the American dream, and he did. Dr. Sergio expanded his father's business, which includes First Response—a national award-winning disaster restoration company, involved in every major hurricane and storm disaster in recent history, with awards for their performance and how effectively and efficiently they brought response to people who needed it following these disasters—and Polar Clean—another company he has which is an environmentally friendly dry ice blast cleaning industrial service. We talk about going green. We talk about caring about our environment. This is a revolutionary way of cleaning any number of factories, businesses, energy companies, and so forth with a new environmentally friendly process.

Here is what Dr. Sergio said to me: ''As a small business, we have felt the profound imposition of the Affordable Care Act, or as it is known among many small business entrepreneurs, the Unaffordable Care Act.''

As a small business owner, Dr. Sergio said to be successful he needed to be able to accurately identify, forecast, and control expenses in order to create profits which would then be reinvested in his growing business. That means new jobs and new opportunity. That, he said, is where the frustration with ObamaCare begins.

Now, look, what Dr. Sergio outlined is economics 101. It is the first thing you learn in an economics class or the first thing your parents tell you: To be successful—and I wish this applied to the Federal Government—you have to control your costs, you have to identify and forecast what your expenses are going to be in the future and make sure you can cover those. And only when you make a profit—not just seeking neutrality here in the Federal Government—but only when you make a profit in the business can you grow that business and put more people back to work.

ObamaCare, Dr. Sergio said, has imposed a whole set of complications and regulations on small business owners that obscures their ability to do just that—to identify, forecast, and control expenses. This makes it difficult to determine profits that are needed to increase employee wages, expand research and development, and invest in new equipment. For a company working in disaster response, all of this is important. Of course, all of this is important for any company.

Dr. Sergio said his business has been forced to make major changes to meet the requirements imposed by ObamaCare. They had to drop their health care plan because it didn't meet the requirements of ObamaCare, even though it had been worked out between the employer and the employees and they were happy with their plan.

As a result, his employees and the company are paying more for an inferior policy. He said:

> Employees are now paying larger co-pays and larger deductibles. Some are opting to pay the penalty rather than absorb the high cost of ObamaCare.

This not only illustrates how ObamaCare affects businesses but how it directly affects families all across our Nation.

Small business owners are angry because ObamaCare promised to lower costs for the average family by $2,500. That was another broken promise from the White House. They said it would lower costs by an average of $2,500. Rather, ObamaCare now has increased the price of insurance and decreased the quality of affordable insurance.

In addition to the quality of insurance, the mandate has affected his company's growth, said Dr. Sergio. Small business owners have a limited amount of capital to spend on their labor pool—employees. The mandates of ObamaCare have pushed spending over to the benefits side. This limits the amount of day-to-day compensation increases a company can provide.

This is not only demoralizing to the employee but frustrating to the employer that is seeing capital going into an ObamaCare-compliant benefits plan that is not benefiting their employees as well as it used to. So all the touting of the magnificence of this ObamaCare helping people to have better insurance coverage without increasing their cost is a fraud. It has simply not turned out to be what it was promised to be, and it doesn't benefit his employees—small business employees—as well as the plans they had before, he said.

So this is Dr. Sergio's current dilemma. He has a history of providing a strong benefits package, paying up to 50 percent of insurance for employees and their dependents and now is unsure how he can keep it under the new law. He testified that surpassing 50 employees would now bring on more administrative costs and reporting requirements, causing him to purposely stay under the 50-employee threshold and utilize more part-time employees that work less than 30 hours per week.

We have heard story after story after story on this floor. I have an abundance of messages coming into my office simply saying I have no choice other than to put my full-time employees on a part-time basis. And I have no choice of adding new employees who take me over the 50-employee threshold because it puts me into all these regulations and impositions by ObamaCare. So it is having a dramatic negative effect on employment—on business growth—and that is where the jobs are. It is not the big companies as much as it is small companies in America, and they are being strangled over these regulations and taxes imposed and the regulations telling them what they have put together that their employees are happy with, that allow the employer to be profitable so they can continue to maintain these benefits and increase wages is simply out the window under ObamaCare.

Can we repair the damage of ObamaCare? Dr. Sergio closed his remarks with this request:

> Please work to undo the vast harms that ObamaCare has and is causing to the middle class and start addressing the essential issue of unleashing small businesses to create millions of new jobs which could raise most people from being at risk and into truly affordable plans.
>
> As a small business entrepreneur and job creator, I urge you to repeal ObamaCare, and allow for market innovation within the health industry, and allow for pooling across State lines, and allow small businesses freedom from oppressive requirements, new taxes and fees, and increased uncertainty.

I was moved by his testimony, and that is why I am standing here today, so I can put it in the RECORD. I was moved by his experience of how ObamaCare has impacted his business decisions in a negative way, how it has hurt his employees, the families of his employees, how it has restricted him from expanding his business, how it has caused him from going to a profitable business, where he could do more research, do more innovation, pay more, provide more benefits to his employees to a situation where he now has to reduce those benefits, where he has to sit down with his employees and say, I am sorry, under the requirements of this new act, this is where we are as a company. We can't continue to give you the benefits you once had. We can't raise your wages because we are not making the profits, and it is either go out of business or it is to try to struggle along under this new law, which is why he believes we need to change it.

I certainly agree with that, and I think this is backed by tens of millions of businesses all across America. We can all agree with the goal of ensuring access to quality care when it is needed. I don't think anyone on this floor has disputed that fact. Unfortunately, a one-size-fits-all government-run health care system is not the answer. We are looking for the best workable, real-world solution for Americans and their health care, and we have not hit that mark. This Congress has failed and this administration has failed to hit that mark.

We should pursue initiatives that truly make health care an option for all. Such initiatives should drive down costs by increasing competition and transparency, reforming medical malpractice, making health insurance portable, promoting pooling options for small businesses, and giving States greater flexibility in how they deliver their services.

Dr. Sergio should have better certainty for his business, and all small business people should have better certainty for their future. His employees should have a better health care system, as should all Americans. These are the goals we need to reach.

We should strive for a system that puts individuals squarely in charge of their health care and doesn't discourage Americans from working and improving their earnings. That is the American dream Dr. Sergio's father sought to achieve when he started his business 36 years ago. That is the dream we should pursue. Yet we are hampered in doing that by the onerous regulations, taxes, and stipulations imposed by the health care law passed by one party without any input from the opposing party, and famously labeled as something we would need to learn about after it was passed. That was probably the most telling statement by a Member of Congress—in this case the former majority leader and then-Speaker of the House of Representatives—about something that was shoved down America's throat without any bipartisan support whatsoever.

Now, yes, if it had been read before it was passed, we could have avoided all of this. It could have been debated and people could have looked for a bipartisan way of moving forward to provide health care for the uninsured and to ensure the health care plan they imposed would not have these negative effects. That is what should have happened. It didn't. We now have a chance to rectify that. We have a chance to remedy that. We are waiting for a Supreme Court decision before we go forward with an alternative to what has cost us in terms of jobs and all the costs to small businesses in terms of their ability to grow.

That is a part of the American dream. We have denied that under this health care program, and I am hoping my colleagues will join us as we look to address this very important issue—important not only for the health of the American public but important for the growth of our economy.

Mr. President, with that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. COATS. The Senator will be happy to do just that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

PROMOTING UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to talk about an amendment I have filed to the National Defense Authorization Act, amendment No. 1708.

This amendment would require the President to submit a comprehensive strategy within 120 days to promote U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region. This language or similar language was already placed in the House version of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

The amendment would assure that the U.S. Government is effectively marshaling resources and employing a whole-of-government approach to implement an effective, multifaceted engagement policy in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

This region will be vital to U.S. national interests for generations to come, and the administration's Asia pivot or rebalance policy was intended to reflect that. This is something the administration has talked about for years, this Asia rebalance or Asia pivot. But currently, the administration does not seem to have such a comprehensive strategy or approach that seamlessly incorporates U.S. military, diplomatic, and commercial activities to make the rebalance an effective policy.

In April of 2014, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee released a report stating that U.S. Government agencies ''have not substantially prioritized their resources to increase engagement in the Asia-Pacific region.'' In fact, if we look at U.S. foreign military assistance, I believe it ranks somewhere around 4 percent of spending. If we look at the Bureaus, this region we are addressing, hopefully through the Asia pivot and rebalance, receives about 1 percent or so of funding, depending on how we measure it. In fact, it is last among the Bureau funding.

Last month, at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter announced a new initiative that envisions a boost in U.S. military assistance over the next 5 years to enhance maritime security efforts with Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Thailand. This effort is a welcomed step forward but alone is not enough.

These initiatives cannot take place in a vacuum. Department of Defense efforts need to be more effectively wedded with other efforts of U.S. Government agencies into a coherent and comprehensive strategy of assistance and engagement in the region. In light of the shared threats in the region, this lack of a comprehensive policy sends the wrong message to our allies throughout the region.

The amendment will ensure that Congress is a genuine partner to the administration's effort to implement this important effort. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

One of the challenges we have seen going forward, of course, in the Asia-Pacific region is—as we talk about Asia balance, as we talk about a pivot—our day-to-day attention seems to be more and more drawn to the Middle East, rightly so. But our long-term interests lie in Asia and these regions that we are trying to negotiate a Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement with. Hopefully, the House will pass trade promotion authority later this week, and we can begin to work in earnest on ideas that represent our commitment through the Asia pivot or Asia rebalance.

I am concerned that we have talked a lot of good talk and we have put together some fancy rhetoric and put a pretty good label on our foreign policy efforts as it relates to the Asia Pacific, but what we haven't done is actually followed through. While I commend Secretary Carter for his efforts and commitment, we can't just stop there. We must make sure we are doing everything we can to grow our opportunities in this region through an Asia pivot or Asia rebalance that truly does need reenergizing.

One of the best ways to help a rising China truly become a great nation is to make sure it is abiding by the norms and standards of acceptable international behavior. We have talked before about the challenges we have—from violations of intellectual property rights and cyber theft. In fact, five PLA officers have been indicted. President Obama has put forward an Executive order listing possible sanctions on cyber threats. We know that if we can start avoiding these kinds of bad behaviors when we start engaging Asia and our neighbors and friends throughout the region, the region we will be dealing with through the Trans-Pacific Partnership—it is my hope we can truly bring this amendment through the National Defense Authorization Act to bring coherence and clarity to the rebalance strategy we have talked about but so far have not been the best in our execution.

COLORADO'S WESTERN SLOPE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to talk a little bit about what is happening on Colorado's Western Slope this morning.

Several weeks ago, a judge in Denver, CO, ruled that a permit was improperly given to a mine known as the Colowyo mine on the Western Slope in Northwestern Colorado. This lawsuit was brought, I think, some 8 years after this permit was granted. Mine employees number around 220 people on Colorado's Western Slope. It is critical to the region's economy, and it is critical to the economy of Craig, CO. Without these employees and without this mine, it will truly be an economically devastating moment in Western Slope history.

So I hope the Department of the Interior will pay attention to the multiple

letters they have received from our colleague Senator BENNET, from Governor Hickenlooper of Colorado, who have urged this to be taken seriously, to be reconsidered and appealed. It would be economically devastating for these communities to lose 220 jobs. I certainly hope the administration is paying the serious attention to this matter that it deserves.

Mr. President, 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we will begin today, and hopefully, with the agreement of my friend from Rhode Island, we will have some amendments, voice votes, and recorded votes today. My colleagues can look forward to it. Also, those who wish to come to the floor to propose amendments, we are still looking at, hopefully, an agreement that the amendments will be closed out by this evening.

Mr. REED. We are fine with that.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words here about the fact that apparently President Obama is now going to send hundreds more troops to Iraq. ''The President plans to deploy hundreds,'' according to the media reports, ''more American troops to western Anbar Province, POLITICO has learned, to step up training for Iraqi troops who'll be charged with retaking the city of Ramadi and other ground lost to ISIL.''

However, American troops still will not go into combat with Iraqi units, to help fight ISIL directly or to call for airstrikes. And defense officials continue to worry about Iraqis' end of the bargain—whether Baghdad can send enough recruits to take advantage of a widened American training pipeline. One U.S. training center, at Al Assad Air Base in western Anbar, hasn't had any Iraqi recruits to train for months.

We are going to send 400 more people, maybe, to staff up their headquarters. I don't know, but when we have a situation where 75 percent of the air combat missions over Iraq and Syria return—75 percent of them—without dropping a weapon, it is so reminiscent of another war at another time many years ago where, under then-Secretary of Defense McNamara, this same kind of strategy prevailed.

I would remind my colleagues of the various statements that have been made by President Obama and others.

January 27, 2014: ''Obama Likens ISIS to 'J.V. Team.' ''

On August 7, 2014, Mr. Obama said that ''the United States had no intention of 'being the Iraqi air force.' ''

September 10, 2014:

President Obama authorized a major expansion of the campaign against the Islamic State, saying the United States was recruiting a global coalition to ''degrade and ultimately destroy'' the militants.

Unfortunately, there is still—the President said I believe the day before yesterday that ''we do not yet have a complete strategy'' for fighting the Islamic State and that thousands of new fighters were replenishing the ranks of the militant group faster than the coalition could remove them from the fight.

In other words, we are losing.

I would remind my colleagues of the news items today. The Wall Street Journal: ''U.S. Strategy in Lebanon Stirs Fears.''

Critics say Washington's funding cut for a program in Lebanon to develop alternative Shiite political voices to Hezbollah is an effort to appease Iran.

''China military says conducted drills near Taiwan, Philippines.''

Chinese warships and aircraft on Wednesday passed through Bashi Channel between Taiwan and the Philippines to hold routine planned exercises in the Western Pacific.

The Hill: ''U.S. training base in Iraq hasn't seen a new recruit in weeks.''

The U.S. mission in Iraq has stalled at one of the five coalition training sites because the central government has not been sending new recruits, according to defense officials.

There is an interesting one in the Wall Street Journal: ''Iraqi City of Mosul Transformed a Year After Islamic State Capture.''

I remind my colleagues of the many statements made by American officials as well as Iraqis that they were going to retake the city of Mosul very quickly.

In Islamic State's stronghold of Mosul, the extremist group is working day and night to repair roads, manicure gardens and refurbish hotels. Iraq's second-largest city has never looked so good thanks to strict laws enforced by the Sunni militants. But beneath that veneer, the group metes out deadly punishments to those who don't comply with a long list of prohibitions imposed over the year since it took control of Mosul on June 10, 2014, according to interviews with more than a dozen current and former city. . . . officials.

Mosul is still almost fully inhabited—a contrast to cities where Iraqi and coalition forces have pushed the Islamic State out.

Doctors, judges, and professors who defied or questioned Islamic State laws have been executed, sometimes by public stoning or crucifixion. Prisons are filled with people awaiting their sentences from the Islamic court.

''Nearly no one gets out alive,'' one of the residents said.

Then came the attacks on minorities.

''There are many things we do not consider Islamic at all, like the way Christians were treated,'' said a female doctor from Mosul who is pious and veiled.

''All of Mosul does not accept what has happened to the Christians,'' said the woman, who lives in the northern city of Kirkuk. The group's attack on minorities ''was a major mistake that cost them our support.''

''Suicide bomber attacks tourist site in Luxor, four Egyptians wounded.''

''China military conducts drills near Taiwan, Philippines.''

''Al-Qaida militants in Libya attack IS after leader killed.''

''China exports repression beyond its borders.''

''Foreign Policy: Airstrikes Killing Thousands of Islamic State Fighters, but It Just Recruits More.''

''The strength of ISIS continues to grow, so they're getting more in from recruits than they are losing through casualties,'' said Rick Brennan, a former U.S. Army infantry officer who was a civilian adviser to the U.S. military in Iraq. . . . Brennan, now a senior political scientist at the Rand Corp., said he was basing his opinion on intelligence estimates that have been made public.

So the bragging about killing 10,000 ISIS—they forgot to mention that there are more coming in than they are killing—also reminiscent of the days of the Vietnam war where body counts seemed to be the criteria.

''Islamic State keeps firm grip one year after Mosul's fall.''

Weak Iraqi forces no closer to reclaiming strategic city.

The New York Times: ''ISIS Stages Attacks in Iraq and Libya, Despite U.S. Airstrikes.''

Islamic State militants staged attacks near Baghdad and the Libyan city of Surt on Tuesday, underscoring the group's persistent strength on both fronts despite a monthlong American-led air campaign against it in Syria and Iraq.

The Wall Street Journal: ''U.S. Prepares Plan to Send Hundreds More Trainers to Iraq,'' as I talked about.

The Associated Press: ''State Dep't spokesman: Saving Iraq could take 3–5 years.''

Naturally, there is no mention of Syria.

By the way, they said that they were developing if not a complete strategy—I would like to know the incomplete part of it. I would like to know what strategy there is of any kind.

The Wall Street Journal: ''Iraqi City of Mosul Transformed a Year After Islamic State Capture.''

I mentioned before that ISIS stage attacks in Iraq and Libya despite U.S. airstrikes.

It goes on and on. Meanwhile, the President of the United States will, according to the media reports, announce today that we will send 400 or so more to Iraq, none of which is accompanied by a strategy, none of which is accompanied by forward air controllers, so we will continue to see 75 percent of the combat missions flown return to base without having discharged their weapons since we have no one on the ground to identify targets. This is incrementalism at its best or worst, depending on how you would describe it.

Today, I hope we will be able to take some additional amendments. We have a managers' package getting prepared,

and I believe Senator REED and I are moving forward with some amendments we can have debated and also voted on today.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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 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, to 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.

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.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

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.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to ensure criminal background checks of employees of the military child care system and providers of child care services and youth program services for military dependents.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

Burr/McCain amendment No. 1921 (to amendment No. 1569), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. 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.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I was first going to offer an amendment, but both the chairman and ranking member of the committee suggested that I wait until after they have had a chance to review some of the technical details. So I will speak on an amendment that I will in all probability offer at a later time.

My amendment really goes to how we make sure we help our troops with the many stresses that are in their lives. My goal is to add money to funding our commissaries. This amendment, which I will offer at a later time, restores $322 million in cuts to commissaries proposed by the Department of Defense. It would authorize $1.4 billion in funding—the same level that is in the House National Defense Authorization Act and in the House Defense appropriations bill. It offsets the $322 million for commissaries by reducing the Pentagon's budget in failed policies to buy spare parts. They have a lot of waste there, and we think we can find the $322 million we need there, and that is the technical issue we need to work, also known as the offset. But what is not technical is the fact that we have to make sure our commissaries function at their current level.

Commissaries represent one of the most significant and lasting benefits for military members and their families. Commissaries have been around since 1826, giving military families the ability to shop at a network of stores. The commissary system is simple. If you are Active Duty, Reserve, National Guard, or a retired member of the family, you have access to 246 commissaries worldwide. They are particularly important to many of our troops overseas, and they give military families affordable access to healthy foods.

The benefits of commissaries are significant. They feed those people who are actually members of our military. They help military families stretch their budgets, and they also help provide jobs to family members in the military who work in those commissaries.

Our distinguished colleagues on the authorizing committee, Senator MCCAIN and Senator JACK REED, are themselves military men. Senator MCCAIN is a graduate of the Naval Academy and Senator JACK REED graduated from West Point. They know that one of the big expenditures right now for our military is rising health costs. The military itself is looking at how to make sure they keep our troops healthy not only while they are doing their job but also how to keep them healthy so that when they move on, they will be in excellent shape. The commissaries do those kinds of things. They provide what grocery stores provide—fresh fruits and vegetables. They provide healthy foods.

Also, for example, my own commissary at Fort Meade, which is part of the Healthy Base Initiative, has shown people how to stretch their dollar more so they can get more for their family budget and also has actual recommendations on how to add nutrition—save money and add nutrition. If we want to bend the health care cost curve, while we are looking at important medical research, research shows that good food leads to good health.

The other thing is this: Military members get a significant savings from commissaries. The average savings is about 30 percent on a grocery bill. For a family of four, that comes to over $4,000 a year. Everyone knows how much military families are stretched, and for our men and women who are enlisted, this is a really big deal. We need to make this available for them.

What many people don't realize is that the commissaries not only create jobs, but 60 percent of commissary workers are spouses of men who serve in the military. About 100,000 jobs are supported through commissaries. The other thing the DOD wants to do is cut their hours. Well, if they cut their hours, that does cut jobs, but it also cuts opportunity.

When you are in the military, you work around the clock. You are not on the clock; you work around the clock. So if you are a military police officer, you could be getting off of duty late at night. If you are someone who repairs our helicopters or airplanes, you could be getting off at night.

The commissary at Fort Meade serves agencies such as the National Security Agency. They essentially work a 36-hour day. They work around the clock, 24 hours a day. Our commissary isn't open 24 hours a day, but I can tell you it can't be open from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and still meet the needs of our military workforce.

The Department of Defense wants to make the commissaries more self-sustaining, and we don't argue with that. We can always find efficiencies and look at new ways to do things. But don't cut $322 million and further cut it close to $1 billion over the next 4 years.

What we want to do is make sure our military families have what they need. First of all, we want them to have good food. We want them to be able to go to these commissaries at hours that work for military families. We also want to look at the long-range effects of bending the health care curve.

I am going to come back to the commissary at Fort Meade. I am very proud of the fact that Fort Meade is what we call a compassionate post. That means if you are in the U.S. Army and you have a special needs child, one of the highly desirable places to be based is at Fort Meade. Why? Because Anne Arundel County has one of

the best programs for special education in the State and in the country. You also have access to Kennedy Krieger, which is one of the internationally iconic agencies that address the needs of children with not only special needs but multiple special needs.

We are very happy that Fort Meade is in Maryland and that it is known as a compassionate post. But think of those families who have a child with cerebral palsy or multiple complications that might even require the child to constantly need a respirator. All of these things go on along with the stress of being a military family. We can certainly keep the commissaries open so that they can get the food they need for their families and have the commissaries open during the hours that work for them. This is what real life in the military is.

After Desert Storm, I remember when the Appropriations Committee met under the leadership of Senator Byrd and Senator Ted Steven. They asked General Schwarzkopf what he needed in an after-action report. He said: We need better intelligence. And we worked really hard to upgrade to where we are. He also said: We need better food. We need better food for our troops, and people need to believe their families are being taken care of while they are in harm's way.

We ask a lot from our military, and our military families are now asking us: Don't cut the commissaries. Keep them open. Keep them affordable. Keep them available. Once we clarify the technicalities of the offset, which is required, I will come back and offer my amendment, which I hope will pass the Senate with a 100-to-0 vote.

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. CORNYN. 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. 1569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I modify my amendment No. 1569 by accepting the second-degree amendment No. 1921, offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

TITLE XVII—CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING

SECTION 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015''.

SEC. 1702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term ''antitrust laws''—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12);

(B) includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that section 5 of that Act applies to unfair methods of competition; and

(C) includes any State law that has the same intent and effect as the laws under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The term ''appropriate Federal entities'' means the following:

(A) The Department of Commerce.

(B) The Department of Defense.

(C) The Department of Energy.

(D) The Department of Homeland Security.

(E) The Department of Justice.

(F) The Department of the Treasury.

(G) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(4) CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.—The term ''cybersecurity purpose'' means the purpose of protecting an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system from a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(5) CYBERSECURITY THREAT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''cybersecurity threat'' means an action, not protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, on or through an information system that may result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, availability, confidentiality, or integrity of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''cybersecurity threat'' does not include any action that solely involves a violation of a consumer term of service or a consumer licensing agreement.

(6) CYBER THREAT INDICATOR.—The term ''cyber threat indicator'' means information that is necessary to describe or identify—

(A) malicious reconnaissance, including anomalous patterns of communications that appear to be transmitted for the purpose of gathering technical information related to a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability;

(B) a method of defeating a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(C) a security vulnerability, including anomalous activity that appears to indicate the existence of a security vulnerability;

(D) a method of causing a user with legitimate access to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system to unwittingly enable the defeat of a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(E) malicious cyber command and control;

(F) the actual or potential harm caused by an incident, including a description of the information exfiltrated as a result of a particular cybersecurity threat;

(G) any other attribute of a cybersecurity threat, if disclosure of such attribute is not otherwise prohibited by law; or

(H) any combination thereof.

(7) DEFENSIVE MEASURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''defensive measure'' means an action, device, procedure, signature, technique, or other measure applied to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system that detects, prevents, or mitigates a known or suspected cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''defensive measure'' does not include a measure that destroys, renders unusable, or substantially harms an information system or data on an information system not belonging to—

(i) the private entity operating the measure; or

(ii) another entity or Federal entity that is authorized to provide consent and has provided consent to that private entity for operation of such measure.

(8) ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term ''entity'' means any private entity, non-Federal government agency or department, or State, tribal, or local government (including a political subdivision, department, or component thereof).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''entity'' includes a government agency or department of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term ''entity'' does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(9) FEDERAL ENTITY.—The term ''Federal entity'' means a department or agency of the United States or any component of such department or agency.

(10) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term ''information system''—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) includes industrial control systems, such as supervisory control and data acquisition systems, distributed control systems, and programmable logic controllers.

(11) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ''local government'' means any borough, city, county, parish, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of a State.

(12) MALICIOUS CYBER COMMAND AND CONTROL.—The term ''malicious cyber command and control'' means a method for unauthorized remote identification of, access to, or use of, an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(13) MALICIOUS RECONNAISSANCE.—The term ''malicious reconnaissance'' means a method for actively probing or passively monitoring an information system for the purpose of discerning security vulnerabilities of the information system, if such method is associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity threat.

(14) MONITOR.—The term ''monitor'' means to acquire, identify, or scan, or to possess, information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(15) PRIVATE ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term ''private entity'' means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''private entity'' includes a State, tribal, or local government performing electric utility services.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term ''private entity'' does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(16) SECURITY CONTROL.—The term ''security control'' means the management, operational, and technical controls used to protect against an unauthorized effort to adversely affect the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of an information system or its information.

(17) SECURITY VULNERABILITY.—The term ''security vulnerability'' means any attribute of hardware, software, process, or procedure that could enable or facilitate the defeat of a security control.

(18) TRIBAL.—The term ''tribal'' has the meaning given the term ''Indian tribe'' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 1703. SHARING OF INFORMATION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the protection of classified information, intelligence sources and methods, and privacy and civil liberties, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and promulgate procedures to facilitate and promote—

(1) the timely sharing of classified cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government with cleared representatives of relevant entities;

(2) the timely sharing with relevant entities of cyber threat indicators or information in the possession of the Federal Government that may be declassified and shared at an unclassified level;

(3) the sharing with relevant entities, or the public if appropriate, of unclassified, including controlled unclassified, cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government; and

(4) the sharing with entities, if appropriate, of information in the possession of the Federal Government about cybersecurity threats to such entities to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from such cybersecurity threats.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The procedures developed and promulgated under subsection (a) shall—

(A) ensure the Federal Government has and maintains the capability to share cyber threat indicators in real time consistent with the protection of classified information;

(B) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, existing processes and existing roles and responsibilities of Federal and non-Federal entities for information sharing by the Federal Government, including sector specific information sharing and analysis centers;

(C) include procedures for notifying entities that have received a cyber threat indicator from a Federal entity under this title that is known or determined to be in error or in contravention of the requirements of this title or another provision of Federal law or policy of such error or contravention;

(D) include requirements for Federal entities receiving cyber threat indicators or defensive measures to implement and utilize security controls to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators or defensive measures; and

(E) include procedures that require a Federal entity, prior to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator—

(i) to review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that such Federal entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(ii) to implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(2) COORDINATION.—In developing the procedures required under this section, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General shall coordinate with appropriate Federal entities, including the National Laboratories (as defined in section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)), to ensure that effective protocols are implemented that will facilitate and promote the sharing of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government in a timely manner.

(c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall submit to Congress the procedures required by subsection (a).

SEC. 1704. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PREVENTING, DETECTING, ANALYZING, AND MITIGATING CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR MONITORING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, monitor—

(A) an information system of such private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity, upon the authorization and written consent of such other entity;

(C) an information system of a Federal entity, upon the authorization and written consent of an authorized representative of the Federal entity; and

(D) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system monitored by the private entity under this paragraph.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the monitoring of an information system, or the use of any information obtained through such monitoring, other than as provided in this title; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR OPERATION OF DEFENSIVE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, operate a defensive measure that is applied to—

(A) an information system of such private entity in order to protect the rights or property of the private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity upon written consent of such entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of such entity; and

(C) an information system of a Federal entity upon written consent of an authorized representative of such Federal entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of the Federal Government.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the use of a defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(c) AUTHORIZATION FOR SHARING OR RECEIVING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS OR DEFENSIVE MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this title and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) LAWFUL RESTRICTION.—An entity receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure from another entity or Federal entity shall comply with otherwise lawful restrictions placed on the sharing or use of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure by the sharing entity or Federal entity.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the sharing or receiving of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(d) PROTECTION AND USE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) SECURITY OF INFORMATION.—An entity monitoring an information system, operating a defensive measure, or providing or receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this section shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION.—An entity sharing a cyber threat indicator pursuant to this title shall, prior to such sharing—

(A) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(3) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY ENTITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with this title, a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared or received under this section may, for cybersecurity purposes—

(i) be used by an entity to monitor or operate a defensive measure on—

(I) an information system of the entity; or

(II) an information system of another entity or a Federal entity upon the written consent of that other entity or that Federal entity; and

(ii) be otherwise used, retained, and further shared by an entity subject to—

(I) an otherwise lawful restriction placed by the sharing entity or Federal entity on such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure; or

(II) an otherwise applicable provision of law.

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the use of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this section.

(4) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS BY STATE, TRIBAL, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT USE.—

(i) PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section may, with the prior written consent of the entity sharing such indicator, be used by a State, tribal, or local government for the purpose of preventing, investigating, or prosecuting any of the offenses described in section 1705(d)(5)(A)(vi).

(ii) ORAL CONSENT.—If exigent circumstances prevent obtaining written consent under clause (i), such consent may be provided orally with subsequent documentation of the consent.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—A cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section shall be—

(i) deemed voluntarily shared information; and

(ii) exempt from disclosure under any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(C) STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this title shall not be directly used by any State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activity of any entity, including an activity relating to monitoring, operating a defensive measure, or sharing of a cyber threat indicator.

(ii) REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measures shared as described in clause (i) may, consistent with a State, tribal, or local government regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of a regulation relating to such information systems.

(e) ANTITRUST EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 1708(e), it shall not be considered a violation of any provision of antitrust laws for 2 or more private entities to exchange or provide a cyber threat indicator, or assistance relating to the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat, for cybersecurity purposes under this title.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to information that is exchanged or assistance provided in order to assist with—

(A) facilitating the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; or

(B) communicating or disclosing a cyber threat indicator to help prevent, investigate, or mitigate the effect of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(f) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The sharing of a cyber threat indicator with an entity under this title shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such entity or any other entity.

SEC. 1705. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) INTERIM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and submit to Congress interim policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

(2) FINAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, promulgate final policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

(3) REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Consistent with the guidelines required by subsection (b), the policies and procedures developed and promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure that cyber threat indicators are shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 1704(c) through the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared in an automated manner with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any delay, modification, or any other action that could impede real-time receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(B) ensure that cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 1704 in a manner other than the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared as quickly as operationally practicable with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any unnecessary delay, interference, or any other action that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(C) consistent with this title, any other applicable provisions of law, and the fair information practice principles set forth in appendix A of the document entitled ''National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace'' and published by the President in April 2011, govern the retention, use, and dissemination by the Federal Government of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the extent, if any, to which such cyber threat indicators may be used by the Federal Government; and

(D) ensure there is—

(i) an audit capability; and

(ii) appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of a Federal entity who knowingly and willfully conduct activities under this title in an unauthorized manner.

(4) GUIDELINES FOR ENTITIES SHARING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall develop and make publicly available guidance to assist entities and promote sharing of cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this title.

(B) CONTENTS.—The guidelines developed and made publicly available under subparagraph (A) shall include guidance on the following:

(i) Identification of types of information that would qualify as a cyber threat indicator under this title that would be unlikely to include personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cyber security threat.

(ii) Identification of types of information protected under otherwise applicable privacy laws that are unlikely to be directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(iii) Such other matters as the Attorney General considers appropriate for entities sharing cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this title.

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) GUIDELINES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1), develop, submit to Congress, and make available to the public interim guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this title.

(2) FINAL GUIDELINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1) and such private entities with industry expertise as the Attorney General considers relevant, promulgate final guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this title.

(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers and private entities described in subparagraph (A), periodically review the guidelines promulgated under subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government under this title;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process for the timely destruction of such information that is known not to be directly related to uses authorized under this title; and

(ii) specific limitations on the length of any period in which a cyber threat indicator may be retained;

(C) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition, including appropriate sanctions for activities by officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government in contravention of such guidelines;

(D) include procedures for notifying entities and Federal entities if information received pursuant to this section is known or determined by a Federal entity receiving such information not to constitute a cyber threat indicator;

(E) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons to the greatest extent practicable and require recipients to be informed that such indicators may only be used for purposes authorized under this title; and

(F) include steps that may be needed so that dissemination of cyber threat indicators is consistent with the protection of classified and other sensitive national security information.

(c) CAPABILITY AND PROCESS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and implement a capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security that—

(A) shall accept from any entity in real time cyber threat indicators and defensive measures, pursuant to this section;

(B) shall, upon submittal of the certification under paragraph (2) that such capability and process fully and effectively operates as described in such paragraph, be the process by which the Federal Government receives cyber threat indicators and defensive measures under this title that are shared by a private entity with the Federal Government through electronic mail or media, an interactive form on an Internet website, or a real time, automated process between information systems except—

(i) communications between a Federal entity and a private entity regarding a previously shared cyber threat indicator; and

(ii) communications by a regulated entity with such entity's Federal regulatory authority regarding a cybersecurity threat;

(C) ensures that all of the appropriate Federal entities receive in an automated manner such cyber threat indicators shared through the real-time process within the Department of Homeland Security;

(D) is in compliance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by this section; and

(E) does not limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including—

(i) reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or a Federal entity;

(ii) voluntary or legally compelled participation in a Federal investigation; and

(iii) providing cyber threat indicators or defensive measures as part of a statutory or authorized contractual requirement.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 10 days prior to the implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, certify to Congress whether such capability and process fully and effectively operates—

(A) as the process by which the Federal Government receives from any entity a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this title; and

(B) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines developed under this section.

(3) PUBLIC NOTICE AND ACCESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure there is public notice of, and access to, the capability and process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) so that—

(A) any entity may share cyber threat indicators and defensive measures through such process with the Federal Government; and

(B) all of the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators and defensive measures in real time with receipt through the process within the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) shall ensure that other Federal entities receive in a timely manner any cyber threat indicators and defensive measures shared with the Federal Government through such process.

(5) REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report on the development and implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), including a description of such capability and process and the public notice of, and access to, such process.

(B) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) INFORMATION SHARED WITH OR PROVIDED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) NO WAIVER OF PRIVILEGE OR PROTECTION.—The provision of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures to the Federal Government under this title shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection provided by law, including trade secret protection.

(2) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Consistent with section 1704(c)(2), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided by an entity to the Federal Government under this title shall be considered the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of such entity when so designated by the originating entity or a third party acting in accordance with the written authorization of the originating entity.

(3) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall be—

(A) deemed voluntarily shared information and exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records; and

(B) withheld, without discretion, from the public under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(4) EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.—The provision of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to the Federal Government under this title shall not be subject to a rule of any Federal agency or department or any judicial doctrine regarding ex parte communications with a decisionmaking official.

(5) DISCLOSURE, RETENTION, AND USE.—

(A) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title may be disclosed to, retained by, and used by, consistent with otherwise applicable provisions of Federal law, any Federal agency or department, component, officer, employee, or agent of the Federal Government solely for—

(i) a cybersecurity purpose;

(ii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat, including the source of such cybersecurity threat, or a security vulnerability;

(iii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat involving the use of an information system by a foreign adversary or terrorist;

(iv) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, an imminent threat of death, serious bodily harm, or serious economic harm, including a terrorist act or a use of a weapon of mass destruction;

(v) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, a serious threat to a minor, including sexual exploitation and threats to physical safety; or

(vi) the purpose of preventing, investigating, disrupting, or prosecuting an offense arising out of a threat described in clause (iv) or any of the offenses listed in—

(I) section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18, United States Code (relating to serious violent felonies);

(II) sections 1028 through 1030 of such title (relating to fraud and identity theft);

(III) chapter 37 of such title (relating to espionage and censorship); and

(IV) chapter 90 of such title (relating to protection of trade secrets).

(B) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall not be disclosed to, retained by, or used by any Federal agency or department for any use not permitted under subparagraph (A).

(C) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall be retained, used, and disseminated by the Federal Government—

(i) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by subsections (a) and (b);

(ii) in a manner that protects from unauthorized use or disclosure any cyber threat indicators that may contain personal information of or identifying specific persons; and

(iii) in a manner that protects the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying a specific person.

(D) FEDERAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title shall not be directly used by any Federal, State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activities of any entity, including activities relating to monitoring, operating defensive measures, or sharing cyber threat indicators.

(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—

(I) REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.—Cyber threat indicators and defensive measures provided to the Federal Government under this title may, consistent with Federal or State regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of regulations relating to such information systems.

(II) PROCEDURES DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED UNDER THIS TITLE.—Clause (i) shall not apply to procedures developed and implemented under this title.

SEC. 1706. PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.

(a) MONITORING OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any private entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the monitoring of information systems and information under section 1704(a) that is conducted in accordance with this title.

(b) SHARING OR RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the sharing or receipt of cyber threat indicators or defensive measures under section 1704(c) if—

(1) such sharing or receipt is conducted in accordance with this title; and

(2) in a case in which a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure is shared with the Federal Government, the cyber threat indicator or defensive measure is shared in a manner that is consistent with section 1705(c)(1)(B) and the sharing or receipt, as the case may be, occurs after the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the interim policies and procedures are submitted to Congress under section 1705(a)(1); or

(B) the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to require dismissal of a cause of action against an entity that has engaged in gross negligence or willful misconduct in the course of conducting activities authorized by this title; or

(2) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

SEC. 1707. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) BIENNIAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this title, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the heads of the appropriate Federal entities shall jointly submit and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, shall jointly submit to Congress a

detailed report concerning the implementation of this title.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by section 1705 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators are shared effectively and responsibly within the Federal Government.

(B) An evaluation of the effectiveness of real-time information sharing through the capability and process developed under section 1705(c), including any impediments to such real-time sharing.

(C) An assessment of the sufficiency of the procedures developed under section 1703 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government are shared in a timely and adequate manner with appropriate entities, or, if appropriate, are made publicly available.

(D) An assessment of whether cyber threat indicators have been properly classified and an accounting of the number of security clearances authorized by the Federal Government for the purposes of this title.

(E) A review of the type of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the following:

(i) The degree to which such information may impact the privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(ii) A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the impact of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(iii) The adequacy of any steps taken by the Federal Government to reduce such impact.

(F) A review of actions taken by the Federal Government based on cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this title, including the appropriateness of any subsequent use or dissemination of such cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity under section 1705.

(G) A description of any significant violations of the requirements of this title by the Federal Government.

(H) A summary of the number and type of entities that received classified cyber threat indicators from the Federal Government under this title and an evaluation of the risks and benefits of sharing such cyber threat indicators.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) may include recommendations for improvements or modifications to the authorities and processes under this title.

(4) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) REPORTS ON PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORT FROM PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this title and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall submit to Congress and the President a report providing—

(A) an assessment of the effect on privacy and civil liberties by the type of activities carried out under this title; and

(B) an assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines established pursuant to section 1705 in addressing concerns relating to privacy and civil liberties.

(2) BIENNIAL REPORT OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this title and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy shall, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, jointly submit to Congress a report on the receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures that have been shared with Federal entities under this title.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A review of the types of cyber threat indicators shared with Federal entities.

(ii) A review of the actions taken by Federal entities as a result of the receipt of such cyber threat indicators.

(iii) A list of Federal entities receiving such cyber threat indicators.

(iv) A review of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators among Federal entities to identify inappropriate barriers to sharing information.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report submitted under this subsection may include such recommendations as the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1), or the Inspectors General referred to in paragraph (2)(A), with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (2), may have for improvements or modifications to the authorities under this title.

(4) FORM.—Each report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1708. CONSTRUCTION AND PREEMPTION.

(a) OTHERWISE LAWFUL DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or the Federal Government under this title; or

(2) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful use of such disclosures by any Federal entity, even when such otherwise lawful disclosures duplicate or replicate disclosures made under this title.

(b) WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit or limit the disclosure of information protected under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats), section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress), section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military), section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) (governing disclosure by employees of elements of the intelligence community), or any similar provision of Federal or State law.

(c) PROTECTION OF SOURCES AND METHODS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) as creating any immunity against, or otherwise affecting, any action brought by the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to enforce any law, executive order, or procedure governing the appropriate handling, disclosure, or use of classified information;

(2) to affect the conduct of authorized law enforcement or intelligence activities; or

(3) to modify the authority of a department or agency of the Federal Government to protect classified information and sources and methods and the national security of the United States.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect any requirement under any other provision of law for an entity to provide information to the Federal Government.

(e) PROHIBITED CONDUCT.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to permit price-fixing, allocating a market between competitors, monopolizing or attempting to monopolize a market, boycotting, or exchanges of price or cost information, customer lists, or information regarding future competitive planning.

(f) INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

(2) to prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

(3) to require a new information sharing relationship between any entity and the Federal Government; or

(4) to require the use of the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security developed under section 1705(c).

(g) PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any entities, or between any entity and a Federal entity; or

(2) to abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any entity or Federal entity.

(h) ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to permit the Federal Government—

(1) to require an entity to provide information to the Federal Government;

(2) to condition the sharing of cyber threat indicators with an entity on such entity's provision of cyber threat indicators to the Federal Government; or

(3) to condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the provision of a cyber threat indicator to a Federal entity.

(i) NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to subject any entity to liability for choosing not to engage in the voluntary activities authorized in this title.

(j) USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use any information shared under this title for any use other than permitted in this title.

(k) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title supersedes any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under this title.

(2) STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State concerning the use of authorized law enforcement practices and procedures.

(l) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to authorize the promulgation of any regulations not specifically authorized by this title;

(2) to establish or limit any regulatory authority not specifically established or limited under this title; or

(3) to authorize regulatory actions that would duplicate or conflict with regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or related processes under another provision of Federal law.

(m) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO RESPOND TO CYBER ATTACKS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, or, when authorized by the President to do so, conduct a military cyber operation in response to a malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign government or an organization sponsored by a foreign government or a terrorist organization.

SEC. 1709. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate elements of the intelligence community, shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the current intelligence sharing and cooperation relationships of the United States with other countries regarding cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches, directed against the United States and which threaten the United States national security interests and economy and intellectual property, specifically identifying the relative utility of such relationships, which elements of the intelligence community participate in such relationships, and whether and how such relationships could be improved.

(2) A list and an assessment of the countries and nonstate actors that are the primary threats of carrying out a cybersecurity threat, including a cyber attack, theft, or data breach, against the United States and which threaten the United States national security, economy, and intellectual property.

(3) A description of the extent to which the capabilities of the United States Government to respond to or prevent cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, or data breaches, directed against the United States private sector are degraded by a delay in the prompt notification by private entities of such threats or cyber attacks, theft, and breaches.

(4) An assessment of additional technologies or capabilities that would enhance the ability of the United States to prevent and to respond to cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(5) An assessment of any technologies or practices utilized by the private sector that could be rapidly fielded to assist the intelligence community in preventing and responding to cybersecurity threats.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available in classified and unclassified forms.

(d) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 1710. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—Section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking ''wells.'' and inserting ''wells; or''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) information shared with or provided to the Federal Government pursuant to the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING PENETRATIONS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTOR NETWORKS.—Section 941(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is amended by inserting at the end the following: ''The Secretary may share such information with other Federal entities if such information consists of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures and such information is shared consistent with the policies and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General under section 1705 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 1711. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM AND PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS.

(a) EMPLOYEES OF MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM.—Section 1792 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—The criminal background check of child care employees under this section that is required pursuant to section 231 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13041) shall be conducted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f).''.

(b) PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES.—Section 1798 of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A provider of child care services or youth program services may not provide such services under this section unless such provider complies with the requirements for criminal background checks under section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f) for the State in which such services are provided.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Amounts for activities required by reason of the amendments made by this section during fiscal year 2016 shall be derived from amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program as specified in the funding tables in section 4301.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 1921 is rendered moot.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, turning to the underlying legislation that we are debating, the Defense authorization bill, I can't think of anything more basic or fundamental to the Federal Government's responsibility than national security and defense and to make sure we provide our men and women in uniform with the resources they need in order to do the job they volunteered to do on our behalf. Of course, many of us have commented time and again on this floor and elsewhere about the increasing complexity of the threats facing our national security and the security and peace of the world.

This legislation enables our troops to get the funding and the resources and the authorities they need in order to have success on the battlefield. As we consider the current state of the world, it is clear why this bill is vital. We live in a world marked by constant dynamic threats to our way of life. For example, parts of the Middle East and North Africa have been overrun by the Islamic State, and the region continues to be a hotbed of failed states and ungoverned places. If we have learned anything from 9/11, it is that ungoverned spaces are a threat to our national security, because that is where our adversaries will organize and train and then export those threats to our homeland.

Despite ongoing negotiations, Iran remains an enemy of the United States and continues its campaign to achieve regional domination and become a threshold nuclear State, threatening our most trusted allies and partners in the region. In Europe and in Asia, Russia and China continue to threaten our allies in their respective neighborhoods, using a growing array of soft-power and hard-power tactics to twist arms and to coerce our friends and allies. These new dynamic threats include cyber attacks, which have been much in the news today, including espionage and just outright theft of our intellectual property in seed corn created from the brains and ingenuity of American entrepreneurs and creators. Today, our courageous men and women in uniform are tasked with the challenge of facing these many threats and many others in regions all around the world.

So it is astounding to me that the Democratic leader, in the face of these threats and in the face of our grave responsibilities to meet these challenges, would come to the floor and suggest that debating this bill would be what he called a ''waste of time'' and go further to say that the Democratic minority would consider filibustering this legislation. It is just unbelievable.

This blatant disregard for our responsibilities and for our troops is very troubling, particularly because this bill has historically been one that has enjoyed broad bipartisan support. In fact, as our colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona, pointed out in an op-ed he wrote yesterday, Congress has passed a Defense authorization bill for 53 consecutive years—53 consecutive years—because it is a national priority. It should be, and it is. Up to now, this bill has been marked by strong bipartisan backing in the committee. The bill sailed through the Senate Armed Services Committee with a bipartisan vote of 22 to 4. We don't get much more bipartisan in today's Senate than that.

Yet, with all of the support from both sides of the aisle and even with such a clearly demonstrated need as the funding and well-being of our troops and their families, the President himself—the Commander in Chief—has threatened to veto this bill—a bill that actually provides the full funding levels he himself requested.

It is important to note—because some of our colleagues on the other side have said that the problem with this bill is that it doesn't spend enough money or that we ought to reallocate our nondefense discretionary spending to increase that, as well—that this bill includes the exact same level of funding that President Obama himself requested in his budget. So why in the world would the President threaten to veto a bill that meets the funding levels that he himself identified in his budget?

For some reason, instead of focusing on our most fundamental responsibilities of funding the brave men and women in our Armed Forces and making sure they have the resources they need to keep our country safe, our Commander in Chief and the minority leader are threatening to hold this bill hostage to extract more government spending for nondefense discretionary spending for organizations and agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service. So why in the world would we hold national security spending hostage so we can spend more money on the IRS? It is just a complete upside-down view of our priorities.

So the President's lack of strategic depth or his understanding of our Nation's most fundamental duties is really astounding. I am troubled to say this, but I think it is actually true: I think the President understands our Nation's fundamental duties very clearly. The problem is that this threat to hold this bill hostage is just cynical. It just uses a political tool to try to gain advantage when it comes to raising the caps on nondefense discretionary spending. For a President who admits that he doesn't have a complete strategy to defeat the Islamic State, I find his comments to be irresponsible. He is threatening to veto this bill to satisfy the far leftwing of his party, which doesn't believe government could ever spend too much money and that government is ever big enough. The government is never big enough or spends enough for some of our colleagues across the aisle and some of the political base in the President's party.

Just this morning, the Washington Post reported that Senate Democrats have now come up with a brand-new political strategy, and this time they are going further—to threaten to block all funding bills for the rest of the summer, including the Defense appropriations bill, which I know the majority leader is scheduling to be debated and voted on right after we complete our work on this legislation. As a matter of fact, the Democratic leader said this morning: ''We're headed for another shutdown.'' Senator REID said: ''They did it once, they're going to do it again. . . . They want to wait until the fiscal year ends and then close up government.''

It is bad enough that Democrats are threatening to filibuster the defense spending bill, but now they are claiming that it is really the Republicans' fault. In other words, they are saying: We are not for stopping the Defense authorization bill.

We are for funding our national responsibilities when it comes to national security. But because our Democratic friends wish to hold the Defense authorization bill and the Defense appropriations bill hostage, they somehow now are claiming that we are the ones responsible. Because we won't accede to their insatiable demand for bigger government and more government spending, and we won't allow them to hold our troops and their families and our national security hostage, we are the ones at fault.

But, today, as we know, thanks to the Washington Post, the filibustering of this and other bills is just part of a political strategy.

One point I have to acknowledge is the candor of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. If we want to know what they are planning to do, all we have to do is read the newspaper, because they are more than happy to tell us exactly what they are going to do and what their plans are.

This is all part of a cynical political strategy to keep the Senate from working and to deny funding to our Armed Forces while bulking up Federal agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the IRS. This is shameless, and it is hypothetical, and the American people will not be fooled by it.

I wish to remind our colleagues across the aisle that stifling debate and blocking votes is a pretty lousy political strategy, as well. It is what lost them control of this Chamber last November. It is a losing strategy, it is bad policy, it is cynical politics, and the American people understand that. It is simply shameful that they are trying to use our troops, who protect this great Nation, as some sort of leverage in some sort of political game.

I don't have to remind the Presiding Officer, who continues to serve honorably in our military services, that we live in a very dangerous world. Somehow, we don't pay enough attention to that until something reaches out and bites us or injures someone we love. Our Armed Forces face new and growing threats on a daily basis. Our troops deserve our full attention and every resource they need as they serve and defend our country around the world.

So that is why I have come to the floor, to say: Why in the world, after 53 consecutive Defense authorization bills, would the Democratic leader—and indeed with the complicity of the President of the United States himself—say they are going to hold this Defense bill hostage until they get what they want when it comes to spending more money?

This bipartisan bill, which focuses squarely on the needs of our warfighters and authorizes funding at the same level the President himself suggested, should not be held hostage to political gamesmanship. So I would encourage the more sensible Members across the aisle to focus on the troops and their families, not on the partisan agenda of their leadership, and pass this legislation to provide the funding our troops need to continue to do their courageous work of keeping our country safe.

One way my colleagues could play a constructive role and move this legislation forward, instead of threatening to filibuster, is to work with us on commonsense amendments, such as the one I have filed that is pending on the underlying bill.

Under current law, the President has discretion to allow energy exports to vulnerable allies, our partners in Europe, and around the world when it is deemed to be in our national interest. The amendment I have offered in the underlying bill simply reaffirms the existing authority of the President of the United States but encourages the President not to allow our adversaries, such as Vladimir Putin, to use energy supplies for vulnerable countries in Europe as a weapon. It would also commission a report that would allow us to get an accurate assessment of just how dependent our allies in the region are on those who would wield their energy supply as a weapon.

This amendment is a commonsense measure that serves as a first step to addressing the requests—the pleas in some cases—of our allies and partners in an increasingly unpredictable world, and it doesn't change the existing authority the President already has.

I would urge our colleagues to put down the political playbook and work with us in a constructive way on the underlying legislation. This has been the great tradition of the Defense authorization bill and one that is being threatened by the political gamesmanship that we see threatened by the Democratic leader and, indeed, even with the complicity and the fingerprints of the President of the United States.

We owe it and so much more to our troops, who are relying on us to act today. Even more than that, we have a duty to the country to make sure we maintain the security of the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. 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.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, last week we learned of the latest in the string of massive breaches of private information from cyber penetrations, this time of government personnel records held by the Office of Personnel Management.

In its annual worldwide threat assessment, the intelligence community this year ranked cyber intrusions and attacks as the No. 1 threat to our Nation's security. Cyber attacks and threats are also a major drag on our economy, with the theft of billions and billions of dollars of intellectual property and actual money from our Nation's businesses. Quite simply, cyber attacks are a major and growing threat to every aspect of our life.

It is with that background that Senator BURR and I began working early this year on a new cyber security information-sharing bill. It is a first-step bill, in that for sharing company to company or sharing cyber threat information directly with the government, a company would receive liability protection and therefore feel free to have this kind of constructive interchange.

The Senate Select Intelligence Committee produced the bill in the last Congress, but it didn't receive a vote. Chairman BURR and I have been determined not only to get a vote but to get a bill signed into law. It should be evident to everybody that the only way we will get this done is if it is bipartisan.

With significant compromises on both sides, we put together the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, a bill approved in March by our Intelligence Committee by an overwhelming 14-to-1 vote. That bill has been ready for Senate consideration for nearly 3 months but has not yet been brought to the floor.

Last week's attack underscores why such legislation is necessary.

The Democratic leader told me many weeks ago that this issue is too important for political wrangling, that he would not seek to block or slow down consideration of the bill and would work to move the bill quickly. So the bill is ready for floor consideration.

Now, a number of my colleagues would like to propose amendments—as is their right—and I expect I would support some of them and would oppose some of them. The Senate should have an opportunity to fully consider the bill and to receive the input of other committees with jurisdiction in this area. Unless we do this, we won't have a bipartisan vote, I believe, because, like it or not, no matter how simple—and I have been through two bills now—this was not an easy bill to draft because there are conflicts on both sides.

Filing the cyber security bill as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill prompted a lot of legitimate and understandable concern from both sides of the aisle. People want debate on the legislation, and they want an opportunity to offer relevant amendments. To do this as an amendment—when Senator BURR discussed it with me, I indicated I did not want to go on and make that proposal—I think is a mistake.

I very much hope that the majority leader will reconsider this path, and that once we have finished with the Defense authorization bill, the Senate can take up, consider, and hopefully approve the cyber security legislation. I think if we do it any other way, we are in for real trouble, and this is the product of experience. So I very much hope that there can be a change in procedure and that this bill—I know our leader will agree—could come up directly following the Defense authorization bill.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. 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. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I speak today about Cotton amendment No. 1605, addressing funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration, the administration that safeguards our nuclear stockpile for the country. The Obama administration, in its budget earlier this year, requested approximately $50 million per year for the next 5 years for the administration to be able to dismantle old or obsolete warheads. My amendment would simply codify President Obama's own budget request, limiting the administration to spend $50 million per year for the next 5 years on nuclear dismantlement.

My amendment also includes a waiver that would allow the President to increase the amount of spending under certain limited conditions. This amendment has been approved not only by the majority but also the minority of the Armed Services Committee.

I offer this amendment because of troubling statements from the Obama administration about their intent to accelerate nuclear disarmament, however. Last month, Secretary of State Kerry announced at the Nuclear Nonproliferation Review Conference that the United States would accelerate its dismantlement of nuclear warheads by 20 percent. Beyond obsolete or outdated warheads, I do not believe that is a priority. Nuclear modernization is a priority.

We should not be accelerating our nuclear disarmament by up to 20 percent because it would send the exact wrong message to Russia, other adversaries, and our allies. Russia is making overt nuclear threats to the United States and our allies, and we are going to accelerate our unilateral nuclear disarmament? That defies logic.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up Cotton amendment No. 1605.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object. I am very concerned about this. It unnecessarily limits the National Nuclear Security Administration's ability to dismantle the retired nuclear weapons that no longer have any role in our national defense.

The President's budget proposed $48 million for dismantlement, and this amendment would freeze funding at that level and at specific funding levels for the next 5 years. However, the Appropriations Committee, just last month, provided an additional $4 million for dismantlement in the Energy and Water bill.

I am ranking member on that committee. It was approved on a bipartisan basis, 26 to 4. This funding is appropriate and it is justified. The fact is, there are currently approximately 2,400 retired warheads awaiting dismantlement. The rate at which we dismantle these warheads does not have anything to do with the 4,800 warheads that remain in the stockpile, consistent with the New START treaty.

This is a treaty, not an agreement. The administration has committed accelerating dismantlement and we should support its goals of eliminating redundant nuclear weapons. I see no reason to imply congressional disapproval for this effort and to micromanage NNSA's weapons activity. Modernization and dismantlement go hand in hand. NNSA routinely shifts employees from weapons stockpile stewardship and modernization work to dismantlement to keep the workforce fully and usefully engaged. It is completely unnecessary to complicate this process. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I understand that the Senator from California objects to my amendment. But this is the Senate. This is an important issue. We should be debating the matter. If the Senator from California wishes to defeat my amendment, we should call it up and make it pending and have a vote on it, not object to an amendment simply being brought to the floor to be debated.

Is there a reason to manage our nuclear policy? Yes, I would say there is a strong reason. On many issues, the administration has shown itself less than forthcoming in dealing with Congress, in particular on nuclear policy. As we now know, the administration minimized reports of Russia's activities under the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty at a time they were trying to pass the New START treaty in 2010.

I would further say this amendment simply codifies the President's budget request. The Senator from California said $48 million for this year. For the next 4 years after that, it is $48.3 million, $50 million, $52.4 million, $51.8 million. I will concede that, in sum, that is $50.1 million per year, on average. So I am giving the administration a haircut of $100,000 per year. If that is objectionable, I would be happy to modify my amendment to put it at $50.1 million per year.

But this Congress should not give the President a blank check to engage in further unilateral nuclear disarmament at a time when Vladimir Putin is making nuclear threats against the United States, invading sovereign countries, and his missiles are shooting civilian aircraft out of the sky in the heart of Europe.

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. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I rise to speak on my amendment No. 1706. This amendment addresses the contributions of the member states to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in relation to their commitment towards their defense budgets within their economy.

At the 2006 NATO summit in Riga, Latvia, which I was honored to be able to attend, NATO member countries committed to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their national income, GDP, on defense. Furthermore, at the 2014 NATO summit in Wales, NATO member countries agreed again that ''allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense will aim to continue to do so''.

They went on to state 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 2 percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfall.''

Well, I suggest that is a pretty weak commitment, but it remains a commitment. It certainly can be stretched out, and they are already failing too often to meet those commitments.

So, in 2015, only 4 this year—only 4 out of the 28 NATO-member countries, including the United States, meet the 2-percent target. That is 4 out of the 28.

Regrettably, European NATO allies averaged just 1.33 percent of their GDP on defense, even though NATO countries have made numerous, unbinding, unfulfilled agreements to spend 2 percent. The United States currently spends 3.8 percent of its GDP on defense—a large portion of it defending Europe.

So, in contrast, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development data shows that European-NATO allies averaged 24 percent of their GDP on social welfare programs, contrasting to 19 percent in the United States. So they spend more in-country on their programs while we are spending more to defend them.

Unfortunately, reductions in military spending are a common theme across Europe. Just 5 years ago, according to the NATO figures, France's military budget amounted to 2.4 percent of GDP. This past year, it stood at 1.9 percent, and France's budget law orders no increases before 2019. As for Germany, Europe's economic powerhouse, it spends only 1.3 percent of its GDP on defense. By the way, the European economy, as a whole, is as large or slightly larger than the U.S. economy as a whole.

So in 1990, NATO's European member states spent, on average, about 2.3 percent GDP on defense—well above today's average of 1.3. America's share of NATO military expenditures—get this, colleagues—is 75 percent. The U.S. share of the NATO military expenditures is 75 percent and has grown an additional 5 percent since 2007. This is a rather dramatic figure.

I had the privilege to be able to travel to Eastern Europe recently, and it was raised to us, by individuals in those countries, that they were somewhat embarrassed about this. But the reality is, they are taking no substantial steps to deal with it.

Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates—who is one of the most wise people in the world, I believe, in terms of U.S. policy and international policy, served in multiple administrations over the years in the White House and as Secretary of Defense under President Obama and President Bush—in his last speech as Secretary of Defense had the following to say on this matter:

> Indeed, if current trends in the decline of European defense capabilities are not halted and reversed, future U.S. political leaders—those for whom the Cold War was not the formative experience that it was for me—may not consider the return on America's investment in NATO worth the cost.
>
> What I've sketched out is the real possibility for a dim, if not dismal future for the transatlantic alliance. Such a future is possible, but it is not inevitable. The good news is that the members of NATO—individually and collectively—have it well within their means to halt and reverse these trends, and instead produce a very different future.

This was his last speech. He made a speech on a subject he considered to be extraordinarily important. It is a statement he has made previously at other times, but it reflected, I think, something akin to Washington's Farewell Address as he raised and discussed one of the most important problems facing the world today; that is, the developed world, other than the United States, is not conducting itself financially in an effective way to defend themselves.

Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, for decades one of the world's wisest world leaders and commentators, has repeatedly questioned Europe's will. It gets down to that level: To what extent is Europe willing to pay a modest price to maintain their security?

There was a book out a number of years ago, referred to as ''Of Paradise and Power,'' and Robert Kagan's book notes that the Europeans are living in the paradise provided by American power.

So when the Russians took this aggressive step to invade the Ukraine, a nation we have considered for admission into NATO, took Crimea and otherwise acted in violation of international law, we announced a European reassurance initiative, $1 billion. This $1 billion was to be utilized in a way that would reassure our allies and reaffirm our commitment to Europe, even in the face of this dangerous and provocative action by Russia.

Well, colleagues, after having been to Europe and Eastern Europe on a number of occasions, I would say I am getting to the point where I want to be reassured. I want to have confidence in Europe's commitments.

At this volatile time in world history, this lack of commitment on the part of our European allies must end. We need to ensure that NATO members are spending at least what is needed and certainly the minimum 2 percent of GDP they repeatedly committed to spend.

The dangers in this world are much closer to Europe than they are to the United States, and our European allies are right to be concerned. They are anxious to have our presence. The requests for more and numerous military support, action from the United States, are even urgent in some of those countries. They want us there.

But, great danger arises from Europe living in an unreal comfort zone, living in the paradise of American power. Unless the history of the world has been dramatically altered, and it has not, threats to Europe will remain. Who will resist the dangerous pressures on Europe? Will our European partners just rest on American power? That is what the reality suggests is, in fact, occurring now.

Europeans now insist Greece must take painful financial steps for the good of the European Union to be a good team player, they say.

I think it is right and appropriate for the United States to call on our NATO

allies to do their part for this great alliance that has done so much for stability, prosperity, and peace for Europe and for the entire world.

This amendment before the Senate has overwhelming support, I believe. I think it will be accepted as part of the managers' package. The call it makes on NATO members is the absolute minimum, I think, that can be expected of them.

Let's consider the plain facts. The deployment of U.S. military forces to any nation in the world, for the purpose of defending that nation and a region, is an august thing. Obviously, the military might of the United States is unsurpassed. The United States cannot and must not take these commitments lightly. The ramifications of our commitment to the defense of a foreign nation are significant—grave indeed.

This Nation has every right and a duty to our citizens to ensure that those with whom we partner do their share. The idea that a small nation can simply send an email to the United States calling for more forces whenever they become nervous—while taking only limited steps to fund and defend their own country—suggests a disconnect with reality.

This Senate, by this amendment, is sending a clear call for NATO to do more. It is not too late to maintain this alliance as the force for good it has always been. But everyone on both sides of the Atlantic who understands these issues realizes we are in a precarious situation if a miscalculation occurs, and miscalculations can lead to violence and war.

So it is time to make clear the strength of our commitment to each other and to ensure there is no miscalculation. To do that, more is required of our NATO allies.

I yield the floor.

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. VITTER. 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. 1473

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to speak about amendment No. 1473 that is pending. I will be modifying it, not now but later today, in a technical way. The majority and the minority have been notified of this modification, so I will be making that later, and I am going to talk about the substance of the amendment.

This amendment is very significant in terms of our Army force structure. It would limit any additional reductions the Army can make to Army BCTs, which have already been drastically reduced from 48 brigade combat teams in 2008 to 45 in 2013, to now 33 in 2015—so in just 7 years, from 48 to 33. Obviously, it was a dramatic reduction.

This is important because brigade combat teams are a very significant element of Army force structure, and many experts all across the spectrum would acknowledge that and would acknowledge that further significant reductions would be very dangerous.

To clarify, my amendment would require the Army to trim its force structure. It doesn't stop that trend, but it also offers protections for that primary core unit of the brigade combat team without mandating additional money, additional requirements, et cetera. There is a serious and urgent need for Congress to act quickly so the Defense Department has the authority and support it needs to defend our Nation.

This specific amendment protecting those core, required brigade combat teams is supported by the National Guard Association of the United States and the Association of the United States Army, the two key national groups that support the direct Army and the National Guard.

Some Members may argue that we don't want to micromanage the Army and how it deals with force structure. I certainly agree with that generally, but this is certainly not getting into the fine weeds. This is a major issue, and brigade combat teams are a major tool of their force structure. Furthermore, exactly this sort of limitation has been done in this bill, in the underlying bill, both with regard to the Air Force and with regard to the Navy.

The bill, as it stands on the floor coming out of committee, includes numerous provisions to block the elimination of certain weapons systems, such as the Air Force fighter inventory, the A–10, EC–130 Compass Call aircraft. So it is very similar on the Air Force side to justify blocking these eliminations. The chairman's report states:

> The committee believes further reductions in fighter force capacity, in light of ongoing and anticipated operations in Iraq and Syria against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant, coupled with a potential delay of force withdrawals from Afghanistan, poses excessive risk to the Air Force's ability to execute the National Defense Strategy, causes remaining fighter squadrons to deploy more frequently, and drives even lower readiness rates across the combat air forces.

Exactly that same sort of rationale which is in the bill with regard to limitations of what the Air Force can do also applies to the Army and brigade combat teams.

In addition, the same sort of thing is already in this underlying bill with regard to the Navy. There is specific language blocking certain further reductions of aircraft carriers—again, a major element of force structure; again, Congress saying: No, don't go below this number. That is not justified. That will weaken our overall capability, and that will weaken force structure.

So again on the Navy side on this bill the chairman and the committee have done exactly the same thing. My amendment would simply do something very similar and equally as important and justified on the Army side with regard to brigade combat teams.

Because of the significance of brigade combat teams to Army readiness and operations, because of the enormous cuts that have already been made in those numbers in the last 7 years—from 48 to 33—I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support this commonsense amendment.

Again, Madam President, to underscore, I will be returning to the floor sometime today to modify my amendment in a technical way. Everyone—certainly including the majority and minority leaders on this bill—has been given those modifications. They are not controversial. I will simply wait for them to be on the floor to make that modification, which is within my right and purview and does not require unanimous consent, and then I am very hopeful this amendment will be teed up in the next group of votes, perhaps around 3:30.

Madam President, with that, 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. 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. 1921

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want to say a few words about the Burr amendment, No. 1921, which has now been made pending. I am thankful for the leadership of Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN.

The language of this amendment, of which I am an original cosponsor, was overwhelmingly approved by a 14-to-1 vote in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in March.

Implementing legislation to address a long list of cyber threats that have become all too common is among my highest priorities. Earlier this month, it was the Office of Personnel Management and the Army. A few weeks before that, it was the Pentagon network, the White House, and the State Department. Before that, it was Anthem and Sony. That is just to name a few.

I am pleased we are able to consider this amendment on the National Defense Authorization Act. This voluntary information sharing is critical to addressing these threats and ensuring that mechanisms are in place to identify those responsible for costly and crippling cyber attacks and ultimately deterring future attacks.

Our current defenses are inadequate, and our overall cyber strategy has failed to deter cyber adversaries from continued attacks of intellectual property theft and cyber espionage against the U.S. Government and American companies. This failure to develop a meaningful cyber deterrent strategy has increased the resolve of our adversaries and will continue to do so at a growing risk to our national security

until we demonstrate that the consequences of exploiting the United States through cyber greatly outweigh any perceived benefit.

This amendment is a crucial piece of that overall deterrent strategy, and it is long past time that Congress move forward on information-sharing legislation. This legislation—again, 14 to 1 from the Select Committee on Intelligence—complements a number of critical cyber provisions which are already in the bill which will ensure that the Department of Defense has the capabilities it needs to deter aggression, defend our national security interests, and, when called upon, defeat our adversaries in cyber space.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, and, when authorized by the President, conduct a military cyber operation in response to malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a U.S. person by a foreign power.

The bill includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to conduct biennial exercises on responding to cyber attacks against critical infrastructure. It limits $10 million in funds available to the Department of Defense to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President until the President submits the integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyber space, which was required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

It authorizes $200 million for a directed evaluation by the Secretary of Defense of the cyber vulnerabilities of every major DOD weapons system by not later than December 31, 2019.

It requires an independent panel on DOD war games to assess the ability of the national mission forces of the U.S. Cyber Command to reliably prevent or block large-scale attacks on the United States by foreign powers with capabilities comparable to those expected of China, Iran, North Korea, and Russia in years 2020 and 2025.

It establishes a $75 million cyber operations procurement fund for the commander of U.S. Cyber Command to exercise limited acquisition authorities.

It directs the Secretary of Defense to designate Department of Defense entities to be responsible for the acquisition of critical cyber capabilities.

The cyber security bill was passed through the Select Committee on Intelligence because that is clearly, in many respects, among the responsibilities of the Select Committee on Intelligence. But I think it is obvious to anyone that the Department of Defense is a major player. I just outlined a number of the provisions of the bill which are directly overseen and related to the Department of Defense.

So my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be all torqued-up about the fact that this cyber bill should be divorced from the Department of Defense. I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very aware that just in the last few days, 4 million Americans—4 million Americans—had their privacy compromised by a cyber attack. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has stated that we are ahead in every aspect of a potential adversary except for one, and that is cyber. There are great threats that are now literally to America's supremacy in space and to many other aspects of technology that have been developed throughout the world and are now part of our daily lives.

So I am not quite sure why my friends on the other side of the aisle should take such exception to legislation that addresses our national security and the threats to it, which literally every expert in America has agreed is a major threat to our ability to defend the Nation.

So I think there are colleagues who are not on the Intelligence Committee and are not familiar with the provisions of this bill. It clearly is not only Department of Defense-related, but it is Department of Defense-centric, with funds available to DOD to provide services to the Executive Office of the President, $200 million, cyber vulnerabilities of major DOD weapons system, an independent panel on DOD war games, and on and on. It is Department of Defense-related, and it is the whole purpose of the Defense authorization bill, which is to defend the Nation. To leave cyber security out of that—yes, there are some provisions in the underlying bill, but this hones and refines the requirements that we are badly in need of and gives the President of the United States and Secretary of Defense tools to try to limit the damage that is occurring as we speak.

I want to repeat—and to my colleague from Indiana who is a member of that committee, I would ask him—4 million Americans recently were compromised by cyber attack.

Mr. COATS. In response to my friend from Arizona——

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, this is a serious breach, and there is more to the story to be told. It shows the extreme position that we are in here as Americans, as there are those who want to take this country down, those who want to invade privacy of Americans and have the capabilities of breaching this. The legislation before us, and the reason why it is brought here now and, hopefully, will be attached to the Defense bill is that this needs to be done now and not later. How many breaches do we have to hear about—whether it is the private sector or whether it is the government sector—before this Congress and this Senate will stand up and say we have the capability of preventing some of these things from happening, but we need the legislative authority to do it. To delay and not even allow us to go forward with this puts more and more millions of Americans at risk, whether they work for the government or are in private industry.

Mr. MCCAIN. And isn't it true, I would ask my colleague from Indiana, that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently stated that in the potential of our adversaries to threaten our security, we have a definite superiority in all areas except for one, which is in the issue of cyber security; is that correct?

Mr. COATS. I think that is obvious, because, clearly, while we have the capability to address some of these issues, we are not allowed to use the capability. This legislation gives us the opportunity to have a cooperative effort. Some of those who resist the use of this because they think it is potentially a breach of privacy now understand that breaches are occurring from outside and into the United States, by those who are enemies of the state, those who are criminal groups, those who are terrorist groups. While we may have the capacity to deal with this, without this legislative authority we are not allowed to use it.

So what an irony—what an irony that some are saying: We can't trust the government on this to help us. This is defense. This is like saying we can't trust the Department of Defense, we can't trust the Army or the Navy to protect us from attack because it is government-run. Now, they are saying there are some operations in government here that are part of our defenses that can't be used until we have authority. The irony is that people's privacies are being breached by all of these attempts, and we are denying the opportunity to put the tools in place to stop that from happening.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask my colleague again: The 4 million people whose privacy was just breached—4 million Americans—what potential damage is that to those individual Americans?

Mr. COATS. Well, we are just learning what damage this is and how it can be misused in any number of ways. Some of this information is classified. But I can say to my colleague from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that this puts some of our people and some of our systems in great peril. It is something that needs to be addressed now and not pushed down the line.

Mr. MCCAIN. So it seems to me that to those 4 million Americans, we owe them and it is our responsibility—in fact, our urgent responsibility—to try to prevent that same kind of breach from being perpetrated on 4 million or 8 million or 10 million more Americans. If they are capable of doing it once to 4 million Americans, what is to keep them from doing the same thing to millions of Americans more, if we sit here idly by and do nothing on the grounds that the objection is that it is not part of the Department of Defense

bill, which seems to me almost ludicrous?

Mr. COATS. Well, since the Department of Defense is one of those agencies being attacked, I would certainly think this is the appropriate attachment to a bill for which, hopefully, we will be given the opportunity by our friends across the aisle. Hopefully, we will be able to pass it in the Senate, move it on to the House, and get it to the President so that these authorities can be in place.

The Senator mentioned 4 million. A company whose headquarters is in the State of Indiana, Anthem insurance company, was breached—and this is public information—of 80 million people on their roles. That is almost one-third of all Americans who have had their private information breached by a cyber attack—not to mention the threat that comes from cyber attack on our critical infrastructure.

What if they take down the financial system of one of our major banks or several banks? What if they take down the financial transactions that they place on Wall Street every day? What if they shut down an electric power grid in the middle of February when the temperatures in the Northeast are in minus-Fahrenheit temperatures or when it is 110 degrees in Phoenix and you lose your power and can't turn on air conditioning? People will die. People will be severely impacted by this. To not go forward and give authorization to use the tools to try to better protect American safety is not only unreasonable but is a very serious thing.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague from Indiana for his outstanding work on a very difficult issue that poses a threat to every American and citizens throughout the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator VITTER's amendment No. 1473, which requires the Army to maintain no fewer than 32 brigade combat teams, which are also referred to as BCTs.

I support this amendment because cutting the brigade combat teams is cutting the core of the Army's structure and their ability to perform their mission. This amendment requires the Army to maintain a brigade combat team level of 32. Currently, the Army is planning on cutting these to 30 and to continue cutting to a point where we will have a hollow force. This is a short-sighted approach to a bigger problem.

First, what the amendment says is that the Secretary shall give priority under this paragraph to be carried out as funding or appropriations become available.

Secondly, nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede the Army's manning of brigade combat teams at designated levels, and it requires congressional defense committees to have a report on the current manning of each brigade combat team of the Army. It also ensures that the Army National Guard brigade combat teams are maintained at 26, and this accounts for the deactivation of two Air National Guard brigade combat teams previously agreed to.

You may ask, Why do we need 32 brigade combat teams? At the height of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, we had 48 brigade combat teams. If we have noticed, in the Middle East, it is getting worse, not better. This is not to say that we will commit these troops, but it will be to say that we shall maintain our readiness.

Next, the Army's key weapon system is the brigade combat team. This amendment protects that key weapon from those cuts.

Lastly, reducing brigade combat teams does not—I emphasize, does not—make existing brigade combat teams more ready. It wears them out. If you have fewer teams, they are deployed more often in whatever activity they are deployed to, and that stretches that manpower and womanpower potentially to the break.

Under this, with the higher level of force, there is less stress upon those who are there maintaining their readiness. In total, this amendment requires the Army to take a closer look at their strategy and risk, forcing the Army to think long term instead of just cutting the most crucial part of our force, which is the people, the human capital, our fellow citizens.

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.

Mr. PORTMAN. 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. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to support the underlying bill we are talking about on the floor, which is the Defense authorization bill.

At a time of a rapidly deteriorating security environment around the world, we need to modify our policies. From the violence in Iraq and Syria to China's aggressive land reclamation in the South China Sea to Russia's activities on the eastern border of Ukraine as we speak here today—all of this is going on. We live in a world that is a lot less safe and less friendly to U.S. interests. Every day we see more of this. Frankly, it is time for us here in the Senate to help by changing some of our policy approaches to address this changing and more dangerous situation we see around the world.

I would hope we can do this on a bipartisan basis. Our differences with regard to other issues tend to be more pronounced, but with regard to national security, normally we come together. I am concerned with what I am hearing, at least from some of the debate I have heard on the floor, where it sounds as though some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to actually shut down this debate and not have a debate on some of these amendments and not have some votes on some of these amendments and not have a vote on this bill to try to adjust our national security posture so that we can address these new challenges around the world. It doesn't mean that everything that this side of the aisle wants to do would be accepted. Democrats would have the chance to offer their ideas, and we would have a good debate on it, and they would have a say in it. We need Democrat support to get the legislation done. But let's have that debate and that discussion.

So I hope that what I am hearing is not accurate. I hope we will be able to come together and continue this discussion and be able to have votes on amendments and on the final bill and then be able to help, to the extent we can in the Senate, to adjust our foreign policy and our national security policy to address these very real threats we see emerging all over the world.

I will give an example of one that I will offer today. This is an amendment that has to do with Ukraine. As some of my colleagues know, the situation in Ukraine has deteriorated significantly in the last year or so, and it has done so because Russia not only invaded Crimea and took that part of Ukraine but they are also now continuing their aggression on the border of Ukraine. This is a situation that affects us as Americans because Ukraine is our ally. Ukraine is a country that has decided to stand with us. It is time for us and the other NATO countries to stand with them.

Our policy toward Ukraine, in my view, has been not just insufficient but it has been kind of piecemeal. We haven't had a strategy to deal with this issue. So what this amendment attempts to do is to take the language that is in the underlying legislation—already in the bill the committee put together—and improve it so that, indeed, we do have a more comprehensive strategy toward Ukraine. This is incredibly important not just for Ukraine but for the international order, for our national security, and for our ability to help stop this aggression in Europe—the first, really, since World War II, where we have seen that a country is going across another country's boundaries and actually violating territorial integrity.

I visited Ukraine a couple of months ago in April. I got to see some of the conflict consequences firsthand. For those who have been to Ukraine—a number of my colleagues have, including Senator DURBIN, who just got back from Ukraine—I think they would all agree with me that Ukraine is in a state of war and it is under siege. That makes it much more difficult for Ukraine to do what they know they need to do, which is to improve their

economy, to deal with corruption, to have more transparency, to become more like those countries they want to emulate—the European countries and the United States of America. They are attempting to do that, but it is difficult when they have this conflict on their border where troops are being killed and civilians are being killed and where they have to devote enormous amounts of time and resources.

Just this week I had the opportunity to meet with the Prime Minister of Ukraine and the Finance Minister, both of whom are in town. In fact, we met with them yesterday as part of the Ukrainian Caucus, which I cofounded with Senator DURBIN. I will tell my colleagues that talking to them, it is very troubling to hear what is happening in their country right now.

As some of my colleagues know, there is supposed to be a cease-fire in place. It came from the second of what is called the Minsk agreement. Whatever semblance of credibility this Minsk cease-fire had left—I don't think it had much—it has now totally crumbled. Just last week, combined Russian-separatist forces launched a major assault to the north and southwest of the Province of Donetsk. Donetsk is one of those areas also known as an oblast or a province, where there is a lot of Russian and Russian-separatist activity. They were focused on this strategic town of Maryinka. We probably saw some of this on TV. It is very troubling that once again it looks as of these separatist forces, backed by Russia and Russian equipment, which are directly involved in this, are beginning to push back into Ukraine again.

The casualty reports are still coming in, but it appears that dozens have been killed or wounded in this assault, according BBC. These independent news organizations are following this, and I hope all of us are focused on this. The U.S. intelligence in the area is not what it ought to be, frankly, in my view, so we do need to rely on some of these media sources.

It is very clear that in terms of this assault, they were using tanks and heavy multiple-launch rocket systems and over 1,000 men were involved. So clearly, this is something that is not only a serious military exercise, but it is one that is backed by Russia, using Russian equipment. We have seen just how committed the Russian Government is to this—to promoting instability in that region of the world. They are committed.

The question is whether we are committed to step up and support the people of Ukraine. This is something that, in my view, the NATO forces and the United States should have done a long time ago—not by us getting involved directly, which, frankly, that is not what they are asking for. They are asking for assistance and aid to be able to defend themselves. They are asking for us to help them to be able to stop this assault by giving them just the basic weaponry they need to stop tanks, potentially to stop aircraft if aircraft get involved, and to be able to stop the invasion and to protect the territorial integrity of the country of Ukraine.

The President and some of his top advisers continue to stand in the way of meaningful U.S. and NATO action. They have told me they fear that it would provoke Russia, as if deadly clashes such as the one we saw last week and, in fact, yesterday—and we will continue to see today, probably, this steady stream of Russian tanks, artillery pieces, and soldiers into Ukraine—aren't evidence enough that NATO and American restraint has not deescalated this conflict. In fact, I think, in a way, it has emboldened the Russians, and it has inflamed them. Again, we are not talking about U.S. troops. What we are talking about is helping this country that is our ally that has turned to us through NATO, and we want them to be able to defend themselves.

The President continues to enforce this de facto embargo on any kind of significant weapon that Ukraine has said it needs to defend itself. He does that despite an overwhelming bipartisan consensus here in this body and in the House that it is time to increase this help. That would include lethal and nonlethal assistance to Ukraine. Congress has voted repeatedly to do just that, most notably in the Ukrainian Freedom Support Act, which was signed into law by President Obama in December. It also provided the President a national security waiver so he didn't have to do what we think he should do, which is to help them to defend themselves. The administration continues to withhold these arms, and it is time for that to end.

There is really very little disagreement on the capabilities that Ukraine needs. My amendment, which is amendment No. 1850, modifies and builds on the great work that Senator MCCAIN and Senator REED and others have already done in the bill. If we look at section 1251 of the bill, we will see that there is already assistance being provided to Ukraine, about $300 million. Our amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to spend this money in a way that all of us know is the appropriate way to ensure that we get the most bang for the buck and that we are giving them the assistance they really need.

It requires the Secretary of Defense to spend this money on a number of critical capabilities they need to defend themselves, including real-time intelligence, medium-range and long-range counter-artillery radars, defensive lethal assistance such as antitank weapons, UAVs, secure communications, and training to develop key combat, planning, and support capabilities at both the small unit level and at the brigade level. So it provides, frankly, less wiggle room for the administration by laying out exactly what is needed, what is being asked for by the Ukrainian military, and what, in this Chamber and having done a lot of work in this area through our Ukrainian Caucus and through other sources, we know is necessary.

Half of this $300 million under our amendment would be fenced off until at least $60 million of it is spent on the important capabilities the Ukrainians really need and have requested. That is the real-time intelligence, defensive lethal assistance, and counter-artillery batteries. If the administration fails to use this money for the purposes specified, then they have to use it to support other nations facing an increased risk of Russian aggression—countries such as Georgia and Moldova.

The amendment also requires DOD to report on the quantity and the type of security assistance being provided to Ukraine and how it complies with the purposes that are established in the legislation.

So the amendment helps to ensure that U.S. military assistance provides the assistance that will truly have a meaningful impact on the ground, and it gives Ukraine the tools it needs to defend itself.

It will also finally increase the cost of Russia's aggression. At no point has President Putin's decision to escalate this war been costly enough to force President Putin and the Russians to fundamentally reconsider their strategy. The annexation of Crimea, the campaign to destabilize and then invade eastern Ukraine last summer and fall, and the recent offensive have all happened despite a flurry of Western attempts to force a negotiated settlement. In fact, each temporary cease-fire in some senses has merely legitimized what the Russians have done. When there is this flurry of diplomatic activity, it tends to happen after the Russians have made gains on the ground and then it accepts those gains on the ground as the basis for negotiations, granting the separatists and their Russian supporters moral and, I would say, some legal equivalency that they simply don't deserve.

There is a pattern here. They seize the land, they preserve their gains through an internationally mediated cease-fire, and then they break that cease-fire, as they are doing right now, to seize more land and then use a new cease-fire to secure acceptance of their new gains. This has to stop.

The Obama administration and some EU members have been so fixated on ensuring that the successful implementation of the February cease-fire is a goal in and of itself that they have lost sight of this broader policy objective that a cease-fire should be working to achieve, which should be the defense of Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity and support for the economic and political reforms that Ukraine needs. Let me underscore that. It is very difficult for them to undertake the economic and political reforms they need with this siege going on, and that is what we need. We need them to make those reforms so they cannot

just keep their territorial integrity but also so they become a stable, democratic, and prosperous country.

The Russian aggression in Ukraine is not going to go away or resolve itself simply because we wish it to. It will take a comprehensive strategy, which is laid out in this amendment, and coordinated political, military, and economic actions to change the current dynamic. Sanctions and economic assistance for Ukraine are important, but they are tools, not a strategy. Russian military action has been successful in threatening Ukraine's stability where other attempts to use economic or political means have failed. So what the Russians and separatists have found is that they have tried to disrupt through economic means and political means, and they haven't been successful there. In fact, the Ukrainians have rejected that, including by a recent election. It is no accident that their most successful tactic, the military tactic, is the one the United States and the West has done the least to address.

I have argued for months that this piecemeal, reactionary response to intimidation from Moscow is a recipe for failure. Instead, we have to have a comprehensive, proactive strategy that strengthens NATO, deters Russian aggression, and gives Ukraine the political, economic, and military support it needs to maintain its independence. We need a strategy that seeks to shape the outcomes, rather than one that is shaped by them. Much of that leadership must come from us and the administration here in the United States. Of course, this body has an important role to play, and that is what this amendment is all about.

Let's include funding for Ukrainian military assistance, not just in this authorization bill where we are setting the policy for it, but let's be sure in the spending bills that follow that we provide the Ukrainians what they need.

We should pass this legislation—the underlying bill—which Chairman MCCAIN has correctly noted is critical to helping us deal with so many challenges in the dangerous world we face. We should pass, again, the defense spending bill that doesn't leave the men and women in uniform without the means to carry out their incredibly important mission.

Importantly, for today's purposes, we have to be clear about what the stakes are in Ukraine. Events in Ukraine are a direct and deliberate challenge to the credibility of NATO itself, to the U.S.-led international order. President Putin's actions upend decades of established international norms and threaten the very foundation of this system order. Confidence in America and our European allies' unity and commitment to upholding this system deters bad actors. It incentivizes other countries to play by the rules. That is what we want. We want to help ensure peace, stability, and prosperity. If the credibility of our commitment is in doubt, the risk of economic collapse, more violence, and more instability increases. Into a void, chaos ensues. The Ukrainians understand this. They understand the importance of this conflict well beyond their borders. I hope in the United States of America we understand it. I hope we act in a way to help the Ukrainians be able to defend themselves and counter these activities on the eastern border of Ukraine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of debate only until 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. 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.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you so much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business until I conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

HIGHWAY BILL

I come to talk about something different than the pending legislation—I have a number of things to say about that, a number of amendments I am supporting, many of them bipartisan.

At this point, I want to talk about the crisis we are facing in terms of our highway bill. We now have 51 days until the highway trust fund is empty. For all of us, this is a terrible prospect because a lot of our States rely on the Federal Government for up to 85 to 90 percent of their funding. Some States rely on less. My State relies on about 50 percent, but it is still huge. When this trust fund goes under, we are going to be in a lot of trouble.

What we have seen in this particular Senate since our Republican friends took over—and they are my friends—are a number of self-inflicted crises. Lord knows we have enough of them coming our way, we don't have to invent them—but we have seen several. In the first crisis we had, we were headed toward a partial shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security over an unrelated immigration issue. That was ridiculous. There was a lot of angst and finally it was resolved.

The second self-inflicted crisis ended last week, and it was brought about because the Republican leader didn't like the USA FREEDOM Act the House had passed overwhelmingly. As a result of his opposition, he, for several days, turned away from 57, 58, and more Senators who actually supported that bill, and he brought the surveillance of terrorists to a screeching halt. That wasn't what he wanted to do, but as a result of that self-inflicted crisis, we had a couple of moments there where we were dark. That problem luckily ended after a couple of days.

And now we are headed for another self-inflicted crisis, although I must say, from conversations I have had, I have some hope we can avert this crisis.

We have known about this since last December, when Democrats said: Let's stay in until we solve the highway trust fund. And Republicans said: Oh, no, let's just take care of it in May. Then, in May, the Republicans said: Let's just take care of it in July. That is no way to run a country. It is no way to run a transportation system. It is ridiculous, and our States, as I will point out later, are starting to cut way back on transportation projects—highways, bridges, and transit systems—because they are scared we are not going to reach agreement. So, 51 days, and I am here today to talk about it.

I want to show you a photograph of a bridge collapse in Minneapolis, MN, that happened in August of 2007. This bridge collapsed because there was a design flaw. It went undetected because there were not enough inspections made of the bridge because there wasn't enough being spent on ensuring that our bridges are safe.

To me, as I look at this, it is a metaphor for the current status of the highway trust fund, which supports thousands of businesses and millions of jobs and is on the verge of bankruptcy. You can see on this photograph the chaos, the danger, the disaster. Even though there are no people you can see, you can imagine the shock that occurred from this collapse.

Now, you might think this is an isolated incident, but I want to tell you we have 61,300 bridges in the United States which have been cited as being structurally deficient by engineers. The fact that we don't have a multiyear plan in place to fix these bridges is a shame upon our Nation. It is a shame upon our Nation. If you had your loved one in one of these cars, you would know this is unacceptable.

My message today to both sides of the aisle and to the House and the Senate is simple: We cannot afford to pass yet another short-term extension because that doesn't give us the certainty or the funds to fix bridges such as these—the 61,300 bridges that need repair. The continued inaction by Congress to enact a long-term bill is a disgrace and we need to meet this challenge head-on.

Now, I have heard rumors that we are making progress, and I know we are in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I serve on that committee with my friend Senator INHOFE. He and I have agreed we will go forward with a multiyear bill. This is wonderful. It is a little late in the day—we should have done it a long time ago—but I am proud he and I have agreed this is a priority. We have a date set of June 24 to mark up the bill. That is only about 35 days before the collapse of the trust

fund, but if all the other committees did their job as our committee did, we would be OK. So, yes, I am encouraged, but there are three other committees that haven't set up dates to mark up anything, as far as I know. Unless a miracle occurs, I believe my Republican friends are going to ask us for yet another short-term extension.

Now, if you went out on the street and stopped anybody—Republican, Democrat, whatever age—if you asked: Is it controversial for the Federal Government to fund transportation projects? They would say no.

Maintaining and improving our roads, bridges, and transit systems is a necessity. It is a necessary investment in our future that was recognized at our country's founding in the Constitution. That is why Senator INHOFE, who is one of the leading conservatives in the Senate, and myself, a very strong progressive Member, agree. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gave Congress the authority ''to establish Post Offices and post Roads,'' and that has continued throughout our Nation's history.

Legislation authorizing Federal investment in our highways dates back 100 years to the passage of the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916 and the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1921.

I quote one of my favorite Presidents, Dwight Eisenhower. In 1956, he established the highway trust fund to serve as the major source of funding for our Nation's highway systems. This was significant because it was a large increase of Federal infrastructure investment. President Eisenhower knew we needed modern, efficient transportation systems to ensure our security. I say ''security'' because this is what President-elect Eisenhower said, a general and a hero from World War II: ''A network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and personal safety.''

He viewed a network of modern roads as a necessity to our defense. And I would add the word ''bridges,'' because you can have a convoy going over our bridges, too. So General Eisenhower and then President Eisenhower knew how important an efficient system of roads is to our military and national defense.

While serving in the Army way back in 1919, he joined a convoy of approximately 80 trucks and other military vehicles to cross from Washington, DC, to San Francisco to test the military's motor vehicles. This trip took 2 months, averaging 6 miles an hour. From this experience, plus his countless other experiences with the military, both home and abroad, he understood how important a reliable transportation system is to a First World nation.

Again, he said, ''A network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and our personal safety.''

Today, our economy still relies on interconnected transportation systems to move goods out of major ports of entry. I want to talk about my own State because at the Port of Los Angeles, we take in about 40 percent of the Nation's imports. We know they go straight out onto those roads and they deliver goods all over our great Nation.

We know there is a universal understanding that we have to maintain that road system so we can move people and goods efficiently. These surface transportation systems, which used to be the envy of the world, remain the foundation of a strong U.S. economy and enable us to compete in the global marketplace.

I hope you heard that I said our transportation system used to be the envy of the world because it is no longer the envy of the world. It is our fault. This has to be a priority. The United States lags behind its overseas competitors in infrastructure investment. According to the most recent World Economic Forum ranking within the past decade, the United States has fallen from 7th to 16th in the quality of our roads. We are behind countries such as China, Portugal, and Oman. This is ridiculous. The greatest Nation in the world—that is what we are—but we are falling behind on our infrastructure because we do not have the guts to face the fact that we have to fund the highway system.

Why are we behind? We only spend 2 percent of our gross domestic product on infrastructure, and that is a 50-percent decline from 1960. So we spend 2 percent of our gross domestic product while Europe spends 5 percent and China spends 9 percent.

The Federal Government does provide, as I said, over 50 percent of the capital expenditures for State highway projects nationwide, which means that all of our States and all of our local governments rely heavily on Federal funding to maintain and to improve their transportation. However, this is just a national average.

(Mr. SCOTT assumed the Chair.)

I see my colleagues have changed places here. For South Carolina, South Carolina depends on the Federal Government for 80 percent of their highway funds and their bridge repair—80 percent. California is 50 percent. North Dakota is 80 percent. Montana is 87 percent.

So what I am saying to my colleagues who I hope are somewhere listening is that if we do not act to fill the highway trust fund and to meet this looming made-up crisis—check out your State and how much you rely on Federal funds.

I already showed the picture of the Minnesota bridge collapse. I would like to put that up again because I think the Minnesota bridge collapse is a metaphor for where we are. Our whole thing is discombobulated. Our whole thing is disrupted because we do not have the courage to fund the highway trust fund, which, as President Eisenhower said all of those areas ago, is critical to our national security.

I am going keep this picture up here for a minute. I want to talk about our States and the bridges that are in disrepair. I hope people who may be listening across the country—if you live in one of these States, give a call to your Senator and ask him or her: What are you doing to fill the highway trust fund?

For example, in Kentucky there are over 1,100 structurally deficient bridges—bridges that could look like this. Pennsylvania has more than 5,000 structurally deficient bridges, which accounts for over 20 percent of all the bridges in their State.

In addition to the dangerously poor conditions of our bridges, 50 percent of our Nation's roads are in less than good condition. These roads and bridges that are no longer in good working condition span across the country.

So I am going to show a chart that I don't think we have ever talked about here. These are examples of deficient highway bridges in need of repair: Alabama, I–65 bridge over U.S. 11 in Jefferson County; Arizona, I–17 bridge over 19th Avenue in Maricopa County; Arkansas, I–30 bridge over the UP Railroad in Pulaski County; California, the Golden Gate Bridge, for goodness' sake; Colorado, the I–70 bridge in Denver; Connecticut, the West River Bridge in New Haven; District of Columbia, the Memorial Bridge. There was a press conference right near the Memorial Bridge by one of my colleagues a couple of weeks ago.

People are getting really scared about this. The point of this is not to scare anybody; the point of this is to say to my colleagues that we are responsible.

You know, maybe it is me. When I was growing up, my mother and father said: If you know there is a problem, do something about it. You don't have a right to turn your back and walk away.

I remember once when I was a county supervisor I found out that the county building we were in was earthquake-prone. Nobody talked about it. As soon as I found out it could collapse in an earthquake, I brought it to my colleagues. I said: Colleagues, we need to do something.

Do you know what they said, one or two of them? Don't bring it up. We don't have the money.

Excuse me. You have to have the money if you know the building you are in could collapse in an earthquake. You have to have some money if you know all of these bridges are in disrepair.

So let's continue. Florida, the Pensacola Bay Bridge; Georgia, a bridge in Fulton County; Hawaii, Halona Street Bridge in Honolulu; Illinois, Poplar Street Bridge; Indiana, the bridge over the CSX Railroad; Iowa, the Centennial Bridge; Kentucky—another one—the Brent Spence Bridge; Louisiana, another bridge there; Maine, the Piscataqua River Bridge; Maryland, the Chesapeake Bay Bridge; Massachusetts, the I–95 bridge in Middlesex; Michigan, the I–75 Rogue River Bridge.

Remember, if you are hearing my voice and you are hearing your State mentioned, give a call to your Senator and ask him or her, whether they are a Democrat or Republican, what they are doing about the highway trust fund because in 51 days it will go bust.

In Minnesota—did I mention that—the I–35 East Bridge over Pennsylvania Avenue; Mississippi, the Vicksburg Bridge; Missouri, the East Bridge over Conway Road; Nevada, the Virginia Street Bridge in Reno; New Hampshire, the I–293 bridge in Hillsborough; New Jersey, the Garden State Parkway in Union County; New Mexico, the Main Street Bridge; New York, the Brooklyn Bridge.

If you did not read the book ''The Great Bridge,'' you should read that book by David McCullough. It is an incredible book. That bridge was built so long ago. We don't want to lose the Brooklyn Bridge.

In North Carolina, the Greensboro Bridge; Ohio, the John Roebling Suspension Bridge; Oklahoma, the I–40 bridge over Crooked Oak Creek; Oregon, the Columbia River Crossing; Pennsylvania, the Benjamin Franklin Bridge; Rhode Island, the viaduct in Providence; South Carolina, the I–85 bridge in Greenville; Texas, the I–45 bridge over White Oak Bayou; Utah, the I–15 bridge over SR–93 in Davis County; Washington, the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge; Wisconsin, the U.S. 41 bridge over a river.

I just have to ask my friends on both sides of the aisle, if the roof on your house is about to cave in with your children inside and you know about it, would you find a way to pay for that repair or would you let it collapse on your kids? The answer is obvious. Of course you are going to fix the roof on your house. You have to keep infrastructure in good repair. The roof is caving in on our roads and our bridges. Lord help us if we do not act and someone else goes down in a crisis.

We can look at the details surrounding the I–35 bridge collapse in Minneapolis, MN, shown in that picture. On August 1, 2007, this eight-lane bridge, which is Minnesota's second busiest bridge, carrying 140,000 vehicles every day, suddenly collapsed during rush hour, killing 13 people and injuring 145 people.

It is critical that our Nation continue investing in our aging infrastructure. Everybody knows it. Everybody knows it—Congress, States, businesses, American workers. Republicans say they are for infrastructure investment, but they have not acted. Happily, we are having a markup—I am excited about it—in our EPW Committee. Not one other committee has marked up a long-term bill.

The highway trust fund is an integral part of how the Federal Government provides predictable, multiyear funding to States so that States can plan and construct long-term highway, bridge, and transit projects; therefore, the highway trust fund should be our No. 1 priority. In 51 days, the fund will go bust. It will be gone. We will not be able to pay all of our bills. So we have to move quickly because otherwise we will face a transportation shutdown.

The law that currently authorizes our transportation program is set to expire on July 31, and the highway trust fund will go bankrupt shortly thereafter. The clock is ticking, and failure is not an option. So let's put up that 51-day ticking time bomb, if you will. The highway trust fund is in serious trouble, and much needed transportation projects are in peril.

The short fund creates uncertainty, and uncertainty is terrible for business, it is terrible for workers, and it is terrible for the economy. Billions of dollars will be delayed to our States. Many States, including Utah, Arkansas, Georgia, Tennessee, and Wyoming, have already delayed or cancelled construction projects due to the uncertainty in the funding.

We are facing a crisis, and everybody knows it. If we do not act and act quickly, we will see a domino effect that will be felt throughout our economy.

I don't think I have to remind people that we came out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. I was here when we saw that happen at the end of George W. Bush's term. We were losing 700,000 jobs a month. I remember standing here on the floor of the Senate feeling that the whole world was collapsing around us.

The recovery is taking a long time, and thank God it is moving forward now. Our economy, though, is still recovering, and we must have a strong, modern, efficient transportation system to move goods and people. There are some people who absolutely need transportation to get to work. This is not a game. Either they need their cars or they need to hop on a bus or a subway. And we have 51 days until the highway trust fund will be empty.

The amount of money we need just to keep up with the demand right now to fix our roads and our bridges—that amount is $123 billion just to catch up on the nightmare we are facing. So we not only need a 6-year bill, but we need one that is robust so we can start spending some money on these repairs. Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses are at stake here.

You know, it is 51 days. And I have stood in several press conferences with business leaders, the chamber of commerce, the AFL–CIO, construction workers, the concrete people, the tar people, the granite people—you name it. They are united as one America in favor of a 6-year solution. I will show you just some of the people whom I have stood with over time in recent days: The AFL–CIO; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—it is hard to get them on the same page, but they are on the same page and they want this fix; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; the American Council of Engineering Companies; the American Highway Users Alliance; the American Public Transportation Association; the American Road and Transportation Builders Association; the American Society of Civil Engineers; and the American Trucking Association.

The truckers have said to me: Senator, we are willing to pay more in our gas tax because we cannot continue to ride on these roads that are falling apart.

When was the last time someone came up to you and said ''Raise my gas tax''? It is rare. But the truckers have asked us to do it as long as we use the money to fix the road. The chamber of commerce has asked us to raise the gas tax 6 cents to 8 cents. I mean, this is unusual, and I know there is very little support for that.

I have proposed numerous ways to pay for the trust fund, including a refundable gas tax increase. So if you earn $100,000 or less in your family, you get back the tax increase, which is about $40 a year. So I think it is worth $40 a year to know that the bridge you drive on is safe, but we would make it refundable so that you would get that back if you are in the middle class or below.

I will tell you, facing a shutdown—and we are already seeing a shutdown in five, six, or seven States—is painful for businesses. I have had business people come before me with their heads in their hands because they do this work. They build the highways. They fix the bridges. They build the transit systems. And they know we have not come together yet. It is a recipe for disaster.

What planet are we living on? All of America wants this.

I will continue with some more of these names. I just read some of them; I will read some more: the Associated General Contractors; the Association of Equipment Manufacturers; the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations; the International Union of Operating Engineers; the Laborers' International Union of North America; the National Asphalt Pavement Association; the National Association of Counties; the National Association of Manufacturers.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the Associated General Contractors, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Laborers' International Union of North America—this is all of America. This isn't red. This isn't blue. This is everybody. Everybody wants us to fix the roads. Everybody wants us to fix the bridges.

We have the National Association of Truck Stop Operators; the National Governors Association—the Governors are Republicans and Democrats, and they are begging us to get our act in gear and get this done; the National League of Cities, and finally, the National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; the National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association; the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association;

the Portland Cement Association; and the Retail Industry Leaders Association.

The list I read is a partial list. The list that I read, frankly, is mostly Republican-leaning organizations.

Why have we not done our job? Why don't we already have a long-term transportation bill before us before the fund goes bust in 51 days? Why?

It is Congress's responsibility to act quickly to address our Nation's infrastructure needs. Every day that the Republicans fail to move forward with a bill, they are putting people at risk. This isn't about philosophy. This is about bread and butter. This is about getting to work safely. This is about driving with your family and not being fearful that the bridge you are on is going to fail.

I am always asked: Well, Senator, that is all well and good, but how are you going to pay for this?

Well, I have a lot of ideas, and I will lay them out. There are many ways to pay, and I will give just a sampling of ideas, and I will embrace these ideas. I will work with any Democrat or Republican on any one of these ideas.

Replace existing gas and diesel fuel fees with a user fee charged at the refinery based on the fuel price. In other words, do away with the gas tax and replace it with a refinery-based fuel fee. They did that in Virginia, and I think it is working well.

Increase existing gas and diesel fuel fees by indexing those fees to inflation, along with a refundable tax credit for low- and middle-income families to offset those costs. So we can have a modest increase of 6 cents, 7 cents, 8 cents on the gas tax and make it refundable to families earning $100,000 or less.

Assess a user fee on the sale of new and used vehicles. That is another idea.

Use revenue generated from repatriation of corporate earnings currently held overseas. That is international tax reform. We have a lot of money sitting abroad from corporations that have parked it there. They don't like the rate of their taxes. If you lower their tax, that money can come home, and we can use the taxes we collect to fund the highway trust fund. I have a bill on that with Senator PAUL. It is bipartisan. Join us. Join us and let's fix the problem.

How about this: Borrow money from the general fund, to be paid back from the stimulative effect of transportation infrastructure investments on the economy. When we make these investments, they generate so much employment and so much business that people will pay income taxes because they are working. These are millions of jobs, thousands of businesses.

Another way to pay for it: Apply a new, honor-based user fee on the number of miles each individual drives each year. So when you fill out a form to get your car registered, just tell me how many miles you traveled last year, there will be a modest fee, and we can help the trust fund.

By the way, I notice my friends want to use savings from reducing the overseas contingency operations account. They want to use that money. They used it for the military; why not use it for saving the trust fund? And how about the savings of uncollected revenues owed to the Federal Government? If we just collected one-third of those, we would meet the shortfall.

So, as I count these ideas, there are eight ideas that I have, and I am sure everybody has their own ideas. There is not a shortage of ideas. There is a bit of shortage of courage to come out and say the obvious. If your roof is about to collapse on your home, it will cost you something to fix it. Admit it upfront. No one is going to do it for free. No one is going to fix these 60,000-plus bridges for free. No one is going to build new highways for free. No one is going to build new transit systems for free. Grow up and pay for it. This is ridiculous.

I am speaking for myself. I will support any of these eight ideas or any combination of them. We know our country is in danger. Our people are in danger every day because of these structurally deficient bridges. If we don't do anything about it, we will be liable—maybe not in a court of law, but in my mind it is a moral responsibility. So I can support any of these ideas. Some of them are conservative ideas, and some of them are liberal ideas. I don't care. I want to pay for the highway trust fund.

The bottom line is that the only solution is a consensus-based, bipartisan 6-year transportation bill that will provide States and local communities with the funding and the certainty they need to build these multiyear projects and modernize our infrastructure.

This isn't rocket science. Choose one of the options. Add one of your own. Do a combination of these options. Let's have the courage and the moral fortitude to do what is our responsibility. We know our Nation's infrastructure is deteriorating. We are responsible for it. This is one Nation under God, and we have to act to protect our people. It is our job.

I think the clearest message was from President Eisenhower on this front, and President Reagan, who stepped up to the plate. President Reagan signed into law an increase in the gas tax. He was so proud. He said: I am proud to do this. We have to do this. Let me read his quote. He signed the surface transportation bill, which did increase the gas tax, and he said:

> Because of the prompt and bipartisan action of Congress, we can now ensure for our children a special part of their heritage—a network of highways and mass transit that has enabled our commerce to thrive, our country to grow, and our people to roam freely and easily to every corner of our land.

President Ronald Reagan. I was elected the same year he said this. I mean, I am giving away my age, but I was proud that my President understood this. I didn't agree with Ronald Reagan on a bunch of things. He said once: ''If you have seen one tree, you have seen them all.'' I never agreed with that.

But setting all of that aside, I agree with what he said. This is magnificent. Listen to this:

> Because of the prompt and bipartisan action of Congress, we can now ensure for our children a special part of their heritage—a network of highways and mass transit that has enabled our commerce to thrive, our country to grow, and our people to roam freely and easily to every corner of our land.

Another person whom I really admire on this subject is Senator INHOFE, my friend from Oklahoma, my chairman. I was his chairman for a few years—I think 8—and unfortunately for me I am no longer chairman, I am the ranking member. But I will tell you why we will do hand-to-hand combat on the environment—and we did that today. When it comes to infrastructure, we are very close. Do you know what he said? ''The conservative thing is to pass a bill instead of having the extensions.''

Anthony Foxx, our Transportation Secretary, and 11 of his predecessors offered an open letter to Congress expressing their support for passage of a long-term bill. Remember, this was signed by people who worked for—follow me—President Johnson, President Ford, President Reagan, President George Herbert Walker Bush, President Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President Obama. They offered an open letter and said this about the current situation:

> Never in our nation's history has America's transportation system been on a more unsustainable course. . . . So, what America needs is to break this cycle of governing crisis-to-crisis, only to enact a stopgap measure at the last moment. We need to make a commitment to the American people and the American economy.

That is four Republican Presidents and three Democratic Presidents—people from those administrations. My goodness, there is bipartisanship everywhere but here in this room.

I read the list of everybody who wants this bill, and it is very impressive: labor, business—small business, large business. It is extraordinary.

A survey by the National Association of Manufacturers of its members—one of our more conservative organizations—found that 65 percent don't believe our infrastructure is sufficient. We know from the Texas Institute study that traffic congestion in 2011 was $121 billion. We are wasting so much time in traffic. The cost to truck goods moving on our highway system—$27 billion in wasted time and diesel fuel.

So I hear a lot of talk about passing a long-term bill. I am pleased I am hearing that talk. I say to my colleagues, I hadn't heard of that, and now I am starting to hear my Republican friends say maybe we can do it. I think we need to do it. We still have 1.4 million fewer construction jobs than we had before the recession.

The clock is ticking. Failure is not an option. Let's get going. Let's come together and do the right thing. Pass the highway bill.

Thank you.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, are we in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in a quorum call.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today following on the speech just delivered by Senator BOXER, who highlighted her concern about a manufactured crisis—the impending expiration of the highway bill, which must be reauthorized by July 31. I come to speak to another manufactured crisis. We have to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank by June 30 or face the loss of its support for vital jobs in our economy that will happen with its expiration.

I am a big advocate for manufacturing here in the Senate and in my home State of Delaware, but I am not a big fan of manufactured crises. Both of these are unneeded, self-inflicted wounds that will create further drag on our economic recovery. I think we can and should find ways to work together across the aisle to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

For more than 80 years, the Export-Import Bank, commonly known as Ex-Im, has served as a vital tool to help American companies sell their goods around the world. By making loan guarantees and providing risk insurance and other financial products to American firms at market prices, the Bank has helped to ensure that American companies and their workers can compete anywhere in the world and at no cost to the American taxpayer. I will say that again: at no cost to the American taxpayer.

The Bank not only pays for itself, but it actually often runs a surplus. Last year alone, it returned $700 million to the U.S. Treasury. Today, the Ex-Im Bank helps American businesses sell nearly $30 billion in goods every single year and supports more than 150,000 American jobs.

The Bank is a government agency, however, and even though it costs taxpayers nothing and has an undeniably positive impact on our economy and on job creation, it remains unclear if this Congress will be able to come together to reauthorize it by June 30 and keep it running.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues would like to close the Bank, and they are using arguments I think are unfounded and misguided to do so.

First, I have heard the Ex-Im Bank is somehow a government giveaway to large politically connected corporations. But the truth is the Bank helps companies of many different sizes, large and small.

In my home State of Delaware, for instance, the Ex-Im Bank has helped a company I know well—Voigt and Schweitzer, a hot-dip zinc galvanizing company. It has helped them to sell their products abroad. Voigt & Schweitzer has a few facilities around the United States, in addition to the one in New Castle, DE. At its Delaware location it provides galvanizing services for a range of steel products for export. V&S isn't a huge corporation. It has just a few dozen employees in Delaware. It is because of Ex-Im's support that it has been able to compete with other companies around the globe.

In fact, Ex-Im's support helped the firm's Delaware location earn the business to galvanize literally hundreds of bridges that were manufactured in Pennsylvania and being exported and sold to Africa—business that would have likely gone to competitors overseas without Ex-Im's help.

Now, Ex-Im does also help large corporations export their goods to countries around the world, but that support also benefits small and medium-sized businesses. For example, Boeing often receives significant support from the Ex-Im Bank, which helps it compete with international airplane manufacturers such as Airbus. I have heard Senators criticize this support, but the reality is it isn't just Boeing that benefits. This is an important point about how modern manufacturing and the integration of the supply chain work.

When Boeing manufactures a finished airplane, it doesn't make all of the plane's parts with its own factories and its own workforce. It, in fact, buys the vast majority of the component parts from much smaller manufacturers spread throughout the United States. From the brakes on the landing gear to the in-flight entertainment system, other companies make those parts and sell them to Boeing for the finished product. So when Ex-Im helps Boeing export a 747, it helps sustain tens of thousands of jobs for American workers at other smaller companies.

I have seen this myself in Delaware. Although Boeing directly employs in Delaware just 16 people, the company supports 1,300 jobs with 52 different Delaware companies. Let me give one example. A smallish company, Polymer Technologies, manufactures and sells thermal and acoustic insulation to Boeing for inclusion in their planes, which are then exported through the help of Ex-Im.

So when Ex-Im's opponents in this Chamber argue that this is all about a few big companies, that just isn't true. It also is vital to sustaining and supporting smaller manufacturers that are vital to our communities.

The next misplaced argument I have heard is that government shouldn't be supporting private companies, period. They should not be, as it were, picking winners and losers. But even to a supporter of the free market, the point of government is to step in where the private market fails to do so, and that is exactly what Ex-Im does.

When the Bank makes a loan to a business, it isn't replacing capital that would otherwise have come from a private bank. It supplements private capital or makes a private bank more inclined to put at risk its own capital through provision of political risk insurance. Much of the time Ex-Im serves as a lender of last resort and provides a loan where a private bank can't or won't.

So the Export-Import Bank isn't doing something the private sector should be doing. It is picking up where the market leaves off, and in doing so it helps to level the global playing field on which American companies compete.

The reality is that every single one of our trading partners provides the same type of support for their exports as the Ex-Im Bank does for ours. So they are picking winners. They are picking American winners on the global playing field.

For example, as Ex-Im's chairman, Fred Hochberg, has written, ''Ex-Im has given $590 billion in loans, guarantees, and insurance over its entire history but Chinese institutions''—Chinese export-financing institutions—''have provided an estimated $670 billion in just the past 2 years.''

In other words, China has done more in just 2 years to support the financing of their exporters than our Export-Import Bank has done in its entire 80-year history and at no cost to the taxpayer.

The bottom line is that American jobs are at stake in this debate, and if we fail to keep the doors open to the Export-Import Bank, we will fail a lot of American workers. Every year, Ex-Im supports hundreds of thousands of jobs, and shuttering it will put them at risk.

In fact, as the Wall Street Journal reported just this morning, American companies worry that global competition is ''so cutthroat,'' that they would ''be forced to move manufacturing overseas'' and to ship American manufacturing jobs out of the United States ''if the Ex-Im Bank isn't open.''

At a time when our economy is continuing to gain steam and Americans are going back to work—at a clip of 280,000 new jobs announced just last month—we need to continue to help American companies compete in markets around the world. The Ex-Im Bank is central to our competitiveness and our continued strength at home and abroad. It is critical that we act together to reauthorize it before the end of June. So I urge my colleagues to join this effort to help support American jobs, American manufacturing, and the American middle class.

Mr. President, for more than 20 years, the State Partnership Program—or SPP—has helped the United States to build closer sustained relationships with militaries and nations around the world. Although I will not call it up and make it pending at this moment, I want to take a few minutes to speak on the floor today about my amendment No. 1474 to the NDAA, an amendment that would significantly strengthen the State Partnership Program.

First established after the fall of the Soviet Union, the State Partnership Program was created to help countries transition their militaries from the Soviet model and enshrine the idea of civilian control of the military through professional and personal exchanges with our State National Guard units.

The SPP facilitates cooperation across all aspects of civil military affairs and, besides military relationships, encourages people-to-people ties at the State level. I have personally seen the benefits of this program through the participation of my home State National Guard in their State partnership with Trinidad and Tobago and the civilian control that it reinforces.

I have also seen it in farflung parts of the globe, from Liberia to Senegal to Tunisia on the African continent, where three different State Partnership Programs are actively at work providing training and support and resources for the military of those three nations.

The California National Guard, for example, currently has units that are helping Ukraine to push back against Russian aggression in eastern Ukraine, leveraging a deep and trusting relationship first established back in 1993.

Since its creation, the SPP has grown substantially. Today, it consists of 68 partnerships between U.S. National Guard units and foreign countries, with the 69th, between Kentucky's National Guard and the African nation of Djibouti, having just been signed. Djibouti is a nation that is actually the site of our only substantial military presence on the continent of Africa, and that State Partnership Program will help to strengthen, sustain, and reinforce our ongoing and vital security partnership with Djibouti, a nation that is sandwiched between Somalia and Yemen, countries currently in chaos and facing significant threats from Islamic terrorism.

That is just one example of how the State Partnership Program helps leverage the resources of our National Guard.

Traditionally, the program has needed to be reauthorized every 2 years, so I am happy this year that both the House and Senate have recognized its value and have decided to work together to permanently reauthorize it in their respective National Defense Authorization Act. However, there are a few changes we can make that would add to making the SPP more transparent, more efficient, and more effective, and that is what my amendment would do.

First, it would allow the Secretary of Defense to consolidate the various funding streams for the SPP, which right now come from over a half dozen different accounts scattered across DOD, which makes it more difficult to provide meaningful congressional sight. This amendment would allow the Defense Secretary to combine these funding sources into one National Guard fund to pay for personnel, training, operations, and equipment.

Second, my amendment would allow the National Guard to determine its core competencies and to help combatant commanders determine how best to leverage the National Guard to serve the needs of a partner country.

Last, my amendment would establish clear and enhanced reporting requirements so we can better track the annual performance of our units and make modifications where needed to enhance the program's effectiveness.

Critically, this amendment would not increase the program's costs at all. This amendment, which is based on the State Partnership Program Enhancement Act and currently has 9 Republican and 12 Democratic Senators, including myself, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, Senator PAT LEAHY of Vermont, and Senator JONI ERNST of Iowa, enjoys broad bipartisan support from a wide range of States whose National Guards have participated and benefited from the State Partnership Program.

The amendment is enthusiastically supported by the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Guard Bureau, and the Adjutants General. It would take important steps to strengthening a program that is essential to many of our international partnerships, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I join my Virginia colleague Senator TIM KAINE in expressing concern over the chairman's measure to cut $1.7 billion in funding from specific operations and maintenance accounts in an effort to streamline defense headquarters functions.

The Department of Defense is in the midst of implementing a 20 percent headquarters reduction that defense officials have planned over time to ensure that consequences of the reductions are known and managed. Like my colleague, I am concerned that the chairman's proposed legislation would require additional headquarters reductions, the results of which have not been properly considered.

While I support continued efficiency gains within the Department of Defense, including—where merited—reducing headquarters functions, I believe that before such cuts are taken, the Department must conduct a thorough analysis of the best methods to streamline their organizations for the most efficient staffing solutions while remaining viable and effective.

At a time when department officials are managing through enormous budget pressure in an increasingly complex national security environment, I fear the Department will be forced to reduce funding to critical programs.

Finally, the men and women who will likely bear the brunt of these cuts are performing the very work that Congress charged the Department of Defense to conduct. Even this authorization includes additional reports, studies, and demands for improvement in areas like program management, personnel planning, acquisition, and sexual assault. These programs require a professional cadre to conduct the required analysis and propose recommendations for improvement.

I look forward to passing a defense authorization that adequately supports the Department that has been at war for nearly 15 years.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate is debating the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016. Senators MCCAIN and REED, with help from my colleagues and me on the Senate Armed Services Committee, have worked tirelessly throughout the spring on these important military issues. Our committee prides itself on taking a bipartisan and measured approach to reforming and providing oversight to the Department of Defense. I believe we largely succeeded in this endeavor, but I remain gravely concerned about the chairman's proposals to streamline Department of Defense Headquarters by cutting funding to specific operations and maintenance, O&M, accounts.

The Department of Defense already implemented a 20 percent reduction of headquarters, which began this year and continues through 2019. Planning for the reduction began several years ago, affording the Department adequate time to ensure compliance with various directives, including requirements of the Goldwater-Nichols Act that established the division in roles among the service chiefs and combatant commanders. I am concerned the chairman's proposed legislation this year, requiring additional headquarters reductions, will force the Department of Defense to find efficiencies that will blur the lines between service and warfighting functions, undermining the bedrock reforms established by Goldwater-Nichols.

I support reducing the magnitude of these cuts, while allowing the Department to conduct a thorough analysis of the best methods to streamline organizations for the most efficient staffing solutions while remaining viable and effective.

The chairman's specific proposed reductions are not supported by any report or study. Instead, they are based on a perception of unnecessary growth based on anecdotal evidence and nebulous data-sets fueled a $1.7 billion cut to several operations and maintenance accounts.

To the chairman's point, there has undoubtedly been a growth in headquarters over the past decade. Areas that saw significant increases include cyber warfare and special operations. USCYBERCOM did not exist a decade ago, but now has almost 6,000 employees. Special Operations Command is forecasted to swell to over 70,000 by 2017, but both headquarters are excluded from consideration for reduction, against the requests of the DOD

to leave everything on the table if forced to act on this provision.

The timing and magnitude of these cuts are so severe that I fear the Department will be forced to reduce funding to critical programs associated with the targeted accounts. Some key programs associated with these accounts include military burial honors, suicide prevention, radioactive waste disposal, nuclear command and control networks, acquisition support, veteran hiring programs, and installation fire departments. Many of these programs are tied to our Nation's commitment to our servicemembers and veterans and should not be subjected to such drastic cuts without due consideration of the downstream effects.

Finally, the men and women who will likely bear the brunt of these cuts are performing the very work that Congress charged the Department of Defense to conduct. Even this authorization includes additional reports, studies, and demands for improvement in areas like program management, acquisition, and sexual assault. These programs require a professional cadre to conduct the required analysis and propose recommendations for improvement. Asking our workforce to bear additional oversight and program management functions while cutting their funding is illogical and wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak this afternoon about a controversial proposal, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, otherwise known as CISA, which was filed yesterday as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

I want to begin by saying to the Senate that I believe tacking this legislation onto the Defense bill would, in my view, be a significant mistake. I expect our colleagues are going to have a wide range of views about this legislation, and I hope the Senate can agree that bills as controversial as this one ought to be subject to public debate and an open-ended process, not stapled onto unrelated legislation with only a modest amount of discussion.

This is particularly true given the issue of cyber security, which is going to have a significant impact on the security and the well-being of the American people and obviously the consumer rights and the privacy of law-abiding Americans. Because it is designed to increase government collection of information from private companies, I am of the view that for the Senate to have this expansion of collecting so much information about the people of the United States, for it to have real legitimacy in the eyes of the public, it is important to have open debate, with votes on amendments from Senators who have a wide variety of opinions on the issue of cyber security. Trying to rush this bill through the Senate, in my view, is not going to increase public confidence.

So let me be clear about the process and talk a bit about the substance of the legislation as well. I believe tacking it onto the Defense bill is a flawed process. But I think there are also significant flaws with the substance of the legislation as well. Dozens of independent experts agree this legislation will have serious consequences and do little to make our Nation more secure at a time when cyber threats are very real. The issue of cyber threats requires more than a placebo, and this legislation is a bandaid on a gaping wound. I believe the Senate, having the time for adequate reflection and amendment, can do better.

In beginning, I would like the Senate to know just how much controversy and concern this legislation has generated among those who are considered independent experts on cyber security. Shortly before the Intelligence Committee, which I have been honored to serve on for more than 14 years—shortly before the committee marked up this legislation, a coalition of nearly 50 organizations and security experts wrote to the members of the Intelligence Committee expressing serious concerns about the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Re Cyber Threat Information Sharing Bills

APRIL 16, 2015.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Congressman ADAM SCHIFF,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Senator RICHARD BURR,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Congressman DEVIN NUNES,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BURR, SENATOR FEINSTEIN, AND REPRESENTATIVES NUNES, SCHIFF, AND MCCAUL: We are writing you today as technologists, academics, and computer and network security professionals who research, report on, and defend against Internet security threats. Among us are antivirus and threat signature developers, security researchers and analysts, and system administrators charged with securing networks. We have devoted our careers to building security technologies, and to protecting networks, computers, and critical infrastructure against a wide variety of even highly sophisticated attacks.

We do not need new legal authorities to share information that helps us protect our systems from future attacks. When a system is attacked, the compromise will leave a trail, and investigators can collect these bread crumbs. Some of that data empowers other system operators to check and see if they, too, have been attacked, and also to guard against being similarly attacked in the future. Generally speaking, security practitioners can and do share this information with each other and with the federal government while still complying with our obligations under federal privacy law.

Significantly, threat data that security professionals use to protect networks from future attacks is a far more narrow category of information than those included in the bills being considered by Congress, and will only rarely contain private information. In those rare cases, we generally scrub the data without losing the effectiveness of the threat signature.

These are some common categories of data that we share to figure out if systems have been compromised (indicators of compromise, or IoCs) and to mitigate future threats:

Malware file names, code, and hashes

Objects (code) that communicate with malware

Compile times: data about the conversion of source code to binary code

File size

File path location: where on the computer system malware files are stored

Registry keys: configuration settings for low-level operating system and applications

Memory process or running service information

Attached to this letter is an actual example of a threat signature containing data that helps system administrators secure their networks. You'll see that the information does not contain users' private information.

Waiving privacy rights will not make security sharing better. The more narrowly security practitioners can define these IoCs and the less personal information that is in them, the better. Private information about individual users is often a detriment in developing threat signatures because we need to be able to identify an attack no matter where it comes from and no matter who the target is. Any bill that allows for and results in significant sharing of personal information could decrease the signal-to-noise ratio and make IoCs less actionable.

Further, sharing users' private information creates new security risks. Here are just three examples: First, any IoC that contains personal information exacerbates the danger of false-positives, that innocent behavior will erroneously be classified as a threat. Second, distribution of private data like passwords could expose our users to unauthorized access, since, unfortunately, many people use the same password across multiple sites. Third, private data contained in personal emails or other messages can be abused by criminals developing targeted phishing attacks in which they masquerade as known and trusted correspondents.

For these reasons, we do not support any of the three information sharing bills currently under consideration—the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (CISA), the Protecting Cyber Networks Act (PCNA), or the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015. These bills permit overbroad sharing far beyond the IoCs described above that are necessary to respond to an attack, including all ''harms'' of an attack. This excess sharing will not aid cybersecurity, but would significantly harm privacy and could actually undermine our ability to effectively respond to threats.

As a general rule, when we do need to share addressing information, we are sharing the addresses of servers which are used to host malware, or to which a compromised computer will connect for the exfiltration of data. In these cases, this addressing information helps potential victims block malicious incoming connections. These addresses do not belong to subscribers or customers of the victims of a security breach or of our clients whose systems we are helping to secure. Sharing this kind of addressing is a common current practice. We do not see the need for new authorities to enable this sharing.

Before any information sharing bill moves further, it should be improved to contain at least the following three features:

1. Narrowly define the categories of information to be shared as only those needed for securing systems against future attacks;

2. Require firms to effectively scrub all personally identifying information and other private data not necessary to identify or respond to a threat; and

3. Not allow the shared information to be used for anything other than securing systems.

We appreciate your interest in making our networks more secure, but the legislation proposed does not materially further that goal, and at the same time it puts our users' privacy at risk. These bills weaken privacy law without promoting security. We urge you to reject them.

Sincerely,

Ben Adida; Jacob Appelbaum, Security and privacy researcher, The Tor Project; Sergey Bratus, Research Associate Professor, Computer Science Department, Dartmouth College; Eric Brunner-Williams, CTO, Wampumpeag; Dominique Brezinski, Principal Security Engineer, Amazon.com; Jon Callas; Katherine Carpenter, Independent Consultant; Antonios A. Chariton, Security Researcher, Institute of Computer Science, Foundation of Research and Technology—Hellas; Stephen Checkoway, Assistant Research Professor, Johns Hopkins University; Gordon Cook, Technologist, writer, editor and publisher of ''COOK report on Internet Protocol'' since 1992; Shaun Cooley, Distinguished Engineer, Cisco; John Covici, Systems Administrator, Covici Computer Systems; Tom Cross, CTO, Drawbridge Networks; David L. Dill, Professor of Computer Science, Stanford University; A. Riley Eller, Chief Technology Officer, CoCo Communications Corp; Rik Farrow, USENIX.

Robert G. Ferrell, Special Agent (retired), U.S. Dept of Defense; Kevin Finisterre, Owner, DigitalMunition; Bryan Ford, Associate Professor of Computer Science, Yale University; Dr. Richard Forno, Affiliate, Stanford Center for Internet and Society; Paul Ferguson, Vice President, Threat Intelligence; Jim Fruchterman, Benetech; Kevin Gennuso, Information Security Professional; Dan Gillmor. Teacher and technology writer; Sharon Goldberg, assistant professor, Computer Science Department, Boston University; Joe Grand, Principal Engineer, Grand Idea Studio, Inc.; Thaddeus T Grugq, independent security researcher; J. Alex Halderman, Morris Wellman Faculty Development Assistant Professor of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Michigan, Director, University of Michigan Center for Computer Security and Society; Professor Carl Hewitt, Emeritus EECS MIT; Gary Knott, PhD (Stanford CS, 1975), CEO, Civilized Software; Rich Kulawiec, Senior Internet Security Architect, Fire on the Mountain, LLC; Ryan Lackey; Product, CloudFlare, Inc.

Ronald L. Larsen, Dean and Professor, School of Information Sciences, University of Pittsburgh; Christopher Liljenstolpe, Chief architect for AS3561 (at the time about 30% of the Internet backbone by traffic) and AS1221 (Australia's main Internet infrastructure); Ralph Logan, Partner, Logan Haile, LP; Robert J. Lupo, Senior Security Engineer ''sales team'', IBM inc.; Marc Maiffret, Former CTO BeyondTrust; Steve Manzuik, Director of Security Research, Duo Security; Ryan Maple. Information security professional; Brian Martin, President Open Security Foundation (OSF); Morgan Marquis-Boire; Aaron Massey, Postdoctoral Fellow, School of Interactive Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology; Andrew McConachie. Network engineer with experience working on Internet infrastructure; Daniel L. McDonald, RTI Advocate and Security Point-of-Contact, illumos Project; Alexander McMillen, Mission critical datacenter and cloud services expert; Charlie Miller, Security Engineer at Twitter; HD Moore, Chief Research Officer, Rapid7.

Joseph ''Jay'' Moran, Vice President of Cimpress Technology Operations; Peter G. Neumann, Senior Principal Scientist, SRI International Moderator of the ACM Risks Forum (risks.org); Jesus Oquendo, Information Security Researcher, E-Fensive Security Strategies; Ken Pfeil, CISO, Pioneer investments; Benjamin C. Pierce, Professor of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania; Ryan Rawdon, Network and Security Engineer; Bruce Schneier, security researcher and cryptographer, published seminal works on applied cryptography; Sid Stamm, Ph.D., Principal Engineer, Security and Privacy, Mozilla; Visiting Assistant Professor of Computer Science, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology; Armando Stettner, Technology Consultant; Matt Suiche, Staff Engineer, VMware.

C. Thomas (Space Rogue), Security Strategist Tenable Network Security; Arrigo Triulzi, independent security consultant; Doug Turner, Sr. Director—Privacy, Security, Networking, Mozilla Corporation; Daniel Paul Veditz, Principal Security Engineer, Mozilla, Co-chair Web Application Security Working Group, W3C; David Wagner, Professor of Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley; Dan S. Wallach, Professor, Department of Computer Science and Rice Scholar, Baker Institute for Public Policy, Rice University; Jonathan Weinberg, Professor of Law, Wayne State University; Stephen Wilson, Managing Director and Founder, Lockstep Technologies; Chris Wysopal, CTO and co-founder Veracode, Inc.; Stefano Zanero, Board of Governors member, IEEE Computer Society.

Mr. WYDEN. The signers of the letter expressed very serious concerns about the legislation and were particularly concerned it would ''significantly undermine privacy and civil liberties.'' Unfortunately, as the signers of the legislation will report, these concerns were not adequately addressed in the committee markup.

Shortly after the committee markup, a group of 65 technologists and cyber security professionals wrote to Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN expressing their opposition to this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD as well.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 2015.

Chairman RICHARD BURR,
Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. Senate.

Vice Chairman, DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. Senate.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BURR, VICE CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN, AND MEMBERS OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: We the undersigned civil society organizations, security experts, and academics write to explain how the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (CISA), would significantly undermine privacy and civil liberties. We now know that the National Security Agency (NSA) has secretly collected the personal information of millions of users, and the revelation of these programs has created a strong need to rein in, rather than expand, government surveillance. CISA disregards the fact that information sharing can—and to be truly effective, must—offer both security and robust privacy protections. The legislation fails to achieve these critical objectives by including:

Automatic NSA access to personal information shared with a governmental entity;

Inadequate protections prior to sharing;

Dangerous authorization for countermeasures; and

Overbroad authorization for law enforcement use.

For the following reasons, we urge rejection of CISA in its current form:

Automatic NSA Access to Personal Information and Communications: Since the summer of 2013, NSA surveillance activities, such as the telephony metadata bulk collection program and the PRISM program, have raised nationwide alarm. CISA ignores these objections, and requires real time dissemination to military and intelligence agencies, including the NSA. Congress should be working to limit the NSA's overbroad authorities to conduct surveillance, rather than passing a bill that would increase the NSA's access to personal information and private communications.

Automatic sharing with NSA risks not only privacy, but also effectiveness. During a recent House Intelligence Committee hearing, NSA Director Admiral Mike Rogers stated that sharing threat indicators without filtering out personal data would slow operations and negatively impact NSA's cyber defense activities. Further, in the wake of revelations regarding the PRISM program, major tech companies stated that they would not voluntarily share users' information with the NSA. Automated NSA access could thus disincentivize sharing, undercutting the key goal of the legislation.

Inadequate Protections Prior to Sharing: CISA does not effectively require private entities to strip out information that identifies a specific person prior to sharing cyber threat indicators with the government, a fundamental and important privacy protection. While the bill requires that companies ''review'' cyber threat indicators for information that identifies a specific person and sometimes remove it, the bill contains no standard to ensure that this review effort is—at a minimum—reasonable.

Further, the bill requires companies to remove that information only for individuals that it knows are ''not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.'' This could encourage companies to retain data by default, unnecessarily exposing the information of innocent bystanders and victims to the government, and making it available to law enforcement for a myriad of investigative uses. Legislation should instead require that prior to sharing, companies make at least a reasonable effort to identify all personally identifiable information and, unless it is necessary to counter the cyber threat before sharing any indicators with the government, remove it. The default should be to preserve privacy, rather than to sacrifice it.

Dangerous Authorization for Countermeasures: CISA authorizes countermeasures ''notwithstanding any law,'' including the federal Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. As amended by CISA, federal law would permit companies to retaliate against a perceived threat in a manner that may cause significant harm, and undermine cybersecurity. CISA provides that countermeasures must be ''operated on'' one's own information systems, but may have off-networks effects—including harmful effects to external systems—so long as the countermeasures do not ''intentionally'' destroy other entities' systems. Given the risks of misattribution and

escalation posed by offensive cyber activities—as well as the potential for misappropriation—this is highly inadvisable. CISA permits companies to recklessly deploy countermeasures that damage networks belonging to innocent bystanders, such as a hospital or emergency responders that attackers use as proxies to hide behind, so long as the deploying company does not intend that the countermeasure result in harm. CISA's authorization would not only inadvisably wipe away the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act's current prohibition against these activities, it would be dangerous to internet security.

Overbroad Law Enforcement Use: Law enforcement use of information shared for cybersecurity purposes should be limited to prosecuting specific cyber crimes identified in the bill and preventing imminent loss of life or serious bodily harm. CISA goes far beyond this, and permits law enforcement to use information it receives for investigations and prosecutions of a wide range of crimes involving any level of physical force, including those that involve no threat of death or significant bodily harm, as well as for terrorism investigations, which have served as the basis for overbroad collection programs, and any alleged violations of various provisions of the Espionage Act. The lack of use limitations creates yet another loophole for law enforcement to conduct backdoor searches on Americans—including searches of digital communications that would otherwise require law enforcement to obtain a warrant based on probable cause. This undermines Fourth Amendment protections and constitutional principles.

Cybersecurity legislation should be designed to increase digital hygiene and identify and remediate advanced threats, not create surveillance authorities that would compromise essential privacy rights, and undermine security. Accordingly, we urge that the Committee not approve this bill without addressing these concerns.

Thank you for your consideration,

Civil Society Organizations—Access; American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; American Library Association; Advocacy for Principled Action in Government; American Civil Liberties Union; Association of Research Libraries; Bill of Rights Defense Committee; Brennan Center for Justice; Center for Democracy & Technology; Center for National Security Studies; Competitive Enterprise Institute; Constitutional Alliance; The Constitution Project; Council on American Islamic Relations; Cyber Policy Project; Defending Dissent Foundation; Demand Progress; Electronic Frontier Foundation Free Press Action Fund FreedomWorks; Liberty Coalition; National Association of Criminal Defense; Lawyers; New America's Open Technology Institute; Project on Government Oversight; R Street Institute; Sunlight Foundation.

Security Experts and Academics—Ben Adida, Cryptographer; Jacob Appelbaum, The Tor Project; Alvaro Bedoya, Center on Privacy and Technology at Georgetown Law; Brian Behlendorf; David J Farber, University of Pennsylvania; J. Alex Halderman, University of Michigan; Joan Feigenbaum, Yale University; Bryan Ford, Yale University; Matthew D. Green, Johns Hopkins University; Daniel Kahn Gillmor, Technologist; Susan Landau, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Sascha Meinrath, X-Lab; Peter G, Neumann, SRI International; Ronald L. Rivest, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Phillip Rogaway, University of California, Davis; Bruce Schneier, Cryptographer and Security Specialist; Christopher Soghoian, Technologist; Gene Spafford, Purdue University; Micah Sherr, Georgetown University; Adam Shostack; Dan S. Wallach, Rice University; Nicholas Weaver, University of California at Berkeley.

Mr. WYDEN. This is a particularly important letter. We have some of the most distinguished independent experts from across the country—whether Amazon or Sysco, Stanford University, Dartmouth, some of the leading experts in the private sector and academia—expressing real concerns about this legislation and its House companion.

From their letter:

We appreciate your interest in making our networks more secure, but the legislation proposed does not materially further that goal, and at the same time it puts our users' privacy at risk. These bills weaken privacy law without promoting security. We urge you to reject them.

The reason I want our colleagues to be aware that these distinguished scientists in Silicon Valley, and literally every corner of the country, are so concerned is that the American people want both security and liberty—and they understand the two are not mutually exclusive. What this distinguished group of experts has just said is this ''weaken[s] privacy law without promoting security.'' I hope the Senate will review what these experts are saying.

Along the same lines, I note that the Christian Science Monitor recently polled a group of more than 78 high-profile security and privacy experts from across government, think tanks, and the private sector. With these experts, they asked if legislation along the lines of this bill—this bill which has been attached to the Defense authorization. These experts were asked if this legislation would significantly reduce security breaches, and 87 percent said it would not. Many of them noted—a concern I have noted in opposing the legislation—that incentivizing private companies to share information about security threats is a very worthwhile proposition, a worthwhile thing to do. But they go on to say that bills like this are going to have limited value in that area and would have significant negative consequences.

Now, many of my colleagues may have some disagreement with some of the dozens and dozens of independent experts I have just mentioned. Some of them may agree with the 13 percent of those experts who said this bill will do a lot to reduce security breaches. That is their right, and that is what a good Senate debate would be all about. But what the Senate should not do is pretend that this legislation is uncontroversial and try to rush it through without substantial revisions and the chance for Senators on both sides of the aisle to be heard.

Now, I think we all understand why some in the Senate would feel we have to move immediately on this issue and in effect be tempted to rush to action here. We have all understood there have been a number of recent high-profile hacks that have drawn attention to the need to improve our Nation's cyber security—and I don't disagree with the importance of that at all.

For example, a major company in Oregon was hacked by the Chinese simply because they were trying to enforce their rights under trade law.

So this is not some abstract issue for the people I represent. We have seen it in my home State.

So these high-profile hacks, like the one we saw here recently, is obviously drawing attention to the need to improve cyber security. The recent compromise of a very large amount of Office of Personnel Management data is obviously the latest of these, but it is certainly not going to be the last.

Every single time I read about these kind of hacks, what I do is—and I have a very talented staff from the Intelligence Committee and my own office to assist me—I try to reach out and talk to experts in the field about ways to improve cyber security. But that doesn't mean every single piece of legislation with the word ''cyber security'' in it is automatically a good idea that ought to be blessed without revision in the Senate.

The fact is, this particular cyber security bill is largely focused on trying to make it more difficult for individuals to be able to take on corporations. I understand why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce likes it so much. They have always been concerned about the rights of the large corporations. Sometimes the inevitable is, well, we are concerned about the large corporations, let's make it harder for individuals to be able to get a fair shake in the marketplace. But in my judgment, the actual cyber security value of this bill would be very limited, and the consequences for those individuals who are trying to get a fair shake would be quite serious.

I am going to turn in a moment to the substance of the CISA bill to explain why I consider it so problematic and why it needs a major revision. But first I am going to take just a few minutes to discuss proposals that I believe would actually make a difference in terms of improving American cyber security.

First, the most effective way to improve cyber security is to ensure that network owners take responsibility for the security of their networks and effectively implement good security practices. This proposal was the centerpiece of a 2012 bill called the Lieberman-Collins cyber security bill, and in my view that legislation was just a few changes away from being good cyber security law. Unfortunately, the notion of having the government create even voluntary standards for private companies was strongly opposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Congress has not revisited it since.

Beyond ensuring that network owners take responsibility and implement good security practices, it is also important to ensure that government agencies do not deliberately weaken security standards.

I know the Presiding Officer in the Senate has a great interest, as I do, in

innovation and American competitiveness. It is pretty hard—when we say the words: The American Government is actually thinking, as the FBI Director has talked about, about requiring companies to build weaknesses into their products—it is pretty hard to get your arms around this theory, not the least of which is the reason that once the good guys have the keys, the bad guys will also have the keys, which will facilitate cyber hacking.

I have been skeptical of these statements from senior FBI officials suggesting that U.S. hardware and software companies should be required, as I would characterize it, to weaken the security of their products because encryption and other advanced security measures are a key part, a key compound of actually improving cyber security.

I was pleased to see that in the other body, just last week, a new amendment from Representatives MASSIE and LOFGREN to prevent the government from deliberately weakening encryption standards was voted on, and I am very hopeful the Senate will eventually follow suit. In fact, I offered that concept in the Intelligence Committee, and regrettably it did not pass.

With regard to government-held data, it is absolutely imperative that Federal agencies receive the funding and expertise they need to develop and implement strong network security programs and to ensure that they have the technical and administrative controls in place to combat a wide range of cyber security threats.

I also believe our government needs to be in a stronger position to recruit and retain a capable Federal cyber security workforce by ensuring that cyber security professionals can find opportunities in government that are as rewarding as those in the private sector. In order to ensure that there are enough professionals to fill positions in both the private sector and the government, it is obvious that there is going to need to be an investment in the education of the next generation of cyber security leaders.

As we talk about responsible approaches to deal with these cyber issues, I would like to note that I consider the Consumer Privacy Protection Act—a piece of legislation initiated by Senator LEAHY—to be another step in the right direction. This legislation creates a comprehensive approach to data security by requiring companies to build a cyber security program that can defend against cyber attacks and prevent data breaches. It also protects a wide range of personal information, not just name or financial account information but also online user names and passwords, information about a person's geolocation, and access to private digital photographs and videos.

Unlike CISA, this legislation would, in my view, provide real tools to address the kinds of recent cyber attacks we have seen in the news, such as the celebrity photo hack. Unlike CISA, it would also empower individuals by requiring companies to notify consumers if their information has been lost and would protect the rights offered under some State laws for consumers to sue in the event of a privacy incident. The Consumer Privacy Protection Act is the right kind of responsible, thoughtful approach to cyber security, which is legislation that will help us get an added measure of security and public protection, while at the same time protecting the individual liberties and the privacy of our people.

Finally, in my judgment, our country needs to be willing to impose consequences on foreign entities that attempt to hack into American networks and steal large quantities of valuable data. These hacks are undermining our national security, our economic competitiveness, and the personal privacy of huge numbers of Americans. These consequences should draw on the full range of American power, depending on the nature of the hack and the entity responsible.

It would be a failure of American imagination to say that the only way to respond to foreign hacking is to have our military and intelligence agencies ''hack back,'' as the concept has been known, at the parties responsible. We are the most powerful country in the world, and our government has a wide variety of tools at its disposal, including economic sanctions, law enforcement, and multilateral diplomacy. And building a multifaceted strategy to deter foreign hacking is going to require all of those kinds of tools I have mentioned by way of articulating responsible steps to deal with cyber security, steps that protect both our security and liberty. All of those tools are ones we will have to draw on.

Having laid out ways that the Senate on a bipartisan basis can improve cyber security, I want to turn to the proposal in detail that is now in front of the Senate. As I have said, I believe it makes sense to encourage private companies to share information about cyber security threats. Cyber is a problem. Sharing information can be useful, but it is also vital that information sharing not be bereft of privacy protections for law-abiding Americans.

Cyber security is a problem. Information sharing is a plus. But let's make no mistake about it—an information-sharing bill that lacks privacy protections really is not a cyber security bill; it is a surveillance bill. That is what has been one of my major concerns about this legislation, that the legislation in front of the Senate—we talked about the flaws in the process, but substantively, if you have an information-sharing bill that lacks adequate privacy protections, it is a surveillance bill by another name.

When the Senate Intelligence Committee voted on the CISA bill, I opposed it. I opposed it because I believe its insufficient privacy protections will lead to large volumes of Americans' personal information, personal information from law-abiding Americans who have done nothing wrong—that they will be faced with the prospect that their information is shared with the government even when that information is not needed for cyber security. When I say ''personal information,'' I am talking about the contents of emails, financial information, and what amounts to any data at all that is stored electronically.

Some of my colleagues have stressed that companies will have a choice about whether to participate in this information-sharing part of the legislation. That is true, but while corporations will have a choice about whether to participate, they will be able to do so without the knowledge or consent of their customers, and they will receive broad liability protections when they do so. The CISA bill as written trumps all Federal privacy laws.

Furthermore, once this information is shared with the government, government agencies will be permitted to use it for a wide variety of purposes unrelated to cyber security. The bill creates what I consider to be a double standard—really a bizarre double standard in that private information that is shared about individuals can be used for a variety of non-cyber security purposes, including law enforcement action against these individuals, but information about the companies supplying that information generally may not be used to police those companies.

I will tell you, I think that will be pretty hard to explain at a townhall meeting in virtually any corner of America because I believe it is wrong to say that the privacy rights of corporations matter more than the privacy rights of individual Americans.

I expect that some colleagues will say that it is not their intent to authorize this excessively broad collection. The argument will be that this is legislation to encourage companies to share information about actual cyber security threats, such as lines of malicious code and signatures of hostile cyber actors. Again, I would say to colleagues that I am all for encouraging companies to share information about genuine security threats, but if you read the language that is now before the Senate in the cyber security bill, the language of that bill is much broader than just sharing information about genuine security threats.

If Senators want to pass a bill that is focused on real cyber security threats and includes real protection for Americans' privacy, then the Senate should add language specifying that companies should only provide the government with individuals' personal information if it is necessary to describe a cyber security threat. That does not seem to me to be an unreasonable protection for the privacy of Americans, that the Senate would adopt language specifying that the companies provide the government with individuals' personal information if it is necessary to

describe a cyber threat. That is pretty obvious.

We can explain that, I would say to the distinguished President of the Senate, at a townhall meeting, that if it is related to a cyber security threat, then the companies would provide individuals' personal information. But this would discourage companies from unnecessarily sharing large amounts of their customers' private information with the government.

Unfortunately, the cyber security bill in front of the Senate now takes the opposite approach. It only requires companies to withhold information that is known at the time of sharing to be personal information unrelated to cyber security. This approach will clearly discourage companies from closely reviewing the information that they share and will lead to a much greater amount of Americans' personal information being transferred needlessly to government agencies.

I hope that here in the Senate there will be an opportunity to carefully consider the potential consequences of this legislation before voting to rush it through by an expedited process.

I have said here several times that cyber security is a real problem, and policymakers are going to have to deal with it. In fact, I will go so far as to say that the issue of cyber security is going to be an ongoing and enduring challenge of the digital age. It is my view that every Senator who serves in this body today can expect to deal with cyber security questions for the rest of their career in public service. Voting to rush a bill through, however, is not going to make these problems somehow go away, and it will have real consequences for our constituents for years to come, and in particular, it will not make us safer and will jeopardize the rights of individual Americans.

Before I wrap up, I believe it is important and I have an obligation to draw my colleagues' attention to one final issue. As of this afternoon, there is a secret Justice Department legal opinion that is of clear relevance to this debate that continues to be withheld from the public. This opinion remains classified. The Senate rules prohibit me from describing it in detail. But I can say that it interprets common commercial service agreements and that in my judgment is inconsistent with the public's understanding of the law.

So this gets back to a question I have talked about on the floor often, which is secret law, when the public reads one thing and there is a secret interpretation that goes in another direction and it contributes to the public's cynicism about Washington.

As always, I certainly see it as my job to say that colleagues can decide whether to take my counsel, but I believe any Senator who votes for this legislation, without reading this secret Justice Department legal opinion I have referred to, is voting without a full understanding of the relevant legal landscape. If Senators do not understand how these common commercial service agreements have been interpreted by the executive branch, then it will be harder for the Senate to have a fully informed debate on the cyber security legislation, whether it is considered now or later.

I would also like to note for the record that I have repeatedly asked the Justice Department to withdraw this opinion and to make it public so anyone who is party to one of these commercial service agreements can decide whether their agreement ought to be revised. The Justice Department has chosen not to take my advice on either of my suggestions.

In public testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee, the deputy head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel told me she personally would not rely on this opinion today, and I appreciate her view on that matter. Yet, until the opinion is withdrawn, I believe Senators should be concerned about other government officials choosing to rely on it at any time. In my judgment, that is a very clear instance of the government developing what is essentially secret law—law that is at variance with what you read if you are in a coffee shop in Arkansas or Utah or anywhere else.

The reality is, as I have said often on the floor, operations always have to be secret, as do the sources and methods. Chairman HATCH remembers this from his service on the Intelligence Committee. Operations always have to be secret, but the law ought to be public because that is how the American people have confidence in how we make decisions in our Republic.

I will close by saying it is quite obvious at this point that I have significant reservations about the cyber security bill. I believe a number of Senators are going to share these concerns. I will let them speak for themselves, although I believe Senator LEAHY's strong statement yesterday was certainly on point. Yet I will also say, even to my colleagues who are inclined to vote for this bill, that I hope all Senators will think about whether this is an appropriate process for this sort of legislation.

I have already said I believe Senators are going to be dealing with cyber security questions for the rest of their time in public service, because in the digital age, I think we are going to see a constant evolution in this field with respect to these threats and both the technical and political concerns that are raised by them.

Should the Senate be rushing a bill like this through by tacking it onto an unrelated defense measure? Is this the best way to show the American people, once again, that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive and that it is possible to do both?

If Senators share the concerns I have raised, I hope they will oppose the cyber security amendment if it is brought up for a vote on the Defense bill. I hope Senators will support this issue, which has been brought to the floor under a different process—a process that involves regular order, so every Senator on both sides of the aisle will have an opportunity to make the revisions I believe it needs and to offer their own ideas.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Utah.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as the House of Representatives moves closer to a vote on the Senate-passed legislation to renew trade promotion authority, I wish to take a few minutes to talk about the links between our Nation's trade policy, foreign policy, and national security. Whether it is Russia's aggression toward the Ukraine, civil wars in the Middle East or ongoing efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation, the world faces a number of challenges that are impacting the future geopolitical landscape.

In all of this, the question we have to consider is: Going forward, what role will the United States play? Are we going to lead or are we going to follow?

Make no mistake, the path we take on international trade will say a lot about how we plan to answer those questions.

Consider a few facts. In the next few years, China will likely pass the United States as the world's largest economy. It is already the world's largest exporting country. China is continually seeking to expand its influence in order to dictate the terms of international trade, particularly in places like Sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia, and Latin America.

In other words, when we are talking about trade and the possibility of the United States retreating from the international marketplace, China is the proverbial 800-pound gorilla in the room. Indeed, any ground we cede in leading the world on trade is, more likely than not, ground ceded to China.

I have heard many people—including Members of Congress—express their concerns about China, both strategically and economically, and rightfully so. After all, when it comes to trade, China has constantly shown a disregard for international norms and standards. However, oddly enough, many of those same people who talk the most about the threat posed by China have expressed opposition to TPA, the trade promotion authority bill, and to the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP. This is puzzling and reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the Senate TPA bill and free trade in general.

If we are serious about keeping China and its growing economic and political influence in check, getting a strong TPP agreement that advances U.S. interests should be a top priority. In addition, if we want to eventually convince China to change their harmful practices, a high-standard TPP agreement would naturally be a big step in the right direction.

Free-trade agreements like TPP, if done correctly, should provide new rules for trade in the 21st century. They should set modern standards for economic liberalization and integration, including the protection of foreign investments and intellectual property rights and the marginalization of state-owned enterprises.

We need to be setting the standards and writing the rules on trade so our workers, innovators, researchers, and job creators can fairly compete in the global market. If we don't lead, if we sit on the sidelines, Americans will be competing on an imbalanced playing field, with rules designed specifically to disadvantage us. Given that TPP countries comprise 40 percent of the world economy, it is vital we improve our ability to compete in that region.

Moreover, if TPP fails, we will lose influence in one of the most economically dynamic and strategic regions of the world, and any leadership vacuum left by the United States will almost certainly be filled by someone else and, in this case, most likely China.

But don't just take my word for it. Congress recently received a letter from 17 former Secretaries of Defense and retired military leaders, including Colin Powell, Leon Panetta, William Perry, and Donald Rumsfeld.

In that letter, these leaders said:

> We write to express our strongest possible support for enactment of Trade Promotion Authority legislation, which is critical to the successful conclusion of two vital agreements: the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Indeed, TPP in particular will shape an economic dynamic over the next several decades that will link the United States with one of the world's most vibrant and dynamic regions. If, however, we fail to move forward with TPP, Asian economies will almost certainly develop along a China-centric model. In fact, China is already pursuing an alternative regional free trade initiative. TPP, combined with TTIP, would allow the United States and our closest allies to help shape the rules and standards for global trade.

The concerns outlined in this letter went beyond China.

The letter continues:

> The stakes are clear. There are tremendous strategic benefits to TPP and TTIP, and there would be harmful strategic consequences if we fail to secure these agreements. In both the Asia-Pacific and the Atlantic, our allies and partners would question our commitments, doubt our resolve, and inevitably look to other partners. America's prestige, influence, and leadership are on the line. With TPP originating in the Bush administration, these agreements are fundamentally bipartisan in nature and squarely in our national security interest. It is vitally important that we seize the new strategic opportunities these agreements offer our nation.

When 17 former Secretaries of Defense, admirals, and generals who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations have joined together with such a strong message, they probably have a point, and Congress had better listen closely.

Many people, including a number of our colleagues in Congress, continually argue that one of the best uses of American power would be to better promote human rights and democracy in developing countries and increase our efforts at alleviating poverty. I don't necessarily disagree with that sentiment.

Indeed, while there are different opinions about how we can best accomplish these goals, I think most of us in Congress, in both the Senate and the House, agree with the basic premise that we should continually be working to expand our influence and advance our values, particularly in the developing world.

History has demonstrated that the best way to accomplish these objectives is to increase U.S. trade with these countries. Indeed, if we want to export the benefits of American exceptionalism, capitalism, work ethic, and democracy, a freer, expanded exchange of goods is absolutely the best way to do it.

Trade is an effective exercise of America's economic power and influence, trade is how you spread capitalism and encourage other countries to open their economies, trade is how you export American values in the developing world, and, most importantly, trade is how you counter the growing influence of countries like China in the world economy.

The stakes are high. The importance of TPP and other trade agreements to our strategic and security interests is obvious, and given that reality, the importance of TPA should be just as obvious.

Put simply, without TPA, there is no TPP. That is just a fact. Sure, technically speaking, TPA is not required for the administration to complete negotiations and send the agreement to Congress, but technicalities aside, that route is unlikely to yield a desirable result, both in terms of the substance and process.

Japan and Canada, two of our largest trading partners in the TPP negotiations, have each stated they are reluctant to bring their final offers to the table until Congress provides the administration with TPA. Trade promotion authority assures our trading partners that if they reach an agreement, it will not be unraveled when it is sent to Congress for approval. This allows our negotiators to get the best deal possible.

TPA also ensures that Congress has a meaningful role in crafting the specifics of the agreement by setting objectives, mandating transparency, and requiring periodic updates. Under the Senate-passed bill, Congress will have more authority than ever to review and respond to the administration on individual trade agreements.

Long story short, TPA is absolutely necessary for advancing U.S. interests abroad and protecting the opportunities for millions of Americans to earn and compete for a livelihood in an increasingly global trade environment.

With the House TPA vote set to take place in a matter of days, I hope our colleagues in the other Chamber will recognize the strategic and economic realities we face as a country and be willing to advance our Nation's interests and security. I am confident that most of them will make the right choice, and it will be good for America as well as them.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak about another matter of great importance not just to me but to everybody.

Last year, after the midterm elections, the Obama administration quietly and without much fanfare proposed a massive, far-reaching rule that would overturn a number of bedrock principles of child support enforcement and welfare reform, chief among them being the principle that parents should be financially responsible for their children.

This was just the latest attempt on the part of the Obama administration to bypass Congress and work to enact policies through executive fiat. Sadly, it wasn't even the first time this administration tried to gut welfare reform. Indeed, we all remember a few years back when the administration granted itself the unprecedented authority to waive critical welfare work requirements.

Put simply, this latest rule would make it easier for noncustodial parents to evade paying child support. It would undermine a key feature of welfare reform, which is that single mothers can avoid welfare if fathers comply with child support orders.

I am fundamentally opposed to policies that allow parents to abdicate their responsibilities, which, in return, results in more families having to go on welfare. I think most Americans would agree with me. That is why I, joined by Senator CORNYN and House Ways and Means Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, have introduced legislation that would prevent the Obama administration from bypassing Congress in yet another attempt to subvert key features of welfare reform. I regret that we must take this action.

In the past, Members of Congress have generally been able to find common ground and work on a bipartisan basis to address issues relating to child support. In fact, Congress recently passed, and the President recently signed legislation, that made improvements to child support enforcement policies.

In 2013, the Senate Finance Committee reported a series of ambitious proposals related to child support enforcement. At that time, we requested input on these proposals from the Obama administration. At no time did administration officials indicate that the Department of Health and Human Services was quietly working to advance a massive overhaul of child support enforcement, much less that it was planning on doing so without the help or input of Congress.

It is important to note that this secretive preparation only came to light

after the recent elections. That suggests to me that the administration does not have faith that its proposal can withstand public scrutiny and that they have no interest in making a full and transparent justification for the policies they are trying to ram through.

Truth be told, Chairman RYAN and I have introduced our legislation more out of sorrow than anger. For many months, our offices attempted to work out an equitable arrangement with the Obama administration. We tried to convince HHS to withdraw the problematic features of the rule, and in exchange we would agree to engage in a substantive, productive discussion on how to move forward with improvements to child support enforcement.

I firmly believe there is room for common ground. In fact, there are a number of features of the administration's proposed rule that could generate bipartisan support. But any workable solution would have to include the full participation and ultimate consent of the legislative branch. Any changes to the law would have to go through Congress and not simply be dictated by the administration.

So Chairman RYAN and I will do all we can to get our bill through Congress and present it to the President. If we are successful, I hope he will sign it and commit to working with us in the future to advance reforms to child support enforcement. I stand ready to work with the administration and any of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol to achieve this goal.

Mr. President, 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. AYOTTE. 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. 1986

(Purpose: To reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States)

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator KIRK, I send an amendment to the desk to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Ms. AYOTTE], for Mr. KIRK, proposes an amendment numbered 1986 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1463.

Ms. AYOTTE. 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 printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Ms. AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today to talk about an important amendment that was offered by Senator KIRK, which I cosponsor, and that is the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

I can tell you that in my home State of New Hampshire, on Monday, I was at a roundtable at GE Aviation. GE Aviation has over 700 jobs in the State of New Hampshire. They are building a new facility there. The Export-Import Bank provides a company like GE Aviation the opportunity to obtain financing to export its products that are manufactured in the United States of America, in New Hampshire, to other countries overseas, increasing the opportunity for American manufacturing jobs.

At that company, on Monday, they invited a lot of their suppliers and small businesses who also have either used Ex-Im financing or are suppliers for the larger companies that use Ex-Im financing.

One of those companies that were around the table that had used Ex-Im financing in New Hampshire was Boyle Energy in Concord. In fact, Mike Boyle, who is the CEO of Boyle Energy, has been able to use Ex-Im financing to grow New Hampshire jobs. He has a vision for a new plant in Merrimack, NH, that he is ready to expand. If he can get this financing, he is going to be selling more of his great products overseas, creating more jobs in New Hampshire.

Yet, this Bank expires at the end of June. This is a very important tool for American businesses. This program—and I wish I had this problem with every program in Washington—actually returns money to the Treasury, and it creates American jobs.

The reason this type of financing is available is because of the risk that is often taken in exporting products and there aren't commercial loans always available. The Ex-Im Bank has the ability to allow financing for our businesses in America. In fact, other countries around the world have programs such as this, and that are much more extensive. So without the Ex-Im Bank, it is not a level playing field for our American companies that want to manufacture in the United States of America. The Ex-Im Bank will allow access to financing that will enable businesses to create American jobs.

Also around that table on Monday at GE Aviation was Goss International. They manufacture great printing presses in New Hampshire. We are very proud of them. They have also been able to use Ex-Im financing. If that financing doesn't go through, we heard from a representative of Goss that, in fact, they could lose up to 40 jobs in my home State of New Hampshire. So it is important that we reauthorize this Bank.

I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for offering this amendment to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so that our companies here in the United States of America can manufacture here, sell to consumers around the world, and have access to this financing. In fact, in New Hampshire there have been about 36 companies—many of them small companies—that were able over the last several years to use Ex-Im financing to create New Hampshire jobs.

This is about jobs in the United States of America. This is about competing. We recently had the TPA—trade promotion authority—on the floor to expand opportunities for trade. This goes hand in hand with that legislation so that companies have opportunities to get financing to create jobs here and return money to the Treasury. I wish I could say that about every program—that it returns money to the Treasury. The default rate at Ex-Im Bank is lower than with commercial loans.

I hope that Senator KIRK's amendment will get a vote on the Senate floor, that we can get this reauthorized before the expiration date at the end of this month, and that we can continue to allow this financing for American businesses to continue to build and create products to sell overseas and to create American jobs. This is what this financing allows these businesses to do. This is very important in making sure that we remain competitive and that we have more jobs here and that we continue to sell our great products built here in the United States of America around the world.

So I am very honored to support this amendment. I hope we will get a vote on this amendment on the Defense authorization bill or get a vote and make sure that we have this passed before the end of this month when this Bank expires so that we could have continuity in this important financing mechanism for our businesses here in this country.

In addition to the businesses I previously mentioned that were around the table on Monday, I also want to mention GKN Aerospace from Charleston, which is a larger business with a smaller footprint in New Hampshire that has been able to export and create jobs in New Hampshire and across the country. In addition to that, we were so glad to hear from other businesses in New Hampshire that were able to rely on this important financing mechanism.

I am very glad to support Senator KIRK's amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

SPACE PROGRAM CUT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I just learned that the CJS subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee reported a bill out that made a substantial cut in the request for commercial crew in order for us to be able to have Americans flying on American rockets to and from the International Space Station, instead of having to rely on the Russian Soyuz, which we buy and have been buying those ever since we shut down the space shuttle at something like $60 million to $70 million per

passenger going up to the space station.

Now, the whole idea was that since we cooperated with the Russians in building this space station, we would both have the means of transportation to get up there. We do have the means of transportation of getting cargo to and from the space station, since we shut down the space shuttle, but we are in the process of a competition between several companies—especially those that have been selected in the competition by NASA, Boeing and SpaceX. Each of them has been granted money to develop all of the redundancies and safety and escape systems in their spacecraft capsule in order to make it safe for Americans to go to and from the International Space Station.

Now, I can tell you that for the average American on the street, their image of our space program is one that since the space shuttle shut down in 2011, they think the space program is over, when, in fact, it is really just beginning, and we are going to Mars in the decade of the 2030s. Well, that is the whole point of our being able to rely on our own spacecraft and on our own rockets, instead of relying on the Russians.

If this cut is sustained—and this is a cut from a request of $1.24 billion for this competition for making American rockets safe and creating the spacecraft to take Americans to the space station—it will have been cut to $900 million. If that cut in the subcommittee is sustained in the full committee and ultimately in the final appropriations bill, it is going to delay us from being able to launch Americans on American rockets.

Instead of 2017—just 2 years from now—it will delay us another 4 years. That is 4 more years of relying on the Russians. Now, I know there are a bunch of Senators around here that do not like the fact of the aggressiveness of Vladimir Putin. Well, this is one way to wean ourselves from having to depend on them.

The final comment on this subject is that the money that supposedly is being cut, which is just a little over $300 million, we would lose in still paying that money to the Russians to fly an additional 2 years. We need to wake up to what is happening. Senator MIKULSKI will be offering an amendment to the full Appropriations Committee to restore that cut. I hope Senators will understand all the nuances and support Senator MIKULSKI.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I seek to speak on my amendment on behalf of the Export-Import Bank. I would like to say the Export-Import Bank is set to expire this year on June 30. It allows thousands of American companies to advance their technology overseas. Without these loans, many American jobs would be ceded to China or Europe.

Now, 200,000 American workers depend on Ex-Im, plus 46,000 in my home State of Illinois. They work for these companies that depend on Ex-Im's backing to make exports happen. Some people are interested in killing this agency because it may be a government handout agency. It is not. It actually makes the taxpayer $1 billion a year. In the last 3 years, it has earned the U.S. Treasury over $3 billion.

I will be offering the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment to keep this Bank alive. I want to thank Senators BLUNT, CANTWELL, and MANCHIN for defending these American jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the National Defense Authorization Act. This is legislation we are currently considering that we need to pass. It is important for our military, and it is important for the American people. I have offered a number of amendments, and I rise to speak about three of those amendments at this point.

The first is amendment No. 1483, which involves RPA flight training. Essentially, amendment No. 1483 would instruct the Air Force to consider allowing private contractors to provide the Air Force with training for remotely piloted aircraft or RPAs. These are the vehicles used in unmanned aerial systems, commonly called UAS.

Currently, the Air Force is training pilots for RPAs, remotely piloted aircraft, within the service itself. But there are some very skilled private contractors. In fact, the people who make unmanned aircraft could be doing high-quality training for them as well, particularly in concert with our universities that provide aviation training.

Right now the Air Force faces a real challenge in training a sufficient number of unmanned aircraft pilots to meet operational demands. Specifically, this amendment directs the Air Force to evaluate the use of private contractor facilities, equipment, and trainers to increase the number of qualified pilots for our RPA missions. It requires the Air Force to detail various aspects of their shortfall in manning RPAs, the authorized number of personnel assigned to the missions, and the identification and assessment of actions to address that shortfall.

In this rapidly growing era of unmanned aerial systems technology, it just makes sense for the military to partner with companies and universities that have the expertise to provide the critical training the military needs. It is cost effective. It is efficient. It is good for the military and our country. Right now the demand for unmanned aerial systems is so strong worldwide that the Air Force has all of its pilots flying the missions. That does not give them the resources, the pilots to train more pilots to fly unmanned aerial systems.

So this is a way that we can help the Air Force train these new pilots with the very contractors that make things such as Global Hawk, Predator and with our universities that provide aviation training. I think it would be of great benefit and assistance to the Air Force.

The second amendment that I want to talk about is amendment No. 1484. This one seeks to give the Air National Guard units a larger role in the Global Hawk unmanned aerial systems mission. Specifically, this measure directs the Air Force to determine the feasibility of partnering the Air National Guard with Active-Duty Air Force to operate and maintain the Global Hawk. The RQ–4 Global Hawks, including the Block 20, Block 30, and Block 40 variants, are the Air Force's high-altitude, long-endurance aircraft for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

They are currently operated and maintained only by Active-Duty forces. But the Air National Guard could be providing a valuable adjunct to the Air Force's regular personnel if we allow them to do that. The North Dakota Air National Guard, for example, already operates and maintains the armed MQ–1 Predator, and does it exceptionally well. They and units like them are clearly capable of taking on part of the Global Hawk mission, in association with their Active-Duty counterparts.

This amendment would further the joint operations which have been a major initiative of all of the armed services, the Guard, and the Reserves in recent years, and they have done a tremendous job on jointness. It has made our military stronger, more effective, and more responsive. We need to continue to build on that joint operation. That is exactly what this amendment does.

The third amendment that I would like to discuss is amendment No. 1485. It regards the Nuclear Force Improvement Program. This amendment seeks to fortify the Nuclear Force Improvement Program, or NFIP, which I believe is crucial to our national security both now and well into the future. The reality is that we are facing an increasingly nuclearized future. Nations such as Iran, North Korea, and others have or are developing nuclear weapons.

That means we must maintain a credible, decisive nuclear deterrent. That is what the Nuclear Force Improvement Program is all about. In 2014, the Air Force initiated the program to bolster and enhance its nuclear missions, including the intercontinental ballistic missile, ICBM, and nuclear-capable bomber missions. The program involves a wide range of efforts to improve morale, update facilities and equipment, and reinvigorate the nuclear-related career fields in the Air Force.

We need to continue to invest in and build this program. Specifically, my amendment provides that the nuclear mission should be a top priority for the

Department of Defense and the Air Force; that Congress should support investments which sustain progress made under the Nuclear Force Improvement Program; that the Air Force should regularly inform Congress on the program's progress and any additional requirements it may identify; and that future Air Force budgets should reflect the importance of the nuclear mission and the need to support personnel performing the nuclear mission.

The bottom line is that the men and women assigned to the nuclear mission in the U.S. Air Force are doing incredibly important work every day for the security of our country. We need to do all we can to support them. We need to provide them with the support they deserve so they can continue to do the job we ask them to do and do it at the level that our security requires.

The Nuclear Force Improvement Program is a success, and the Air Force needs to extend it into the future and continue to shore up the foundations of our nuclear deterrent, which is, itself, at the foundation of national security.

In conclusion, let me say that working on legislation as essential as the defense of our Nation is and should be a bipartisan effort. The Senate Armed Services Committee passed this bill out of committee with a bipartisan vote of 22 to 4. Let's come together and do this for the American people and the men, women, and families who have undertaken the great and noble effort to protect our country.

I want to thank both the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking member for their hard work, for their bipartisanship, and, again, offer my support as we work to pass this vitally important legislation for our military and for this great country.

I yield the floor.

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. 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.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to tell you a little bit about Gregg Keesling, a dad and small business owner from Indianapolis. I have gotten to know Gregg over the past few years because Gregg and his wife Jannett lost their son Chancellor to suicide while Chancellor was serving in Iraq in 2009, joining a club he often says he doesn't want anyone else to join.

On the poster, this is Gregg and this is Chancellor. This is Chancellor again, on duty. This is the memorial they had for Chancellor.

Gregg recently said that he sees the invisible wounds borne by our men and women in uniform as ''one of the greatest challenges that our country faces.'' And he noted that ''we're going to face this challenge for many years to come.'' Gregg is right. We have lost more troops to suicide than in combat each of the past 3 years. We lost more than 400 Active-Duty, Guard, and Reserve servicemembers last year alone. It is also estimated that we lose 22 veterans to suicide every single day. These are preventable deaths.

We must do more to get these men and women the mental health care they have earned. We need to remind our troops and veterans, along with our friends and family, that it is OK to share the burden of their personal struggles. It is a sign of strength to seek help. Our servicemembers, veterans, and their families sacrifice for us, so we must do everything possible to support them.

Last year we passed and the President signed into law the Jacob Sexton Military Suicide Prevention Act, which for the first time requires an annual, in-person mental health assessment for all servicemembers, whether they are Active, Guard, or Reserve. Just like physical health, mental health is an essential piece of military readiness. We need to have an attitude of all-in toward providing support for mental health challenges and also for the day-to-day struggles we know contribute to suicide risk, such as financial problems, relationship issues—things that are never made easier by military life.

The Sexton act was named for a member of the Indiana National Guard who took his own life while home on leave from Afghanistan in 2009. Jeff and Barb Sexton, Jacob's parents, have been incredible partners in this work. Jeff recently spoke about the decision he and his wife made to speak out about military suicide.

This is SPC Jake Sexton. Here he is in his Humvee, and here he is serving as well. His parents, Jeff and Barb—actually, it was Jeff in particular, his dad, who said:

> I had three choices: I could crawl in a corner, I could crawl in a bottle or I could stand up and fight. It's not been an easy job, but it's something I feel me and my wife have to do.

The Keeslings and the Sextons are courageously telling their stories to help prevent any more families from going through this nightmare. Congress needs to continue to answer their call. This is an issue we cannot let up on because there is so much more important work to do.

This year, we are taking the next step in the continuum of care and focusing on improving the quality of and access to mental health care through Department of Defense providers, VA providers, and private community providers.

This year, we introduced the servicemember and veteran mental health care package—three bills. Each improves access to quality mental health care for servicemembers and veterans. The care package aims to improve mental health care by focusing on direct care providers at DOD and VA, community providers in their own towns, and the training of physician assistants as mental health providers.

I thank Chairman MCCAIN and Senator REED for working with me to include elements of the care package in the national defense bill, specifically those elements which deal with DOD and care for servicemembers.

I wish to go through the care package provisions in the NDAA briefly and offer two amendments to ensure that these provisions support not only servicemembers but also veterans.

First, section 716 is based on the first of our care package bills, the Community Provider Readiness Recognition Act. It is cosponsored by my friend, Senator JONI ERNST, and it creates a special military-friendly designation for providers who choose to receive training in military culture and the unique needs of servicemembers and military families. Providers who receive this designation would be listed in a regularly updated online registry, allowing servicemembers to search for designated providers in their area.

This bill is inspired by the Star Behavioral Health Provider Network, which is a program that the Military Family Research Institute at Purdue University built in Indiana to train providers to better understand military culture and medical treatments. Designating a provider as part of the Star Behavioral Health Provider Network helps servicemembers and their families make informed choices about where to seek care. This can easily be translated on a national scale so that servicemembers, veterans, and their families know which private mental health care providers are well-suited and trained to treat them.

Mr. President, second, section 713 of the NDAA is drawn from another care package bill, the Military and Veterans Mental Health Provider Assessment Act, cosponsored by my friend Senator ROGER WICKER of Mississippi.

This legislation requires that all of DOD primary care and mental health providers have received evidence-based training on suicide risk recognition and management and that their training be updated to keep pace with changes in mental health care best practices.

It also requires DOD to report to Congress on the military's current mental health workforce, the long-term mental health needs of servicemembers and military families, and how we ensure DOD meets those needs.

Finally, it requires the Department of Defense to bring us a plan to assess mental health outcomes in DOD care, variations in outcomes across different DOD health care facilities, and barriers to DOD mental health providers implementing the best clinical practice guidelines and other evidence-based treatments.

Finally, by including elements from the Frontline Mental Health Provider Training Act, cosponsored by my friend Senator JOHN BOOZMAN from Arkansas, the NDAA calls on the Department of

Defense to train physician assistants to specialize in psychiatric care in order to help meet the increasing demand for mental health services among servicemembers and their families. We are also working to extend the same spectrum of care to our veterans, and we are working toward a hearing on the corresponding veterans bills for this mental health care package in the months ahead. These are smart, bipartisan provisions that address one of the most serious challenges facing our military, our veterans and our country.

We must improve the mental health care at the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration and at private community providers from Ellsworth, ME, to Evansville, IN, to the shores of California so they are better able to serve our servicemembers, veterans, and their families. It is absolutely essential that we have coordination and continuity for servicemembers and their families as they transition to veteran status.

I will leave you with a couple of brief thoughts from two brave Hoosiers I have the privilege to know and have gotten to know well. Jeff Sexton, Jacob's dad, put it this way: ''It is one thing to lose someone you love in the war. It is a whole other thing to lose them to the war.'' And Gregg Keesling, Chancellor's dad, concluded this: ''The bottom line is I don't want anybody to go through what we've gone through.''

We must act and we must act now before any more families have to experience this loss from suicide. I urge all of my colleagues to support the care package provisions for servicemembers and to later extend them to our veterans who need our help and who need us to stand up for them.

Mr. President, 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. MURPHY. 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. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am coming to the floor to speak on behalf of an amendment I am offering, along with Senators SCHATZ, UDALL, BLUMENTHAL, HEINRICH, TESTER, MERKLEY, and BALDWIN.

Today, it was announced that President Obama is going to be sending another 450 troops to Iraq to help assist in the fight against ISIL. That will mean we now have 3,500 troops in position throughout Iraq assisting in the battle against ISIL within those borders. This marks also nearly a year since we have reengaged in military activities in Iraq and in Syria, both with support forces for the Iraqis, with training for those who are fighting in Syria, and major air operations targeting ISIL.

I think there is broad bipartisan consensus here that the United States needs to take the fight to this enemy—an enemy that is seeking to occupy an enormous amount of territory in a very dangerous region from which it can plot attacks against the United States. But I also think there is bipartisan agreement that we should do our constitutional duty; that we should authorize this war against ISIL. My hope is the Foreign Relations Committee—of which I am a member, of which the Presiding Officer is a member—will have that debate in the upcoming months.

But given that we are authorizing hundreds of millions of dollars in this bill in order to take the fight to ISIL, I think it makes sense to have some commonsense limitations on the use of that money that are in keeping with the very public promises the President has made.

President Obama has stated very clearly that he does not think it is a wise strategy to reinsert major combat troop operations into the Middle East. I agree with him. I think many of us agree with him. There is nothing about the last 10 years of American occupation in Iraq that tells us that U.S. troops inside Iraq can have the effect of killing more terrorists than are created, in part, through the recruitment benefit of major U.S. combat operations.

So the amendment we are offering today is a fairly simple one. It would prohibit the use of major combat—of large numbers of combat troops in the fight against ISIL, with certain commonsense exceptions: an exception for rescue operations, an exception for intelligence-gathering exercises, and an exception for special operations in and throughout the region; special operations like the one we used to kill a high-ranking ISIS commander just within the last several weeks.

We think it is important that Congress weigh in and state what we believe to be the desire and imperative of our constituents; that we learn from the mistakes of the Iraq war; that we don't repeat them by inserting thousands of American ground troops back into Iraq or perhaps Syria.

ISIS was created, first and foremost, primarily by a political vacuum inside Iraq, not a military vacuum. We need to acknowledge that any strategy to ultimately defeat ISIL, as we are all committed to, has to first and foremost have a realistic political strategy on the ground to divorce Sunni populations from this death cult that is ISIL.

Sunni grievances grew throughout Nouri al-Maliki's reign. They were denied an equitable share of oil revenues. They were excluded from government jobs. There were real atrocities committed against Sunni communities—mass incarcerations, torture, extrajudicial killings. If we don't have an Iraq Government that is committed to being inclusive of Sunni populations, there is no amount of American troops on the ground that can heal those divisions. In fact, what we know about the Iraq war is that major American combat operations on the ground in Iraq have an effect of exacerbating those divisions rather than healing them. They give space for people like Maliki to try to marginalize these populations. They increase suffering on the ground, especially for these populations that aren't represented effectively within the reigning Shiite government in Baghdad.

So if we really want to learn lessons from the past, then let's take President Obama at his word. Let's include in the NDAA a commonsense limitation, with exceptions, with respect to the deployment of major ground operations inside Iraq.

Now, there are some people who will say this isn't the role of Congress. I would just state for the record that there are a litany of examples in the past in which Congress has placed commonsense limitations on our authorizations for military force. In fact, the President, in submitting a proposed AUMF to the Foreign Relations Committee several months ago, in fact, included in that authorization of military force a limitation on ground forces. So this would be entirely consistent with the history of this body but also with the proposal the President has made.

I know, from having visited our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan, that it is easy for us to believe there is no mission that U.S. soldiers can't take on; that their capability, that their bravery, that their courage, that their adaptability knows no bounds. They have done admirable work inside Iraq over the course of the last 10 years, but what we know is that those troops inside Iraq also made Iraq what our own intelligence community called the cause celebre for the international terrorist movement, drawing in thousands of would-be terrorists to fight the Americans.

What we know is that the ISIS we are fighting today is a follow-on organization from Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was created because of the American invasion and occupation—maybe not in whole but certainly as the primary influence.

So we hope to be able to have a full debate on an authorization of military force. But with the inability to move that piece of legislation through the Foreign Relations Committee, we think it is proper on the NDAA to hold the President at his word, place a commonsense limitation on the use of ground troops and learn from the mistakes of the last 10 years inside Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I urge this Chamber to reject the motion to table my amendment, which put forward reforms to the Export-Import Bank. I would say to Members that this is going to be a key scored vote by the

U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers; that, without my amendment, we would not have the reforms to make sure Ex-Im works at least 25 percent of its portfolio with small businesses.

I urge Members to vote no on the motion to table my amendment by Mr. SHELBY that I understand is coming up. This is a key test vote, Export-Import Bank. With a good bipartisan vote, I would think we would have people supporting the Kirk-Heitkamp-Blunt-Graham reform legislation for Ex-Im.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY. 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. GRAHAM. 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. GRAHAM. Mr. President, very briefly. Senators AYOTTE and KIRK's amendment is coming up. There will be a motion to table. What we are trying to do is basically show support for the Ex-Im Bank, which is due to expire in June. We are trying to find a vehicle, a must-pass piece of legislation, to keep the Bank afloat. I think it is very important to the American economy that American manufacturers not be disadvantaged. The Ex-Im Bank makes money for the American taxpayer. China's Ex-Im Bank is larger than France, Germany, the United States, and England's combined.

What does this mean to the average person? When a product is made in the United States and sold into the developing world without the Ex-Im financing mechanism available to American manufacturers, we are going to lose market share to other countries like China, France, Germany that produce wide-body jets and other products. Eighty-nine percent of the people who get help from the Ex-Im Bank are small businesses.

This is an attempt to show the investor community and those who are watching this issue that the Senate is in support of the Bank. So I am urging a ''no'' vote on tabling. We had to do this procedurally. So this will be a signal to the markets that the Senate is in support of the Bank. I urge everyone who believes the Bank is vital to American exports and not against unilateral surrendering of market share to the Chinese and other competitors to vote no. There will be another vote of our choosing on a vehicle that will have to get to the President's desk. This is not the last vote we will take on Ex-Im Bank.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I understand we have a vote scheduled at 5 o'clock, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak for about 60 seconds.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

I came to the floor today to speak in favor of an amendment described earlier in the afternoon by Senator VITTER. This is an amendment, of course, to the National Defense Authorization Act that makes certain our U.S. Army is able to maintain the current number of brigade combat teams.

Sequestration is creating significant problems in many arenas but no more important than in the area of our Army and defense. The concern is that in the process of downsizing the Army as a result of sequestration and other reductions in available funding, brigade combat teams would be eliminated. Senator VITTER's amendment, which I support and am a cosponsor of, would eliminate that as an option.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Mr. SHELBY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Ayotte-Kirk amendment.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the amendment, which is a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. In my opinion, after evaluating this issue during a series of hearings in the Senate banking committee, there is no compelling case to reauthorize the bank.

After years of efforts to reform the Export-Import Bank, it has become clear to me that its problems are beyond repair and that the Bank's expiration is in the best interest of American taxpayers. Nearly 99 percent of all American exports—over $2 trillion—are financed without the Export-Import Bank's help, which demonstrates that the subsidies are more about corporate welfare than advancing our economy.

I believe the Export-Import Bank has outlived its usefulness and should be allowed to expire.

At this point, I move to table the Kirk amendment No. 1986 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

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 Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Boozman	Flake	Sanders
Capito	Gardner	Sasse
Cassidy	Grassley	Sessions
Corker	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Isakson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Paul	
Enzi	Perdue	

NAYS—65

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Bennet	Hatch	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Blunt	Heitkamp	Portman
Booker	Heller	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Scott
Carper	Kirk	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Manchin	Udall
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	McCain	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	

NOT VOTING—4

Merkley	Rubio
Reid	Toomey

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986 WITHDRAWN

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator KIRK, I withdraw amendment No. 1986.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is withdrawn.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1569, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1569, as modified, to the McCain amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Bob Corker, Michael B. Enzi, Susan M. Collins, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Daniel Coats, John McCain, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. COATS. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Sure.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 1986

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am very excited about the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment getting an overwhelming show of support. The reality is that if we do not vote on the Kirk-Heitkamp bill itself and pass it out of this Chamber, at the end of this month, the charter for the Ex-Im Bank will expire.

This vote has nothing to do with the charter for the Ex-Im Bank. It does nothing to prevent the charter for the Ex-Im Bank from expiring. This is at a time when China and India are pumping billions of dollars into their export credit agency. This is at a time when we have $15 billion worth of credit waiting to move through the Ex-Im Bank so we create jobs here in our country—jobs for American workers—and we are stalling the Bank.

When we had this discussion during the TPA debate, we wanted to have a vote that would guarantee we would have an opportunity to prevent the charter for the Ex-Im Bank from expiring. That is not this vote today.

I am extraordinarily gratified by the show of support because what it really does tell us is if we bring up an Ex-Im Bank bill on its own—an extension bill on its own—we will be able to prevent something from happening that could have catastrophic economic results in this country. So I urge this body to find a path forward to prevent the Ex-Im Bank charter from expiring, to have a path forward to honor our commitments that were made during an earlier vote so we can have a vote and actually move this bill forward and not simply have a vote to show support but actually pass a bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for her comments and I ask her this question: So that we understand the procedure that just took place, there was an amendment offered that would have extended the Ex-Im Bank and then a motion to table it, and I believe 60 Members or more voted against the motion to table, which shows a positive sentiment about extending the Ex-Im Bank charter. After that vote, the sponsors of the amendment withdrew the amendment from this bill.

So at this moment in time, I wish to ask the Senator, for absolute clarity: We have nothing before us that would extend the Ex-Im Bank either in this bill or in any other manner before the end of June when it expires; is that correct?

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DURBIN. And that creates a disadvantage for businesses in Illinois, and I am sure in North Dakota, in terms of exports and jobs, and unless we do take this seriously and quickly, they will be jeopardized.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think the other thing it does also is it is a signal to all of those companies we are competing with, whether it is China or India, that we are out of the business, and that opens a wide path for them to be in the business of exports. So this takes us out of the business of financing exports, which is going to have and will have catastrophic results. We don't have a path forward, and the charter of the Bank expires at the end of this month. Without a path forward, we are opening an opportunity for our competitors to take those exports and to take away our opportunity to have those jobs.

So I am very gratified by the result of this vote because I think it signals support for Ex-Im Bank. When we get this kind of support from the U.S. Senate—almost veto-proof support—maybe we ought to move the bill. People will say there isn't an opportunity to do that; there is no path forward. Let me tell my colleagues that there is no one in the country who believes that is true. If there is a will, there is a way.

We have to have a vote on the Export-Import Bank by the end of the month and get it over to the House so the House can support it and move this forward or we will be playing chicken with the exports of the United States of America.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Senator AYOTTE, in offering this amendment, talked about a forum in New Hampshire at General Electric where a number of small businesses participated. Senator CANTWELL and I were at that forum. We heard testimony from an employee of a company called Goss International, which makes large printing presses and competes mostly with Germany but with countries around the world. One of the issues she spoke about is that they have $10 million in deals that are sitting on the table at Ex-Im that they need to have approved before the end of June when the authorization expires. If those don't get approved, they are not going to be able to create 45 new jobs they are talking about being able to create as part of that deal.

So if the authorization for Ex-Im expires, not only is Goss going to have trouble with those jobs, but companies across this country are going to lose jobs that would be created if those financing deals could go through; isn't that the case?

Ms. HEITKAMP. In fact, the case is nearly $16 billion worth of American business and American exports that create American jobs will languish in the pipeline at the Ex-Im Bank because we foolishly let a charter expire at a time when we are in competition for exports, a competition for commerce throughout the world.

When we debated trade promotion—and a lot of us took some tough votes on TPA—we were promised a vote that would be mutually agreed upon here so we could advance the Ex-Im Bank by the end of June. We haven't gotten that vote because today all we did was show—I think rightfully so—that we have tremendous support in this body for the Ex-Im Bank and we shouldn't be held hostage to the narrow ideology of a few.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Yes.

Ms. CANTWELL. The Senator from North Dakota has obviously been working so hard on this in the Banking Committee, and she understands, I believe, that when the Bank expires on June 30, there is about $12 billion of approved deals that are in the process, and they will not be approved while the Bank is not operating; is that correct?

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is correct. The last number I was given, I say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, was almost $5.5 billion.

Ms. CANTWELL. So today's vote is a symbolic vote but does nothing to help us resolve the issue for getting this approved before June 30.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Unfortunately, too often we have symbolic votes that don't have real consequences in the real world. Our wonderful businesses that are outcompeting and outmanufacturing and outdeveloping and outresearching the rest of the world are now with their hands tied behind their backs and losing credits as we stand.

Ms. CANTWELL. Are there a lot of small businesses in South Dakota that are a part of this export economy?

I say that because I think a lot of people get the impression that this is about big manufacturers. I have always said those guys will take care of themselves; they have lots of people here to take care of them. But the small people who will actually lose business on June 30 don't have people here and that is why we are fighting so hard to get a vote before June 30 that actually will go over to the House on a vehicle.

Ms. HEITKAMP. We have companies in Wahpeton, ND, where bankruptcy has been prevented because they have been able to find their way to the Ex-Im Bank and actually find their way to a credit relationship with their importers.

We have a company in West Fargo that builds portable wheelchair ramps and they have saturated the market here and they are marketing these all

over the country. They will tell us today and tell anyone who will listen that the only reason they are as successful as they are is because of the credit agency, the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator for her leadership in committee. As she said, with 65 votes, we can do a lot of things to get this legislation out of here, so we will certainly be looking for those opportunities.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. HEITKAMP. I will.

Mrs. BOXER. First, before I ask my question, I wish to thank Senator HEITKAMP and Senator CANTWELL and Senator SHAHEEN. These three women have been just stalwart on this. We were on different sides on the trade vote, and I remember how hard they pushed for a real commitment, which I think in good faith they believed they got.

I am afraid what we saw here tonight is quite cynical. It doesn't do anything. I don't get what the point was.

Wouldn't it be far better if we got a commitment from the majority leader to set aside some time right after this bill—certainly before the end of this month, because as Senator CANTWELL always tells us, the end of the month is the end of the Bank.

So if we could get a commitment, I am asking my friend, would she be willing to agree to a time agreement so we wouldn't have to take up days and days and days to get this reauthorization done?

Ms. HEITKAMP. Absolutely. I think we have a vehicle, as we can say, for the Kirk-Heitkamp bill, which was, in fact, this amendment we just voted on. We have overwhelming support in the Senate. We will do anything we can to move this authorization forward because without it we are costing American jobs.

Mrs. BOXER. Another point I wish to make to my friend is I don't know if she is aware, but California has well over $1 billion of projects on the line. Even in our State, that is significant.

I just wanted to thank her and Senators CANTWELL and SHAHEEN and others who have worked so hard. I have been here a long time, and I know a cynical ploy when I see it. I just saw it.

I know how easy it is to resolve this problem. You have an overwhelming, filibuster-proof number of people who want this Bank reauthorized. All you probably need is an hour or so. Anytime night or day, we will come in. I would hope and I would ask my friend if she and her colleagues will pursue a meeting or ask directly at some point in time for a commitment to take this up and, within a reasonable time limit, get it done.

In my State, many jobs are dependent on this, and all across the Nation, as you have eloquently pointed out, as well as Senators CANTWELL and SHAHEEN. I thank you for your leadership.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank my friend from California.

I would say that as much as relationships here matter, what matters more to me is Americans working. What matters more to me are the jobs that will be lost and the opportunities that will be lost, as these manufacturing facilities and as these great innovative manufacturers have worked so hard. Think about all the work that is behind almost $16 billion worth of credit, all the relationships. All of a sudden, they have to say to their customer: Guess what. I am not there.

I would suggest that one of the most heart-wrenching stories I have heard about the loss already of a big deal came out of California—a 100-percent disabled vet who told us he has already lost $57 million and he is on a path to lose a $200 million deal out of the Philippines, and that means jobs, jobs, jobs.

In California, jobs matter. In North Dakota, jobs matter. All across this country, jobs matter. If we can start putting the focus on jobs and the American worker first instead of ideology and politics, if we stop playing games, we can get things done here.

What was interesting to me is people say: Well, there is no path forward.

Really? I think that if we needed a bill passed, if, in fact, we were in a spot where in 2 weeks or 2-plus weeks we were going to lose the charter of the Ex-Im Bank—and we are in that spot. If you really care about the Ex-Im Bank, if you really care about American jobs, you would figure out a way to pass this bill out of the Senate for which we have 65 votes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1548 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JANET BURRELL

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to honor and thank Janet Burrell for her 37 years of talented and dedicated public service upon her retirement from the Senate. Her career in the Senate spans an impressive array of issues and responsibilities—all of which she met with grace, skill, and good cheer. For the last 16 years, Janet has served as the office administrator for the Democratic staff of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Janet started her career in the Senate on the Committee on Finance in 1985 as a staff assistant. She and her colleagues worked around the clock—taking shifts, day and night—to help enact the mammoth and historic Tax Reform Act of 1986. From the Committee on Finance, she moved to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and, finally, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which is now the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Over her 30 years of service in the Senate, Janet worked on teams tackling a wide range of legislation, moving from the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003. She has worked for six Senators over the years, including both Republicans and Democrats, in both the majority and the minority, and even in a Senate evenly split between Democrats and Republicans.

Along the way in her Senate career, Janet learned and mastered a broad array of new skills from managing human resources to operating computers to learning the intricacies of how to make a committee run smoothly. She was the office administrator of the now-Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs during the 9/11 terrorist attacks, when anthrax was discovered in the Senate, and even during an earthquake. The challenges were difficult and diverse but Janet rose to every task. Among other things, at the time of the anthrax incident, Janet supervised the young staff who opened the mail. In that capacity, it was among her responsibilities to calm the fears of the staff and their worried parents. She was also responsible for figuring out evacuation drills for scenarios like a biological attack, terrorist attack, or active shooter—risks that few could have envisioned when she started with the committee 16 years ago. Janet also helped shape Senate history. Beginning in 2004, she played an instrumental role in orchestrating the committee's transition from the Governmental Affairs Committee to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Prior to serving in the Senate, Janet worked in the House of Representatives for my former colleague, Ralph H. Regula of Ohio, and she served 7 years in the executive branch at the U.S. Office of Government Ethics and at the U.S. General Services Administration.

In every office that she was a part of, Janet acted as a force of calm and generosity at the center of chaotic day-to-day, week-to-week schedules. Her colleagues are quick to share stories of times when Janet went above and beyond the call of duty to make someone's day smoother. In fact, they tell me that her selflessness and kindness was reflected in every task she took on. One of Janet's former staff directors said that Janet, ''always did whatever had to be done to make sure that

others felt and understood how much they were appreciated.'' I couldn't agree more. She truly embodies the Golden Rule by always treating others as she would want to be treated. As she gracefully exits her lifelong career in public service, Janet leaves behind a family of colleagues that will miss her and long remember her.

As we speak of Janet's most significant accomplishments, I would be remiss if I did not mention Janet's daughter Ashley, the apple of her eye. Ashley got an early start in the Senate—as an infant in the Senate day care center. She went on to be one of the few students at her high school to earn a full international baccalaureate diploma. From there, Ashley earned an advanced degree in counseling and is now fully licensed, helping numerous young adults and families as they cope with life's challenges. Clearly, the apple did not fall far from the tree.

Upon her retirement, I thank Janet for the many invaluable contributions she has made to our committee, the Senate, the Federal Government, and our Nation. I congratulate her on a truly remarkable career. On behalf of all of us in the Senate, I want to wish her and her family the very best in all that lies ahead for each of them. Godspeed.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING B. GREEN & COMPANY ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize a special Baltimore company—B. Green & Company—on its 100th anniversary, which will be celebrated this Saturday, June 13. Benjamin Green founded this great Baltimore company one century ago. He was an immigrant from Lithuania who worked as a street peddler before starting a wholesale grocery business in 1915 in a rowhouse located at 828 West Baltimore Street. He made deliveries to Baltimore-area grocery stores by horse-drawn carts and later by ''tin lizzy'' type trucks.

One hundred years ago, warehouses were multistoried buildings, recordkeeping, inventories, and billing were done by hand, and most items—even commodities like butter—were sold in bulk. Today, we have sprawling one-story warehouses accessible by tractor-trailer trucks. ''Just in time'' inventories are tracked by barcode. Computer software has automated much of the book-keeping and billing. And products of all types are sold in more convenient packages.

B. Green & Company was—and remains—a family business. All of Benjamin Green's children—his sons Sam and Bernie and his daughters Rose, Anna, Sarah, and Dora ''Duckye'' and their spouses joined in supporting the business, learning it from the ground up. As they developed their own areas of expertise, the size and nature and status of the company grew. The third generation of the family joined their parents in the business in the 1960s and 1970s. Today, the remaining family members in the business are chief executive officer Benjamin ''Benjy'' Green and his cousins Ben Sigman, chairman emeritus; and Bernice Sigman, a retired physician and board member.

For a company to survive and prosper for 100 years, it needs to evolve and change with the times. During World War II, the company started supplying food to military bases and grew into the largest military commissary supplier on the east coast. In 1948, B. Green & Company was one of the first food wholesalers to use data processing equipment. Also, that year, the company relocated to the first single-story warehouse in the area at 2200 Winchester Street. A catastrophic fire destroyed the entire warehouse and most of the corporate offices in 1959, but the company had such strong relations with its suppliers and customers that it was able to resume delivering groceries from a rented warehouse within a few days.

In 1966, B. Green & Company purchased Capital Wholesale Grocery Company, which allowed it to add the Cash & Carry business. The corporate offices were moved to 400 West Conway Street where the Cash & Carry was located. In 1968, the company acquired Colonial Foods Distributing Company to add gourmet and specialty foods and snack items to the main grocery products, and to add some national chains as customers. In 1972, the company acquired property at 3601 Washington Boulevard from Westinghouse to expand warehousing capacity, and the corporate offices relocated there in 1975. Three years later, the company acquired Southern Beef Company to expand its line of meat products.

B. Green & Company eventually became the largest grocery wholesaler on the east coast. In 1979, it helped pioneer warehouse-style, low-price, no-frills supermarkets by opening the York Warehouse Food Market. In 1983, using state-of-the-art technology, it became one of the first wholesalers to use a mechanized warehouse system. In 1989, the Maryland Stadium Authority, by the ''right of eminent domain'', condemned the 400 West Conway location to build Oriole Park at Camden Yards. Cash & Carry moved to its current location at 1300 South Monroe Street.

By 1991, with annual sales of $675 million, B. Green & Company ranked 263d on Forbes magazine's list of the Nation's largest private companies. But the company continued to evolve, shifting its focus from wholesaling to retailing. In 1992, it sold its military distribution business to Nash Finch, a Minnesota-based wholesale grocery distributer. In 1993, it sold its civilian distribution business to Richfood of Richmond, VA.

Today, B. Green & Company runs several different food operations. It still distributes groceries to food retailers who are too small for the big wholesalers. It continues to run Cash & Carry from the warehouse at 1300 South Monroe Street and another one located at 2401 Belair Road. Cash & Carry is a members-only warehouse where many corner grocers in the area can shop for goods. And it operates two ''everyday-low-price'' Food Depot stores in Baltimore at the Belair Road site, which opened in 1996, and at 2495 Frederick Avenue, which opened in 2008. These stores ushered in a new generation of urban full-service supermarkets, featuring a fresh seafood and fish department, one of the largest and most diversified produce departments in Baltimore City, a full-service deli and bakery, and a meat department with a great variety of products and cuts of meat. The stores succeed as independent grocers by customizing their products and services to the neighborhoods they serve. Store managers and associates are encouraged to suggest products and merchandising strategies. In 2011, the company expanded into Howard County with a new format, the Green Valley Marketplace at 7280 Montgomery Road in Elkridge, MD. Green Valley Marketplace is a new suburban supermarket.

I am proud that B. Green & Company launched a campaign to expand healthy food choices in the city's poorest neighborhoods in a partnership with the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health that encourages shoppers to buy healthier items and fewer highly processed foods. Many Food Depot customers rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. The stores have licensed dieticians on-site who teach customers how to shop for and prepare healthy meals on a budget.

Today, B. Green & Company employs nearly 500 associates, who are considered extended family. Benjy Green knows most of them by name and can recount their backgrounds. The company thrives 100 years after its creation because, as Benjy put it, ''we know the neighborhood we serve better than the other guy''. It thrives because it treats its employees and its customers with respect. It thrives because it fulfills a vital function in communities across Baltimore and the surrounding area. I would ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating B. Green & Company on its 100th anniversary and sending best wishes for the next 100 years.•

CONGRATULATING JAYDYN CHILD

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Jaydyn Child who was recently awarded the Girl Scouts' Gold Award, the highest possible award granted to Girl Scouts. Jaydyn is a dedicated Girl Scout and high school junior from Dillon, MT. She earned this prestigious honor for her service project entitled, ''Teen Suicide—Your Life is Worth Living.'' Through this project she spent 150 hours of her time working, fundraising, making bracelets and creating pamphlets to raise awareness. Additionally, she organized

events in local schools for an anti-bullying speaker to educate students about suicide prevention.

Montana currently has the highest suicide rate in the Nation, and a rate twice the national average for suicide amongst teenagers and young adults. Jaydyn is doing a tremendous job informing her peers and the community and she is right to be commended. Jaydyn is exemplifying the best of Montana through her selflessness and dedication to others.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. LEODREY WILLIAMS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I honor Dr. Leodrey Williams, chancellor of the Southern University Agricultural Research and Extension Center, on his retirement after 50 years of public service.

Dr. Williams is a 1961 graduate of Southern University of Louisiana in vocational agriculture education. Immediately upon graduation, he began his distinguished career by joining the U.S. Army and training as an oral x-ray technician and hygienist. He then began working for cooperative extension, where he helped to build the new curriculum by assisting and launching the program throughout the State of Louisiana. He earned a master of science degree in 1970 and doctor of education degree in 1975 from Louisiana State University. After 5 years as an agriculture specialist, Dr. Williams returned to Louisiana State University as an associate professor and director of equal employment opportunity and civil rights. In 1991, Dr. Williams co-chaired a national task force that studied America's cooperative extension system. He was subsequently appointed Special Assistant to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Extension Administrator, and he was later named the National Director of Extension.

Besides his active involvement in agriculture, Dr. Williams has served as a consultant to the governments of Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, and Republic of South Africa in the areas of extension administration and adult and continuing education. During his visits to China, Honduras, and Liberia, he assisted in developing strategies for university collaboration and exchange, along with addressing concerns and issues facing urban populations.

For the past 14 years, Dr. Williams has been the first chancellor for the Southern University Agricultural Research and Extension Center. He has served the citizens of Louisiana, Louisiana State University, and the Southern University System with his knowledge, skill, enthusiasm, and leadership.

I am pleased to honor the esteemed career of Dr. Leodrey Williams. I thank him for his years of service to our state and country and wish him the best in his future endeavors.●

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.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13405 OF JUNE 16, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO BELARUS—PM 19

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 2015*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 235. An act to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

H.R. 889. An act to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

H.R. 2051. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2088. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to improve inspection services performed at export elevators at export port locations, to reauthorize certain authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under such Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2289. An act to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2394. An act to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2577. An act 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.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 235. An act to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2051. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2088. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to improve inspection services performed at export elevators at export port locations, to reauthorize certain authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2289. An act to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2394. An act to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2577. An act 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; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016'' (Rept. No. 114–61).

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment:

S. 552. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 957. A bill to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 958. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for team and joint venture offers for certain contracts.

S. 966. A bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 967. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes.

S. 999. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers.

S. 1000. A bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 1001. A bill to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

S. 1292. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to treat certain qualified disaster areas as HUBZones and to extend the period for HUBZone treatment for certain base closure areas, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance to small business concerns for disaster recovery, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Azita Raji, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Sweden.

*Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Latvia.

*Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo.

*Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Georgia.

*Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Croatia.

*Sunil Sabharwal, of California, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators .

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Daniel L. Angermiller and ending with Laura Merritt Stone, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2015. (minus 1 nominee: Stuart MacKenzie Hatcher)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Bruce Matthews and ending with Brian Stephen Zelakiewicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2015.

*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. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1535. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to with respect to passenger motor vehicle crash avoidance information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1536. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1537. A bill to establish grant programs to improve the health of border area residents and for all hazards preparedness in the border area including bioterrorism, infectious disease, and noncommunicable emerging threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1538. A bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1539. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1540. A bill to improve the enforcement of prohibitions on robocalls, including fraudulent robocalls; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1541. A bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1542. A bill to establish a program that promotes reforms in workforce education and skill training for manufacturing in States and metropolitan areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 1543. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1544. A bill to rescind unused earmarks provided for the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1545. A bill to require a quarterly report by the Federal Communications Commission on the Lifeline program funded by the Universal Service Fund; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1546. A bill to establish an export credit insurance program in the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1547. A bill to provide high-skilled visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees, reduce the rate of the corporate income tax, provide tax credits to workers, deliver additional benefits to retired and disabled Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1549. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1550. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 198. A resolution commemorating the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, often referred to as the ''Second Founding'' of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) 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. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) 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. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1054

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1054, a bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) 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. 1193

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1256

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, loan program, and technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1312

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to modernize Federal policies regarding the supply and distribution of energy in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1385, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring race or ethnicity to be disclosed in connection with the transfer of a firearm.

S. 1398

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1398, a bill to extend, improve, and consolidate energy research and development programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1407

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1407, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 1428

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 194

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 194, a resolution welcoming the President of the Republic of Korea on her official visit to the United States and celebrating the United States-Republic of Korea relationship, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1474

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1474 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1500 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1569 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1578 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1615

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1615 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1622

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1622 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1628

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1628 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1647

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1647 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1650

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1650 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1684

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1684 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1704

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1704 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1710

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1710 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1748

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1748 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1760

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1760 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1783

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1783 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1798

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1798 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1853

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1853 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1874

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1874 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1889

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1889 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1898

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1898 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1916 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1941

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1941 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1944

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1944 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1945

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1945 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1948

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1948 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1958

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1958 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1961

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1961 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1962

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1962 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1966

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1966 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act 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, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1538. A bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1538

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Fair Elections Now Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
TITLE I—FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS
Subtitle A—Fair Elections Financing Program
Sec. 101. Findings and declarations.
Sec. 102. Eligibility requirements and benefits of Fair Elections financing of Senate election campaigns.
Sec. 103. Prohibition on joint fundraising committees.
Sec. 104. Exception to limitation on coordinated expenditures by political party committees with participating candidates.
TITLE II—IMPROVING VOTER INFORMATION
Sec. 201. Broadcasts relating to all Senate candidates.
Sec. 202. Broadcast rates for participating candidates.
Sec. 203. FCC to prescribe standardized form for reporting candidate campaign ads.
TITLE III—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Sec. 301. Petition for certiorari.
Sec. 302. Filing by Senate candidates with Commission.
Sec. 303. Electronic filing of FEC reports.
TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION IN FUNDING OF ELECTIONS
Sec. 401. Refundable tax credit for Senate campaign contributions.
TITLE V—REVENUE PROVISIONS
Sec. 501. Fair Elections Fund revenue.
TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
Sec. 601. Severability.
Sec. 602. Effective date.

TITLE I—FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Subtitle A—Fair Elections Financing Program

SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

(a) UNDERMINING OF DEMOCRACY BY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PRIVATE SOURCES.—The Senate finds and declares that the current system of privately financed campaigns for election to the United States Senate has the capacity, and is often perceived by the public, to undermine democracy in the United States by—

(1) creating a culture that fosters actual or perceived conflicts of interest by encouraging Senators to accept large campaign contributions from private interests that are directly affected by Federal legislation;

(2) diminishing or appearing to diminish Senators' accountability to constituents by compelling legislators to be accountable to the major contributors who finance their election campaigns;

(3) undermining the meaning of the right to vote by allowing monied interests to have a disproportionate and unfair influence within the political process;

(4) imposing large, unwarranted costs on taxpayers through legislative and regulatory distortions caused by unequal access to lawmakers for campaign contributors;

(5) making it difficult for some qualified candidates to mount competitive Senate election campaigns;

(6) disadvantaging challengers and discouraging competitive elections; and

(7) burdening incumbents with a preoccupation with fundraising and thus decreasing the time available to carry out their public responsibilities.

(b) ENHANCEMENT OF DEMOCRACY BY PROVIDING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.—The Senate finds and declares that providing the option of the replacement of large private campaign contributions with allocations from the Fair Elections Fund for all primary, runoff, and general elections to the Senate would enhance American democracy by—

(1) reducing the actual or perceived conflicts of interest created by fully private financing of the election campaigns of public officials and restoring public confidence in the integrity and fairness of the electoral and legislative processes through a program which allows participating candidates to adhere to substantially lower contribution limits for contributors with an assurance that there will be sufficient funds for such candidates to run viable electoral campaigns;

(2) increasing the public's confidence in the accountability of Senators to the constituents who elect them, which derives from the program's qualifying criteria to participate in the voluntary program and the conclusions that constituents may draw regarding candidates who qualify and participate in the program;

(3) helping to reduce the ability to make large campaign contributions as a determinant of a citizen's influence within the political process by facilitating the expression of support by voters at every level of wealth, encouraging political participation, and incentivizing participation on the part of Senators through the matching of small dollar contributions;

(4) potentially saving taxpayers billions of dollars that may be (or that are perceived to be) currently allocated based upon legislative and regulatory agendas skewed by the influence of campaign contributions;

(5) creating genuine opportunities for all Americans to run for the Senate and encouraging more competitive elections;

(6) encouraging participation in the electoral process by citizens of every level of wealth; and

(7) freeing Senators from the incessant preoccupation with raising money, and allowing them more time to carry out their public responsibilities.

SEC. 102. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND BENEFITS OF FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE V—FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING OF SENATE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

"Subtitle A—General Provisions

"SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) ALLOCATION FROM THE FUND.—The term 'allocation from the Fund' means an allocation of money from the Fair Elections Fund to a participating candidate pursuant to section 522.

''(2) BOARD.—The term 'Board' means the Fair Elections Oversight Board established under section 531.

''(3) FAIR ELECTIONS QUALIFYING PERIOD.—The term 'Fair Elections qualifying period' means, with respect to any candidate for Senator, the period—

''(A) beginning on the date on which the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1); and

''(B) ending on the date that is 30 days before—

''(i) the date of the primary election; or

''(ii) in the case of a State that does not hold a primary election, the date prescribed by State law as the last day to qualify for a position on the general election ballot.

''(4) FAIR ELECTIONS START DATE.—The term 'Fair Elections start date' means, with respect to any candidate, the date that is 180 days before—

''(A) the date of the primary election; or

''(B) in the case of a State that does not hold a primary election, the date prescribed by State law as the last day to qualify for a position on the general election ballot.

''(5) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Fair Elections Fund established by section 502.

''(6) IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—The term 'immediate family' means, with respect to any candidate—

''(A) the candidate's spouse;

''(B) a child, stepchild, parent, grandparent, brother, half-brother, sister, or half-sister of the candidate or the candidate's spouse; and

''(C) the spouse of any person described in subparagraph (B).

''(7) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'matching contribution' means a matching payment provided to a participating candidate for qualified small dollar contributions, as provided under section 523.

''(8) NONPARTICIPATING CANDIDATE.—The term 'nonparticipating candidate' means a candidate for Senator who is not a participating candidate.

''(9) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATE.—The term 'participating candidate' means a candidate for Senator who is certified under section 515 as being eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund.

''(10) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'qualifying contribution' means, with respect to a candidate, a contribution that—

''(A) is in an amount that is—

''(i) not less than the greater of $5 or the amount determined by the Commission under section 531; and

''(ii) not more than the greater of $150 or the amount determined by the Commission under section 531;

''(B) is made by an individual—

''(i) who is a resident of the State in which such candidate is seeking election; and

''(ii) who is not otherwise prohibited from making a contribution under this Act;

''(C) is made during the Fair Elections qualifying period; and

''(D) meets the requirements of section 512(b).

''(11) QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'qualified small dollar contribution' means, with respect to a candidate, any contribution (or series of contributions)—

''(A) which is not a qualifying contribution (or does not include a qualifying contribution);

''(B) which is made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution under this Act; and

''(C) the aggregate amount of which does not exceed the greater of—

''(i) $150 per election; or

''(ii) the amount per election determined by the Commission under section 531.

''(12) QUALIFYING MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualifying multicandidate political committee contribution' means any contribution to a candidate that is made from a qualified account of a multicandidate political committee (within the meaning of section 315(a)(2)).

''(B) QUALIFIED ACCOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'qualified account' means, with respect to a multicandidate political committee, a separate, segregated account of the committee that consists solely of contributions which meet the following requirements:

''(i) All contributions to such account are made by individuals who are not prohibited from making contributions under this Act.

''(ii) The aggregate amount of contributions from each individual to such account and all other accounts of the political committee do not exceed the amount described in paragraph (11)(C).

"SEC. 502. FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the 'Fair Elections Fund'.

''(b) AMOUNTS HELD BY FUND.—The Fund shall consist of the following amounts:

''(1) APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to the Fund.

''(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

''(i) there should be imposed on any payment made to any person (other than a State or local government or a foreign nation) who has contracts with the Government of the United States in excess of $10,000,000 a tax equal to 0.50 percent of amount paid pursuant to such contracts, except that the aggregate tax for any person for any taxable year shall not exceed $500,000; and

''(ii) the revenue from such tax should be appropriated to the Fund.

''(2) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Voluntary contributions to the Fund.

''(3) OTHER DEPOSITS.—Amounts deposited into the Fund under—

''(A) section 513(c) (relating to exceptions to contribution requirements);

''(B) section 521(c) (relating to remittance of allocations from the Fund);

''(C) section 533 (relating to violations); and

''(D) any other section of this Act.

''(4) INVESTMENT RETURNS.—Interest on, and the proceeds from, the sale or redemption of, any obligations held by the Fund under subsection (c).

''(c) INVESTMENT.—The Commission shall invest portions of the Fund in obligations of the United States in the same manner as provided under section 9602(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(d) USE OF FUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The sums in the Fund shall be used to provide benefits to participating candidates as provided in subtitle C.

''(2) INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS.—Under regulations established by the Commission, rules similar to the rules of section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply.

"Subtitle B—Eligibility and Certification

"SEC. 511. ELIGIBILITY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator is eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for any election if the candidate meets the following requirements:

''(1) The candidate files with the Commission a statement of intent to seek certification as a participating candidate under this title during the period beginning on the Fair Elections start date and ending on the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period.

''(2) The candidate meets the qualifying contribution requirements of section 512.

''(3) Not later than the last day of the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate files with the Commission an affidavit signed by the candidate and the treasurer of the candidate's principal campaign committee declaring that the candidate—

''(A) has complied and, if certified, will comply with the contribution and expenditure requirements of section 513;

''(B) if certified, will comply with the debate requirements of section 514;

''(C) if certified, will not run as a nonparticipating candidate during such year in any election for the office that such candidate is seeking; and

''(D) has either qualified or will take steps to qualify under State law to be on the ballot.

''(b) GENERAL ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be eligible to receive an allocation from the Fund for a general election or a general runoff election unless the candidate's party nominated the candidate to be placed on the ballot for the general election or the candidate otherwise qualified to be on the ballot under State law.

"SEC. 512. QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirement of this section if, during the Fair Elections qualifying period, the candidate obtains—

''(1) a number of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

''(A) the sum of—

''(i) 2,000; plus

''(ii) 500 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election; or

''(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531; and

''(2) a total dollar amount of qualifying contributions equal to the greater of—

''(A) 10 percent of the amount of the allocation such candidate would be entitled to receive for the primary election under section 522(c)(1) (determined without regard to paragraph (5) thereof) if such candidate were a participating candidate; or

''(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RECEIPT OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTION.—Each qualifying contribution—

''(1) may be made by means of a personal check, money order, debit card, credit card, or electronic payment account;

''(2) shall be accompanied by a signed statement containing—

''(A) the contributor's name and the contributor's address in the State in which the contributor is registered to vote; and

''(B) an oath declaring that the contributor—

''(i) understands that the purpose of the qualifying contribution is to show support for the candidate so that the candidate may qualify for Fair Elections financing;

''(ii) is making the contribution in his or her own name and from his or her own funds;

''(iii) has made the contribution willingly; and

''(iv) has not received anything of value in return for the contribution; and

''(3) shall be acknowledged by a receipt that is sent to the contributor with a copy kept by the candidate for the Commission and a copy kept by the candidate for the election authorities in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election.

''(c) VERIFICATION OF QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Commission shall establish procedures for the auditing and verification of qualifying contributions to ensure that such contributions meet the requirements of this section.

"SEC. 513. CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—A candidate for Senator meets the requirements of this section

if, during the election cycle of the candidate, the candidate—

''(1) except as provided in subsection (b), accepts no contributions other than—

''(A) qualifying contributions;

''(B) qualified small dollar contributions;

''(C) qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions;

''(D) allocations from the Fund under section 522;

''(E) matching contributions under section 523; and

''(F) vouchers provided to the candidate under section 524;

''(2) makes no expenditures from any amounts other than from—

''(A) qualifying contributions;

''(B) qualified small dollar contributions;

''(C) qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions;

''(D) allocations from the Fund under section 522;

''(E) matching contributions under section 523; and

''(F) vouchers provided to the candidate under section 524; and

''(3) makes no expenditures from personal funds or the funds of any immediate family member (other than funds received through qualified small dollar contributions and qualifying contributions).

For purposes of this subsection, a payment made by a political party in coordination with a participating candidate shall not be treated as a contribution to or as an expenditure made by the participating candidate.

''(b) CONTRIBUTIONS FOR LEADERSHIP PACS, ETC.—A political committee of a participating candidate which is not an authorized committee of such candidate may accept contributions other than contributions described in subsection (a)(1) from any person if—

''(1) the aggregate contributions from such person for any calendar year do not exceed $150; and

''(2) no portion of such contributions is disbursed in connection with the campaign of the participating candidate.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a candidate shall not be treated as having failed to meet the requirements of this section if any contributions that are not qualified small dollar contributions, qualifying contributions, qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions, or contributions that meet the requirements of subsection (b) and that are accepted before the date the candidate files a statement of intent under section 511(a)(1) are—

''(1) returned to the contributor; or

''(2) submitted to the Commission for deposit in the Fund.

''SEC. 514. DEBATE REQUIREMENT.

''A candidate for Senator meets the requirements of this section if the candidate participates in at least—

''(1) 1 public debate before the primary election with other participating candidates and other willing candidates from the same party and seeking the same nomination as such candidate; and

''(2) 2 public debates before the general election with other participating candidates and other willing candidates seeking the same office as such candidate.

''SEC. 515. CERTIFICATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days after a candidate for Senator files an affidavit under section 511(a)(3), the Commission shall—

''(1) certify whether or not the candidate is a participating candidate; and

''(2) notify the candidate of the Commission's determination.

''(b) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may revoke a certification under subsection (a) if—

''(A) a candidate fails to qualify to appear on the ballot at any time after the date of certification; or

''(B) a candidate otherwise fails to comply with the requirements of this title, including any regulatory requirements prescribed by the Commission.

''(2) REPAYMENT OF BENEFITS.—If certification is revoked under paragraph (1), the candidate shall repay to the Fund an amount equal to the value of benefits received under this title plus interest (at a rate determined by the Commission) on any such amount received.

''Subtitle C—Benefits

''SEC. 521. BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For each election with respect to which a candidate is certified as a participating candidate, such candidate shall be entitled to—

''(1) an allocation from the Fund to make or obligate to make expenditures with respect to such election, as provided in section 522;

''(2) matching contributions, as provided in section 523; and

''(3) for the general election, vouchers for broadcasts of political advertisements, as provided in section 524.

''(b) RESTRICTION ON USES OF ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—Allocations from the Fund received by a participating candidate under section 522 and matching contributions under section 523 may only be used for campaign-related costs.

''(c) REMITTING ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 45 days after an election in which the participating candidate appeared on the ballot, such participating candidate shall remit to the Commission for deposit in the Fund an amount equal to the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of money in the candidate's campaign account; or

''(B) the sum of the allocations from the Fund received by the candidate under section 522 and the matching contributions received by the candidate under section 523.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a candidate who qualifies to be on the ballot for a primary runoff election, a general election, or a general runoff election, the amounts described in paragraph (1) may be retained by the candidate and used in such subsequent election.

''SEC. 522. ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make allocations from the Fund under section 521(a)(1) to a participating candidate—

''(1) in the case of amounts provided under subsection (c)(1), not later than 48 hours after the date on which such candidate is certified as a participating candidate under section 515;

''(2) in the case of a general election, not later than 48 hours after—

''(A) the date of the certification of the results of the primary election or the primary runoff election; or

''(B) in any case in which there is no primary election, the date the candidate qualifies to be placed on the ballot; and

''(3) in the case of a primary runoff election or a general runoff election, not later than 48 hours after the certification of the results of the primary election or the general election, as the case may be.

''(b) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall distribute funds available to participating candidates under this section through the use of an electronic funds exchange or a debit card.

''(c) AMOUNTS.—

''(1) PRIMARY ELECTION ALLOCATION; INITIAL ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 67 percent of the base amount with respect to such participating candidate.

''(2) PRIMARY RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a primary runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount the participating candidate was eligible to receive under this section for the primary election.

''(3) GENERAL ELECTION ALLOCATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to the base amount with respect to such candidate.

''(4) GENERAL RUNOFF ELECTION ALLOCATION.—The Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund for a general runoff election to a participating candidate in an amount equal to 25 percent of the base amount with respect to such candidate.

''(5) UNCONTESTED ELECTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a primary or general election that is an uncontested election, the Commission shall make an allocation from the Fund to a participating candidate for such election in an amount equal to 25 percent of the allocation which such candidate would be entitled to under this section for such election if this paragraph did not apply.

''(B) UNCONTESTED ELECTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, an election is uncontested if not more than 1 candidate has campaign funds (including payments from the Fund) in an amount equal to or greater than 10 percent of the allocation a participating candidate would be entitled to receive under this section for such election if this paragraph did not apply.

''(d) BASE AMOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the base amount for any candidate is an amount equal to the greater of—

''(A) the sum of—

''(i) $750,000; plus

''(ii) $150,000 for each congressional district in the State with respect to which the candidate is seeking election; or

''(B) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

''(2) INDEXING.—In each even-numbered year after 2019—

''(A) each dollar amount under paragraph (1)(A) shall be increased by the percent difference between the price index (as defined in section 315(c)(2)(A)) for the 12 months preceding the beginning of such calendar year and the price index for calendar year 2018;

''(B) each dollar amount so increased shall remain in effect for the 2-year period beginning on the first day following the date of the last general election in the year preceding the year in which the amount is increased and ending on the date of the next general election; and

''(C) if any amount after adjustment under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $100, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

''SEC. 523. MATCHING PAYMENTS FOR QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall pay to each participating candidate an amount equal to 600 percent of the amount of qualified small dollar contributions received by the candidate from individuals who are residents of the State in which such participating candidate is seeking election after the date on which such candidate is certified under section 515.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The aggregate payments under subsection (a) with respect to any candidate shall not exceed the greater of—

''(1) 400 percent of the allocation such candidate is entitled to receive for such election under section 522 (determined without regard to subsection (c)(5) thereof); or

''(2) the percentage of such allocation determined by the Commission under section 531.

''(c) TIME OF PAYMENT.—The Commission shall make payments under this section not later than 2 business days after the receipt of a report made under subsection (d).

''(d) REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each participating candidate shall file reports of receipts of qualified small dollar contributions at such times and in such manner as the Commission may by regulations prescribe.

''(2) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Each report under this subsection shall disclose—

''(A) the amount of each qualified small dollar contribution received by the candidate;

''(B) the amount of each qualified small dollar contribution received by the candidate from a resident of the State in which the candidate is seeking election; and

''(C) the name, address, and occupation of each individual who made a qualified small dollar contribution to the candidate.

''(3) FREQUENCY OF REPORTS.—Reports under this subsection shall be made no more frequently than—

''(A) once every month until the date that is 90 days before the date of the election;

''(B) once every week after the period described in subparagraph (A) and until the date that is 21 days before the election; and

''(C) once every day after the period described in subparagraph (B).

''(4) LIMITATION ON REGULATIONS.—The Commission may not prescribe any regulations with respect to reporting under this subsection with respect to any election after the date that is 180 days before the date of such election.

''(e) APPEALS.—The Commission shall provide a written explanation with respect to any denial of any payment under this section and shall provide the opportunity for review and reconsideration within 5 business days of such denial.

''SEC. 524. POLITICAL ADVERTISING VOUCHERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish and administer a voucher program for the purchase of airtime on broadcasting stations for political advertisements in accordance with the provisions of this section.

''(b) CANDIDATES.—The Commission shall only disburse vouchers under the program established under subsection (a) to participants certified pursuant to section 515 who have agreed in writing to keep and furnish to the Commission such records, books, and other information as it may require.

''(c) AMOUNTS.—The Commission shall disburse vouchers to each candidate certified under subsection (b) in an aggregate amount equal to the greater of—

''(1) $100,000 multiplied by the number of congressional districts in the State with respect to which such candidate is running for office; or

''(2) the amount determined by the Commission under section 531.

''(d) USE.—

''(1) EXCLUSIVE USE.—Vouchers disbursed by the Commission under this section may be used only for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements relating to a general election for the office of Senate by the participating candidate to which the vouchers were disbursed, except that—

''(A) a candidate may exchange vouchers with a political party under paragraph (2); and

''(B) a political party may use vouchers only to purchase broadcast airtime for political advertisements for generic party advertising (as defined by the Commission in regulations), to support candidates for State or local office in a general election, or to support participating candidates of the party in a general election for Federal office, but only if it discloses the value of the voucher used as an expenditure under section 315(d).

''(2) EXCHANGE WITH POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A participating candidate who receives a voucher under this section may transfer the right to use all or a portion of the value of the voucher to a committee of the political party of which the individual is a candidate (or, in the case of a participating candidate who is not a member of any political party, to a committee of the political party of that candidate's choice) in exchange for money in an amount equal to the cash value of the voucher or portion exchanged.

''(B) CONTINUATION OF CANDIDATE OBLIGATIONS.—The transfer of a voucher, in whole or in part, to a political party committee under this paragraph does not release the candidate from any obligation under the agreement made under subsection (b) or otherwise modify that agreement or its application to that candidate.

''(C) PARTY COMMITTEE OBLIGATIONS.—Any political party committee to which a voucher or portion thereof is transferred under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) shall account fully, in accordance with such requirements as the Commission may establish, for the receipt of the voucher; and

''(ii) may not use the transferred voucher or portion thereof for any purpose other than a purpose described in paragraph (1)(B).

''(D) VOUCHER AS A CONTRIBUTION UNDER FECA.—If a candidate transfers a voucher or any portion thereof to a political party committee under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) the value of the voucher or portion thereof transferred shall be treated as a contribution from the candidate to the committee, and from the committee to the candidate, for purposes of sections 302 and 304;

''(ii) the committee may, in exchange, provide to the candidate only funds subject to the prohibitions, limitations, and reporting requirements of title III of this Act; and

''(iii) the amount, if identified as a 'voucher exchange', shall not be considered a contribution for the purposes of sections 315 and 513.

''(e) VALUE; ACCEPTANCE; REDEMPTION.—

''(1) VOUCHER.—Each voucher disbursed by the Commission under this section shall have a value in dollars, redeemable upon presentation to the Commission, together with such documentation and other information as the Commission may require, for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements in accordance with this section.

''(2) ACCEPTANCE.—A broadcasting station shall accept vouchers in payment for the purchase of broadcast airtime for political advertisements in accordance with this section.

''(3) REDEMPTION.—The Commission shall redeem vouchers accepted by broadcasting stations under paragraph (2) upon presentation, subject to such documentation, verification, accounting, and application requirements as the Commission may impose to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the voucher redemption system.

''(4) EXPIRATION.—

''(A) CANDIDATES.—A voucher may only be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on the day before the date of the Federal election in connection with which it was issued and shall be null and void for any other use or purpose.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.—A voucher held by a political party committee may be used to pay for broadcast airtime for political advertisements to be broadcast before midnight on December 31st of the odd-numbered year following the year in which the voucher was issued by the Commission.

''(5) VOUCHER AS EXPENDITURE UNDER FECA.—The use of a voucher to purchase broadcast airtime constitutes an expenditure as defined in section 301(9)(A).

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BROADCASTING STATION.—The term 'broadcasting station' has the meaning given that term by section 315(f)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934.

''(2) POLITICAL PARTY.—The term 'political party' means a major party or a minor party as defined in section 9002 (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9002 (3) or (4)).

''Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

''SEC. 531. FAIR ELECTIONS OVERSIGHT BOARD.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Federal Election Commission an entity to be known as the 'Fair Elections Oversight Board'.

''(b) STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of whom—

''(A) 2 shall be appointed after consultation with the majority leader of the Senate;

''(B) 2 shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate; and

''(C) 1 shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the members appointed under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The members shall be individuals who are nonpartisan and, by reason of their education, experience, and attainments, exceptionally qualified to perform the duties of members of the Board.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—No member of the Board may be—

''(i) an employee of the Federal Government;

''(ii) a registered lobbyist; or

''(iii) an officer or employee of a political party or political campaign.

''(3) DATE.—Members of the Board shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

''(4) TERMS.—A member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

''(5) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Board shall be filled not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which the Board is given notice of the vacancy, in the same manner as the original appointment. The individual appointed to fill the vacancy shall serve only for the unexpired portion of the term for which the individual's predecessor was appointed.

''(6) CHAIRPERSON.—The Board shall designate a Chairperson from among the members of the Board.

''(c) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

''(1) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall have such duties and powers as the Commission may prescribe, including the power to administer the provisions of this title.

''(2) REVIEW OF FAIR ELECTIONS FINANCING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—After each general election for Federal office, the Board shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Fair Elections financing program under this title, including—

''(i) the maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(11);

''(ii) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(10);

''(iii) the number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512 to qualify for allocations from the Fund;

''(iv) the amount of allocations from the Fund that candidates may receive under section 522;

''(v) the maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 523;

''(vi) the amount and usage of vouchers under section 524;

''(vii) the overall satisfaction of participating candidates and the American public with the program; and

''(viii) such other matters relating to financing of Senate campaigns as the Board determines are appropriate.

''(B) CRITERIA FOR REVIEW.—In conducting the review under subparagraph (A), the Board shall consider the following:

''(i) QUALIFYING CONTRIBUTIONS AND QUALIFIED SMALL DOLLAR CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Board shall consider whether the number and dollar amount of qualifying contributions required and maximum dollar amount for such qualifying contributions and qualified small dollar contributions strikes a balance regarding the importance of voter involvement, the need to assure adequate incentives for participating, and fiscal responsibility, taking into consideration the number of primary and general election participating candidates, the electoral performance of those candidates, program cost, and any other information the Board determines is appropriate.

''(ii) REVIEW OF PROGRAM BENEFITS.—The Board shall consider whether the totality of the amount of funds allowed to be raised by participating candidates (including through qualifying contributions and small dollar contributions), allocations from the Fund under section 522, matching contributions under section 523, and vouchers under section 524 are sufficient for voters in each State to learn about the candidates to cast an informed vote, taking into account the historic amount of spending by winning candidates, media costs, primary election dates, and any other information the Board determines is appropriate.

''(C) ADJUSTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Based on the review conducted under subparagraph (A), the Board shall provide for the adjustments of the following amounts:

''(I) the maximum dollar amount of qualified small dollar contributions under section 501(11)(C);

''(II) the maximum and minimum dollar amounts for qualifying contributions under section 501(10)(A);

''(III) the number and value of qualifying contributions a candidate is required to obtain under section 512(a)(1);

''(IV) the base amount for candidates under section 522(d);

''(V) the maximum amount of matching contributions a candidate may receive under section 523(b); and

''(VI) the dollar amount for vouchers under section 524(c).

''(ii) REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall promulgate regulations providing for the adjustments made by the Board under clause (i).

''(D) REPORT.—Not later than March 30 following any general election for Federal office, the Board shall submit a report to Congress on the review conducted under paragraph (1). Such report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Board based on such review.

''(d) MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—

''(1) MEETINGS.—The Board may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Board considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(2) QUORUM.—Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, but a quorum is not required for members to meet and hold hearings.

''(e) REPORTS.—Not later than March 30, 2018, and every 2 years thereafter, the Board shall submit to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration a report documenting, evaluating, and making recommendations relating to the administrative implementation and enforcement of the provisions of this title.

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member, other than the Chairperson, shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) PERSONNEL.—

''(A) DIRECTOR.—The Board shall have a staff headed by an Executive Director. The Executive Director shall be paid at a rate equivalent to a rate established for the Senior Executive Service under section 5382 of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) STAFF APPOINTMENT.—With the approval of the Chairperson, the Executive Director may appoint such personnel as the Executive Director and the Board determines to be appropriate.

''(C) ACTUARIAL EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—With the approval of the Chairperson, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

''(D) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon the request of the Chairperson, the head of any Federal agency may detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of such agency to the Board to assist in carrying out the duties of the Board. Any such detail shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

''(E) OTHER RESOURCES.—The Board shall have reasonable access to materials, resources, statistical data, and other information from the Library of Congress and other agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. The Chairperson of the Board shall make requests for such access in writing when necessary.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subtitle.

''SEC. 532. ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS.

''The Commission shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this title, including regulations—

''(1) to establish procedures for—

''(A) verifying the amount of valid qualifying contributions with respect to a candidate;

''(B) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the raising of qualified small dollar contributions;

''(C) monitoring the raising of qualifying multicandidate political committee contributions through effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on individual contributions to qualified accounts of multicandidate political committees;

''(D) effectively and efficiently monitoring and enforcing the limits on the use of personal funds by participating candidates;

''(E) monitoring the use of allocations from the Fund and matching contributions under this title through audits or other mechanisms; and

''(F) the administration of the voucher program under section 524; and

''(2) regarding the conduct of debates in a manner consistent with the best practices of States that provide public financing for elections.

''SEC. 533. VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES.

''(a) CIVIL PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS.—If a candidate who has been certified as a participating candidate under section 515(a) accepts a contribution or makes an expenditure that is prohibited under section 513, the Commission shall assess a civil penalty against the candidate in an amount that is not more than 3 times the amount of the contribution or expenditure. Any amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited into the Fund.

''(b) REPAYMENT FOR IMPROPER USE OF FAIR ELECTIONS FUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission determines that any benefit made available to a participating candidate under this title was not used as provided for in this title or that a participating candidate has violated any of the dates for remission of funds contained in this title, the Commission shall so notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay to the Fund an amount equal to—

''(A) the amount of benefits so used or not remitted, as appropriate; and

''(B) interest on any such amounts (at a rate determined by the Commission).

''(2) OTHER ACTION NOT PRECLUDED.—Any action by the Commission in accordance with this subsection shall not preclude enforcement proceedings by the Commission in accordance with section 309(a), including a referral by the Commission to the Attorney General in the case of an apparent knowing and willful violation of this title.''.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON JOINT FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES.

Section 302(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) No authorized committee of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501) may establish a joint fundraising committee with a political committee other than an authorized committee of a candidate.''.

SEC. 104. EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES BY POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES WITH PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 315(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''in the case of'' and inserting ''except as provided in paragraph (5), in the case of''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6)(A) The limitation under paragraph (3)(A) shall not apply with respect to any expenditure from a qualified political party-participating candidate coordinated expenditure fund.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'qualified political party-participating candidate coordinated expenditure fund' means a fund established by the national committee of a political party, or a State committee of a political party, including any subordinate committee of a State committee, for purposes of making expenditures in connection with the general election campaign of a candidate for election to the office of Senator who is a participating candidate (as defined in section

501), that only accepts qualified coordinated expenditure contributions.

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'qualified coordinated expenditure contribution' means, with respect to the general election campaign of a candidate for election to the office of Senator who is a participating candidate (as defined in section 501), any contribution (or series of contributions)—

''(i) which is made by an individual who is not prohibited from making a contribution under this Act; and

''(ii) the aggregate amount of which does not exceed $500 per election.''.

TITLE II—IMPROVING VOTER INFORMATION

SEC. 201. BROADCASTS RELATING TO ALL SENATE CANDIDATES.

(a) LOWEST UNIT CHARGE; NATIONAL COMMITTEES.—Section 315(b)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''to such office'' and inserting the following: ''to such office, or by a national committee of a political party on behalf of such candidate in connection with such campaign,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''for preemptible use thereof'' after ''station''.

(b) PREEMPTION; AUDITS.—Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively and moving them to follow the existing subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating the existing subsection (e) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''(d) PREEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), and notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (b)(1)(A), a licensee shall not preempt the use of a broadcasting station by a legally qualified candidate for Senate who has purchased and paid for such use.

''(2) CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL OF LICENSEE.—If a program to be broadcast by a broadcasting station is preempted because of circumstances beyond the control of the station, any candidate or party advertising spot scheduled to be broadcast during that program shall be treated in the same fashion as a comparable commercial advertising spot.

''(e) AUDITS.—During the 30-day period preceding a primary election and the 60-day period preceding a general election, the Commission shall conduct such audits as it deems necessary to ensure that each broadcaster to which this section applies is allocating television broadcast advertising time in accordance with this section and section 312.''.

(c) REVOCATION OF LICENSE FOR FAILURE TO PERMIT ACCESS.—Section 312(a)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 312(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or repeated'';

(2) by inserting ''or cable system'' after ''broadcasting station''; and

(3) by striking ''his candidacy'' and inserting ''the candidacy of the candidate, under the same terms, conditions, and business practices as apply to the most favored advertiser of the licensee''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''For purposes of this section—'' and inserting the following: ''DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''the term'' and inserting ''BROADCASTING STATION.—The term''; and

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the terms'' and inserting ''LICENSEE; STATION LICENSEE.—The terms''; and

(2) in subsection (g), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1), by striking ''The Commission'' and inserting ''REGULATIONS.—The Commission''.

SEC. 202. BROADCAST RATES FOR PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.

Section 315(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)), as amended by section 201, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—In the case of a participating candidate (as defined in section 501(9) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), the charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for a television broadcast shall not exceed 80 percent of the lowest charge described in paragraph (1)(A) during—

''(A) the 45 days preceding the date of a primary or primary runoff election in which the candidate is opposed; and

''(B) the 60 days preceding the date of a general or special election in which the candidate is opposed.

''(4) RATE CARDS.—A licensee shall provide to a candidate for Senate a rate card that discloses—

''(A) the rate charged under this subsection; and

''(B) the method that the licensee uses to determine the rate charged under this subsection.''.

SEC. 203. FCC TO PRESCRIBE STANDARDIZED FORM FOR REPORTING CANDIDATE CAMPAIGN ADS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to establish a standardized form to be used by each broadcasting station, as defined in section 315(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(f)) (as redesignated by section 201(b)(1)), to record and report the purchase of advertising time by or on behalf of a candidate for nomination for election, or for election, to Federal elective office.

(b) CONTENTS.—The form prescribed by the Commission under subsection (a) shall require a broadcasting station to report to the Commission and to the Federal Election Commission, at a minimum—

(1) the station call letters and mailing address;

(2) the name and telephone number of the station's sales manager (or individual with responsibility for advertising sales);

(3) the name of the candidate who purchased the advertising time, or on whose behalf the advertising time was purchased, and the Federal elective office for which he or she is a candidate;

(4) the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person responsible for purchasing broadcast political advertising for the candidate;

(5) notation as to whether the purchase agreement for which the information is being reported is a draft or final version; and

(6) with respect to the advertisement—

(A) the date and time of the broadcast;

(B) the program in which the advertisement was broadcast; and

(C) the length of the broadcast airtime.

(c) INTERNET ACCESS.—In its rulemaking under subsection (a), the Commission shall require any broadcasting station required to file a report under this section that maintains an Internet website to make available a link to each such report on that website.

TITLE III—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SEC. 301. PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

Section 307(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)(6)) is amended by inserting ''(including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari)'' after ''appeal''.

SEC. 302. FILING BY SENATE CANDIDATES WITH COMMISSION.

Section 302(g) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102(g)) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) FILING WITH THE COMMISSION.—All designations, statements, and reports required to be filed under this Act shall be filed with the Commission.''.

SEC. 303. ELECTRONIC FILING OF FEC REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(11) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''under this Act—'' and all that follows and inserting ''under this Act shall be required to maintain and file such designation, statement, or report in electronic form accessible by computers.'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''48 hours'' and all that follows through ''filed electronically)'' and inserting ''24 hours''; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (D).

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION IN FUNDING OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 401. REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT FOR SENATE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to refundable credits) is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

''SEC. 36C. CREDIT FOR SENATE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified My Voice Federal Senate campaign contributions paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The amount of qualified My Voice Federal Senate campaign contributions taken into account under subsection (a) for the taxable year shall not exceed $50 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return).

''(2) LIMITATION ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL SENATE CANDIDATES.—No credit shall be allowed under this section to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer made aggregate contributions in excess of $300 during the taxable year to—

''(A) any single Federal Senate candidate, or

''(B) any political committee established and maintained by a national political party.

''(3) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—No credit shall be allowed under this section to any taxpayer unless the taxpayer provides the Secretary with such information as the Secretary may require to verify the taxpayer's eligibility for the credit and the amount of the credit for the taxpayer.

''(c) QUALIFIED MY VOICE FEDERAL SENATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'My Voice Federal Senate campaign contribution' means any contribution of cash by an individual to a Federal Senate candidate or to a political committee established and maintained by a national political party if such contribution is not prohibited under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

''(d) FEDERAL SENATE CANDIDATE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Federal Senate candidate' means any candidate for election to the office of Senator.

''(2) TREATMENT OF AUTHORIZED COMMITTEES.—Any contribution made to an authorized committee of a Federal Senate candidate shall be treated as made to such candidate.

''(e) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2018, the $50 amount under subsection (b)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2017' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of $5, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $5.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(2) Section 1324(b)(2) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(3) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

''Sec. 36C. Credit for Senate campaign contributions.''.

(c) FORMS.—The Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, shall ensure that the credit for contributions to Federal Senate candidates allowed under section 36C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section, may be claimed on Forms 1040EZ and 1040A.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—At the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Election Commission shall provide the Secretary of the Treasury with such information and other assistance as the Secretary may reasonably require to administer the credit allowed under section 36C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

TITLE V—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. FAIR ELECTIONS FUND REVENUE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after chapter 36 the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 37—TAX ON PAYMENTS PURSUANT TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

''Sec. 4501. Imposition of tax.

''SEC. 4501. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

''(a) TAX IMPOSED.—There is hereby imposed on any payment made to a qualified person pursuant to a contract with the Government of the United States a tax equal to 0.50 percent of the amount paid.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of tax imposed under subsection (a) for any calendar year shall not exceed $500,000.

''(c) QUALIFIED PERSON.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified person' means any person which—

''(1) is not a State or local government, a foreign nation, or an organization described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a), and

''(2) has contracts with the Government of the United States with a value in excess of $10,000,000.

''(d) PAYMENT OF TAX.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person receiving such payment.

''(e) USE OF REVENUE GENERATED BY TAX.—It is the sense of the Senate that amounts equivalent to the revenue generated by the tax imposed under this chapter should be appropriated for the financing of a Fair Elections Fund and used for the public financing of Senate elections.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 36 the following:

''CHAPTER 37—TAX ON PAYMENTS PURSUANT TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 602. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided for in this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 2018.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees, reduce the rate of the corporate income tax, provide tax credits to workers, deliver additional benefits to retired and disabled Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise this evening to introduce, along with my lead cosponsor, Senator SCHATZ of Hawaii, the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act of 2015.

We announced this legislation this afternoon at an event hosted by the American Enterprise Institute, and I want to thank the American Enterprise Institute for their hospitality. I think their interest in this idea clearly reflects the difference between core conservative economic principles and simply being pushed around by the hectoring of the fossil fuel industry. There is a difference between the two, and this bill meets legitimate conservative economic principles.

I will start by saying the obvious, which is that climate change is real. It is virtually universal in peer-reviewed science that climate change is real, that carbon pollution from burning fossil fuels is causing unprecedented climate and oceanic changes. Every major scientific society in our country has said so. Our brightest scientists at NOAA and at NASA are unequivocal. The fundamental science of climate change is, indeed, settled.

In the details of local application and the extent to which a particular storm is caused by or exacerbated by climate change, in the vagaries of prediction about how things are going to be 10 or 15 years out at those margins, yes—there is always room for conversation and debate at the margins, but the core science of climate change is beyond legitimate debate. It is known science, like debating gravity.

Americans get it. In poll after poll, Americans understand that climate change is real, know that humans are the cause, and want their government to do something about it.

Climate change is not our only national challenge. The Federal Tax Code, for example, is a mess, with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the developed world, while some take advantage of loopholes to pay far less than others and, indeed, some pay nothing at all. We have an economic recovery that has left far too many Americans behind, and we have a job market that has still not fully rebounded.

What if our answer to climate change helped address those other concerns as well? What if that approach was firmly grounded in core conservative economic principles, values such as property rights, market efficiency, and personal liberty?

Aparna Mathur of the free-market think tank the American Enterprise Institute conducted an analysis with a colleague from the Brookings Institution showing that a carbon fee could reduce emissions, shore up the country's fiscal outlook, and play an important part in broader tax reform. AEI's Kevin Hassett, Steven Hayward, and Kenneth Greene have pointed out that a carbon fee could obviate some environmental regulations. The idea behind it is extremely simple. You levy a price on the thing you don't want—carbon pollution—and you use the revenue to help with things you do want.

Whether they are called neighborhood effects or negative externalities, the effects of carbon pollution harm us all. Conservative economist Milton Friedman wrote that the government exists in part to reduce such harms. When the costs of such externalities don't get factored into the price of a product, conservative economic doctrine—indeed, all economic doctrine—classifies that as a subsidy—a market failure. Right now for fossil fuel producers, that subsidy is immense, giving them artificial advantage over cleaner energy sources. The International Monetary Fund just postulated that the annual subsidy just in America to the fossil fuel industry is $700 billion. We tend to talk around here in budget cycles of 10 years. That means it is $7 trillion in a budget cycle. That is a subsidy, all right.

A carbon fee can repair that market failure by incorporating unpriced damage into the costs of fossil fuels. Then the free market—not industry, not government—can drive the best energy mix for the country, with everyone competing on level ground.

That is how Nixon's Treasury Secretary and Reagan's Secretary of State George Shultz sees it. He and the late Nobel laureate Gary S. Becker made the case for a carbon fee in the Wall Street Journal. They wrote:

Americans like to compete on a level playing field. All players should have an equal opportunity to win based on their competitive merits, not on some artificial imbalance that gives someone or some group a special advantage.

Such as a $700 billion-a-year special advantage.

Just last week, even the CEOs of Europe's major oil companies called on governments to institute national prices on carbon.

This could be a big economic win. George W. Bush's Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson said, ''A tax on carbon emissions will unleash a wave of innovation to develop technologies, lower the costs of clean energy, and create jobs, as we and other nations develop new energy products and infrastructure.''

It is in that spirit that I am introducing the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act—a framework I hope both Republicans and Democrats can embrace. The bill would establish an economy-wide carbon fee on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. The fee would be assessed way upstream where it is easiest to administer, minimizing the universe of taxpayers and the compliance burden—at the coal mine, at the natural gas processing station, and at the petroleum refinery.

Other sources of greenhouse gas emissions would be charged at existing reporting requirements that are rate tied to the carbon dioxide equivalency of each gas. Fluorocarbons are assessed at a special rate that accounts for their high greenhouse potency. Sequestering, utilizing, or encapsulating carbon dioxide earns you a credit.

My bill sets the fee per ton of carbon emitted at $45 for 2016. That is the central range of the social cost of carbon as estimated by the Office of Management and Budget. That fee would increase each year at a real 2 percent. When emissions fall 80 percent below 2005 levels, the annual adjustment falls to inflation.

Border adjustments for the trade of energy-intensive goods include tariffs on such goods imported from countries with weaker or no carbon pricing—to make sure we protect our industries at home—and rebates for U.S. exporters of energy-intensive goods. We took care to design the border adjustments to achieve harmony with World Trade Organization rules.

According to the nonpartisan group Resources for the Future, this carbon fee proposal would reduce U.S. CO_2 emissions by more than 40 percent by 2025.

In addition to the environmental benefits, of course, a carbon fee also generates revenue. In this case, it would generate over $2 trillion in revenue over 10 years. We intend to return every dime of that to the American people. Here is how.

First, the bill lowers the top marginal corporate income tax rate from 35 percent to 29 percent. This would cut American corporate taxes by almost $600 billion over the first decade.

Second, it provides workers with a $500 refundable tax credit—$1,000 for a couple—to offset the first $500 paid each year in Social Security payroll taxes. The credit would grow with inflation. The tax credits would return over $750 billion to American households over the first 10 years.

Third, it would give benefits to Social Security recipients, veterans program beneficiaries, and certain other groups of retirees at the same level as the tax credit. These benefits would total more than $400 billion over 10 years.

Finally, the bill would establish a block grant for States, totalling $20 billion in 2016 and growing with inflation, to help with low-income needs, rural households, and transitioning workers. Governors in these States will know best what to do with the funds. In West Virginia, for example, they could use the money to transition coal workers into the technology jobs of the future or to shore up the beleaguered pension plans of coal miners. Rhode Island, on the other hand, might choose to make homes more energy efficient. And we have a reporting mechanism for the public to transparently track where the money is going to assure that it is all going back to the American people.

The entire bill is 37 pages long—short, simple, straightforward. It would cut back on the pollution that threatens dramatic changes to our home planet. It would cut taxes. It would end a grievous market distortion. It would start a wave of investment and innovation.

With this bill, Senator SCHATZ and I extend an open hand, or as one Republican former Congressman who cares about the climate change problem said: It extends an olive limb to conservatives everywhere.

Whether you want to pursue tax reform or support the free market for energy, or as Senator GRAHAM suggested this week, honestly address the real effects of climate change, this can be a vehicle. I hope my colleagues will agree with me that this is a discussion that we can continue. I look forward to trying to find a way forward that is better than simply ignoring this problem, pretending that it does not exist, and sleepwalking through our moment in history.

It is time to wake up. I have an attachment here that summarizes some of the support from conservatives and business leaders for a carbon fee. I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIVES AND BUSINESS LEADERS SUPPORT A CARBON FEE

FORMER REPUBLICAN APPOINTEES

''A tax on carbon emissions will unleash a wave of innovation to develop technologies, lower the costs of clean energy and create jobs as we and other nations develop new energy products and infrastructure.''—Henry M. Paulson, Treasury Secretary under President George W Bush

''How can you possibly create a level playing field? By taking a step that makes all forms of energy bear not only their immediate costs of energy, but also the costs of the pollution they emit . . . So my proposal is to have a revenue-neutral carbon tax.''—George P. Schultz, Secretary of Labor under President Nixon, Treasury Secretary under Presidents Nixon and Ford, and Secretary of State under President Reagan

''A market-based approach, like a carbon tax, would be the best path to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions . . . Rather than argue against [President Obama's] proposals, our leaders in Congress should endorse them and start the overdue debate about what bigger steps are needed and how to achieve them.''—William D. Ruckelshaus, EPA Administrator under Presidents Nixon and Reagan; Lee M. Thomas, EPA Administrator under President Reagan; William K. Reilly, EPA Administrator under President George H. W. Bush; and Christine Todd Whitman, EPA Administrator under President George W. Bush

CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

''I am no scientist, but I've traveled throughout the world with Senator McCain and others, and seen the effects of a warming planet. . . . I've been told by a lot of business leaders in South Carolina, 'Senator Graham, once you price carbon in a reasonable way, this green economy that we're hoping for really will begin to flourish.''—Senator Lindsey Graham (R–SC)

''I wish we would just talk about a carbon tax, 100 percent of which would be returned to the American people.''—Senator Bob Corker (R–TN)

''If there's one economic axiom, it's that if you want less of something, you tax it. Clearly, it's in our interest to move away from carbon.''— Senator Jeff Flake (R–AZ)

''We should eliminate all the subsidies. No more Solyndras. No more production tax credits for wind. No more credits for electric vehicles. No more special tax provisions for oil and gas. Level the playing field. The big challenge is reaching fellow conservatives and convincing them that the biggest subsidy of all may be to belch and burn into the trash dump in the sky—for free. That lack of accountability may be the biggest subsidy of them all.''—former Representative Bob Inglis (R–SC)

FORMER REPUBLICAN AIDES

''The scientists tell us that world temperatures are rising because humans are emitting carbon into the atmosphere. Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax.''—N. Gregory Mankiw, economic advisor to Mitt Romney's presidential campaign and Harvard economist

Using a carbon tax to fund a payroll tax cut ''would be very good for the economy and as an adjunct, it would reduce also carbon emissions into the environment.''—Arthur B. Laffer, economic advisor to President Reagan

''Although a general carbon fuel tax is moot for the moment, the idea will not go away. If carbon dioxide emissions are to be reduced further in the U.S., such a tax will achieve the goal with less economic waste than new bureaucratic hurdles.''—Martin Feldstein, former Chairman of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors

CONSERVATIVE THOUGHT-LEADERS AND ECONOMISTS

[Why a carbon tax?] ''First, it is a less expensive, more efficient and more effective

policy than the status quo. . . . Second, greenhouse gas emissions impose risk. . . . Third, it is the principled conservative position. Government's role is to protect the rights to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness.''—Jerry Taylor, former vice president at the Cato Institute and cofounder of the Niskanen Center

''We have a unique opportunity to end the rancorous debate about climate change, a debate that is poisoning the air—the political air, that is—and inhibiting progress on two fronts: progress on addressing the possibility that we are on the road to a catastrophic warming of the globe, and progress on reforming our anti-growth tax structure, which is so inequitable that it is straining the public's belief in the fairness of capitalism and what we like to call 'the American Dream.' All we need do is stop pretending that the cost of carbon emissions is certainly zero, and that regulation provides a more efficient solution than the Market.''—Irwin M. Stelzer, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute

CORPORATIONS

This month, the top executives for six major oil and gas companies penned a letter to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change calling for a worldwide price on carbon:

BP, Statoil, Shell, Eni SpA, Total, BG Group.

Many other major companies have integrated an ''internal carbon fee'' as part of their long-term financial planning. Companies that have reportedly adopted an internal carbon price include:

Wal-Mart Stores; Delphi Automotive; Devon Energy Corporation; Total; Delta Airlines; Jabil Circuit Inc.; American Electric Power Co.; Entergy Corporation; Xcel Energy Inc.; Microsoft; Chevron Corporation; Hess Corporation; Wells Fargo & Company; General Electric Company; E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; CMS Energy Corporation; Integrys Energy Group; Walt Disney World; ConocoPhillips; Royal Dutch Shell; Cummins Inc.; Google Inc.; Ameren Corporation; Duke Energy Corporation; PG&E Corporation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 198—COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARIES OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE 13TH, 14TH, AND 15TH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, OFTEN REFERRED TO AS THE ''SECOND FOUNDING'' OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 198

Whereas, in 1787, delegates from the original 13 States gathered in Philadelphia to propose and ratify a new guiding charter, the Constitution of the United States, for the young republic;

Whereas George Washington, James Madison, and the other delegates managed to craft the most durable form of government in world history, one that provided for its own revision and, therefore, allowed future generations to continue to build a ''more perfect Union'';

Whereas following the Civil War, President Lincoln and his generation did just that, ratifying a series of transformational amendments that gave the United States what Lincoln promised at Gettysburg, ''a new birth of freedom'';

Whereas the Second Founding of the United States began in earnest on January 31, 1865, when Congress passed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and sent it to the States for ratification;

Whereas the next day, President Lincoln signed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, calling it a ''King's cure'' for the evil of slavery;

Whereas the people of the United States ratified the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States on December 6, 1865, banning slavery and forced labor;

Whereas the people of the United States next ratified the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States on July 9, 1868, enshrining a host of new constitutional guarantees;

Whereas the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States granted United States citizenship to everyone born on the soil of, and subject to the jurisdiction of, the United States, protected fundamental rights like free speech from State abuses, ensured due process of law for the people of the United States, and guaranteed equality for all of the people of the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States ratified the 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States on February 3, 1870, guaranteeing the right to vote free from racial discrimination;

Whereas the ratification of this series of amendments truly constituted a ''Second Founding'' for the United States; and

Whereas the 150th anniversary of the Second Founding occurs over the course of the next 5 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States—the Second Founding of the United States;

(2) designates the year of 2015 as the ''Sesquicentennial of Our Nation's Second Founding, New Birth of Freedom: Commemorating the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments'';

(3) encourages State and local governments to join in the Sesquicentennial celebration by organizing appropriate ceremonies, activities, and educational outreach; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to explore the history and significance of the Second Founding and to celebrate the continuing importance to our Constitution and to the United States of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1974. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1975. 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 1976. 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 1977. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and 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 1978. 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 1979. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, 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 1980. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) 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 1981. Mr. REED 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 1982. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and 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 1983. 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 1984. 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 1985. 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 1986. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. KIRK) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1987. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER , Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. BOXER) 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 1988. Mr. BLUNT (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 1989. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1990. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1991. 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 1992. 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 1993. Mr. REED 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 1994. 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 1995. 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 1996. Mr. VITTER 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 1974. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; 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, medical assistance, 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 continued close cooperation between the residents of Camp Liberty and the 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 1975. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1523. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN UNOBLIGATED FUNDS AVAILABLE TO CONSTRUCT, RENOVATE, REPAIR, OR EXPAND ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS TO ADDRESS CAPACITY OR FACILITY CONDITION DEFICIENCIES.

(a) CESSATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Any amount of the $464,017,143 of 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 as of the date of the enactment of this Act that remain unobligated as of September 30, 2016, shall no longer be available for obligation for that purpose as of October 1, 2016.

(b) AUTHORITY TO REPROGRAM FOR OCO PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may reprogram amounts no longer available for obligation for the purpose described in subsection (a) as of October 1, 2016, by reason of subsection (a) for such programs, projects, and activities in connection with overseas contingency operations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—The authority to reprogram funds under paragraph (1) is in addition to any other authority available to the Secretary to transfer or reprogram funds in this Act or otherwise provided by law.

SA 1976. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. APPREHENSION AND PROSECUTION OF INTERNATIONAL CYBER CRIMINALS.

(a) INTERNATIONAL CYBER CRIMINAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''international cyber criminal'' means an individual—

(1) who is physically present within a country with which the United States does not have a mutual legal assistance treaty or an extradition treaty;

(2) who is believed to have committed a cybercrime or intellectual property crime against the interests of the United States or its citizens; and

(3) for whom—

(A) an arrest warrant has been issued by a judge in the United States; or

(B) an international wanted notice (commonly referred to as a ''Red Notice'') has been circulated by Interpol.

(b) BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary of State, or designee, shall consult with the appropriate government official of each country in which one or more international cyber criminals are physically present to determine what actions the government of such country has taken—

(1) to apprehend and prosecute such criminals; and

(2) to prevent such criminals from carrying out cybercrimes or intellectual property crimes against the interests of the United States or its citizens.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that identifies—

(A) the number of international cyber criminals who are located in countries that do not have an extradition treaty or mutual legal assistance treaty with the United States, broken down by country;

(B) the dates on which an official of the Department of State, as a result of this Act, discussed ways to thwart or prosecute international cyber criminals in a bilateral conversation with an official of another country, including the name of each such country; and

(C) for each international cyber criminal who was extradited into the United States during the most recently completed calendar year—

(i) his or her name;

(ii) the crimes for which he or she was charged;

(iii) his or her previous country of residence; and

(iv) the country from which he or she was extradited into the United States.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this subsection, 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SA 1977. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the

Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; 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 Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations 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 1978. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 718, strike ''has emerged'' on line 15 and all that follows through ''such competition'' on line 17.

SA 1979. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; 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 Interagency Hostage Recovery 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 a 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 Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator shall be limited to hostage cases outside the United States.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a quarterly basis, the Interagency Hostage Recovery 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 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) or any other hostage-takers.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) 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.

(2) 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 1980. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 608. REPORT ON SUFFICIENCY OF MILITARY BASIC PAY TO COMPENSATE MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the extent to which rates of military basic pay are sufficient to compensate military personnel. The assessment shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the extent to which rates of military basic pay are sufficient to compensate members of the Armed Forces when compared with pay available for their civilian counterparts.

(2) A description and assessment of modifications to the structure of military basic pay in order to adequately compensate members of the Armed Forces for their skill sets and educational competencies rather than the current system of rates of military basic pay based primarily on grade and time in grade.

(3) An assessment of replacing the current payment of basic allowance for housing (BAH) with payment of an increased amount of military basic pay adjusted to account for differences in costs among localities.

SA 1981. Mr. REED 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO ENGAGE UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS IN PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES RELATED TO EQUIPPING THE AFGHAN NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Secretaries to engage United States manufacturers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the Afghan National Security Forces.

SA 1982. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. USE OF ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.

(a) ENERGY MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 543(f)(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking ''Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.—Each energy manager of a Department of Defense facility, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7) and using guidelines developed by the Secretary, shall provide an explanation regarding any life-cycle cost-effective measures described in subparagraph (A)(i) that have not been implemented with respect to the Department of Defense facility.''.

(b) REPORTS.—Section 548(b) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) in the case of Department of Defense facilities—

''(A) the status of the energy savings performance contracts and utility energy service contracts of each agency;

''(B) the investment value of the contracts;

''(C) the guaranteed energy savings for the previous year as compared to the actual energy savings for the previous year;

''(D) the plan for entering into the contracts in the coming year; and

''(E) information explaining why any previously submitted plans for the contracts were not implemented.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES.—Section 551(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8259(4)) is amended by striking ''or retrofit activities'' and inserting ''retrofit activities, or, in the case of Department of Defense facilities, energy consuming devices and required support structures''.

(d) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.—Section 801(a)(2)(F) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)(F)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) in the case of the Department of Defense, limit the recognition of operation and maintenance savings associated with systems modernized or replaced with the implementation of energy conservation measures, water conservation measures, or any combination of energy conservation measures and water conservation measures.''.

(e) MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITY.—Section 801(a)(2) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(H) MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may sell or transfer energy savings and apply the proceeds of the sale or transfer to fund a contract under this title.''.

(f) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—Section 802 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287a) is amended by striking ''(and related operation and maintenance expenses)'' and inserting '', including, in the case of the Department of Defense, related operations and maintenance expenses''.

(g) DEFINITION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—Section 804(2) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287c(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''federally owned building or buildings or other federally owned facilities'' and inserting ''Federal building (as defined in section 551)'' each place it appears;

(2) in subparagraph (C) , by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) in the case of the Department of Defense—

''(i) the use, sale, or transfer of energy incentives, rebates, or credits (including renewable energy credits) from Federal, State, or local governments or utilities; and

''(ii) any revenue generated from a reduction in energy or water use, more efficient waste recycling, or additional energy generated from more efficient equipment.''.

SA 1983. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

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—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORITIES AND ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Basic Authorities and Activities

SEC. 5101. 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. 5102. 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 into 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) an estimate of 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. 5103. 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.

(c) TREATMENT OF HONG KONG UNDER UNITED STATES LAW.—

(1) SECRETARY OF STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall certify to Congress whether Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is sufficiently autonomous to justify different treatment for its citizens from the treatment accorded to other citizens of the People's Republic of China in any new laws, agreements, treaties, or arrangements entered into between the United States and Hong Kong after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making a certification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Hong Kong.

(C) EXCEPTION.—A certification shall not be required under this subsection with respect to any new laws, agreements, treaties, or arrangements that support human rights, rule of law, or democracy in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1) if the Secretary—

(A) determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(B) on or before the date on which such waiver would take effect, submits a notice of, and justification for, the waiver to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5104. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(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 Interagency Hostage Recovery 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 sub-section (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 subparagraph 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 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) 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.

(2) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term ''state sponsor of terrorism''—

(A) means a country the government of which the Secretary 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.

SEC. 5105. 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 departments and agencies, as appropriate, shall—

(1) conduct a review of the United States-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (referred to in this section as the ''Dialogue''); and

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the findings of such review.

(b) CONTENTS.—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) cybertheft 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 predetermined benchmarks for assessing whether the commitments achieved are significantly furthering such priorities.

SEC. 5106. 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. 5107. 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 be used in support of 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. 5108. 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 provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed $500,000 in any fiscal year.''.

SEC. 5109. 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. 5110. 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. 5111. 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. 5112. 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. 5113. 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, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, and 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.''.

SEC. 5114. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH JAPAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and Japan is a cornerstone of peace, security, and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and around the world;

(2) Prime Minister Shiuzo Abe's visit to the United States in April 2015 and historic address to a Joint Session of Congress symbolized the strength and importance of ties between the United States and Japan;

(3) in 2015, which marks 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States and Japan continue to strengthen the alliance and work together to ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for the Asia-Pacific region and the world;

(4) the Governments and people of the United States and Japan share values, interests, and capabilities that have helped to build a strong rules-based international order, based on a commitment to rules, norms and institutions;

(5) the revised Guidelines for United States-Japan Defense Cooperation and Japan's policy of ''Proactive Contribution to Peace'' will reinforce deterrence, update the roles and missions of the United States and Japan, enable Japan to expand its contributions to regional and global security, and allow the United States Government and the Government of Japan to enhance cooperation on security issues in the region and beyond;

(6) the United States remain resolute in its commitments under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security to respond to any armed attack in the territories under the administration of Japan;

(7) although the United States Government does not take a position on the ultimate sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands, the United States Government acknowledges that they are under the administration of Japan and opposes any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine such administration;

(8) the United States Government reaffirms that the unilateral actions of a third party will not affect the United States acknowledgment of the administration of Japan over the Senkaku Islands;

(9) the United States Government and the Government of Japan continue to work together on common security interests, including to confront the threat posed by the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(10) the United States Government and the Government of Japan remain committed to ensuring maritime security and respect for international law, including freedom of navigation and overflight; and

(11) the United States Government and the Government of Japan continue to oppose the use of coercion, intimidation, or force to change the status quo, including in the East and South China Seas.

SEC. 5115. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEFENSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has an upgraded, strategic-plus relationship with India based on regional cooperation, space science cooperation, and defense cooperation.

(2) The defense relationship between the United States and the Republic of India is strengthened by the common commitment of both countries to democracy.

(3) The United States and the Republic of India share a common and long-standing commitment to civilian control of the military.

(4) The United States and the Republic of India have increasingly worked together on defense cooperation across a range of activities, exercises, initiatives, and research.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to expand defense cooperation with the Republic of India;

(2) welcome the role of the Republic of India in providing security and stability in the Indo-Pacific region and beyond;

(3) work cooperatively with the Republic of India on matters relating to our common defense;

(4) vigorously support the implementation of the United States-India Defense Framework Agreement; and

(5) support the India Defense Trade and Technology Initiative.

SEC. 5116. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has served as an anchor for stability, security, and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula, in the Asia-Pacific region, and around the world;

(2) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to strengthen and adapt the bilateral, regional, and global scope of the comprehensive strategic alliance between the 2 nations, to serve as a linchpin of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing the shared values of democracy, human rights, free and open markets, and the rule of law, as reaffirmed in the May 2013 ''Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States of America'';

(3) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to broaden and deepen the alliance by strengthening the combined defense posture on the Korean Peninsula, enhancing mutual security based on the Republic of Korea-United States Mutual Defense Treaty, and promoting cooperation for regional and global security in the 21st century;

(4) the United States and the Republic of Korea share deep concerns that the nuclear, cyber, and ballistic missiles programs of North Korea and its repeated provocations pose grave threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia and recognize that both nations are determined to achieve the peaceful denuclearization of North Korea and remain fully committed to continuing close cooperation on the full range of issues related to North Korea;

(5) the United States and the Republic of Korea are particularly concerned that the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of North Korea, including North Korean efforts to miniaturize their nuclear technology and improve the mobility of their ballistic missiles, have gathered significant momentum and are poised to expand in the coming years;

(6) the Republic of Korea has made progress in enhancing future warfighting and interoperability capabilities by taking steps toward procuring Patriot Advanced Capability missiles, F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft, and RQ–4 Global Hawk Surveillance Aircraft;

(7) the United States supports the vision of a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons, free from the fear of war, and peacefully reunited on the basis of democratic and free market principles, as articulated in President Park's address in Dresden, Germany; and

(8) the United States and the Republic of Korea share the future interests of both nations in securing peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

SEC. 5117. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States policy toward Taiwan is based upon the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8), which was enacted in 1979, and the Six Assurances given by President Ronald Reagan in 1982;

(2) provision of defensive weapons to Taiwan should continue as mandated in the Taiwan Relations Act; and

(3) enhanced trade relations with Taiwan should be pursued to mutually benefit the citizens of both countries.

SEC. 5118. REPORT ON POLITICAL FREEDOM IN VENEZUELA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the support provided by the United States to the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of peace and representative democracy (as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States, done at Lima September 11, 2001);

(2) an assessment of work carried out by the United States, in cooperation with the other member states of the Organization of American States and countries of the European Union, to ensure—

(A) the peaceful resolution of the current political situation in Venezuela; and

(B) the immediate cessation of violence against antigovernment protestors;

(3) a list of the government and security officials in Venezuela who—

(A) are responsible for, or complicit in, the use of force in relation to antigovernment protests and similar acts of violence; and

(B) have had their financial assets in the United States frozen or been placed on a visa ban by the United States; and

(4) an assessment of United States support for the development of democratic political processes and independent civil society in Venezuela.

SEC. 5119. STRATEGY FOR THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE EVENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of State shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, other members of the National Security Council, and the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government, develop a strategy for the United States for the Middle East in the event of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy shall include the following:

(1) Efforts to counter Iranian-sponsored terrorism in Middle East region.

(2) Efforts to reassure United States allies and partners in Middle East.

(3) Efforts to address the potential for a conventional or nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after entering into a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran, the Secretary shall submit the strategy developed under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5120. DEPARTMENT OF STATE INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall produce a comprehensive strategy, with a classified annex if necessary, relating to United States international policy with regard to cyberspace.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required in subsection (a) shall include:

(1) A review of actions and activities undertaken by the Secretary of State to date to support the goal of the President's International Strategy for Cyberspace, released in May 2011, to ''work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation''.

(2) A plan of action to guide the Secretary's diplomacy with regard to nation-states, including conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to develop the norms of responsible international behavior in cyberspace, and status review of existing discussions in multilateral fora to obtain agreements on international norms in cyberspace.

(3) A review of the alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by other prominent nation-state actors, including China, Russia, Brazil, and India.

(4) A detailed description of threats to United States national security in cyberspace from other nation-states, state-sponsored actors and private actors, to United States Federal and private sector infrastructure, United States intellectual property, and the privacy of United States citizens.

(5) A review of policy tools available to the President of United States to deter nation-states, state-sponsored actors, and private actors, including, but not limited to, those outlined in Executive Order 13694, released on April 1, 2015.

(6) A review of resources required by the Secretary, including the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues, to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult, as appropriate, with other United States Government agencies, the United States private sector, and United States nongovernmental organizations with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and cybersecurity.

(d) RELEASE.—The Secretary shall publicly release the strategy required in subsection (a) and brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives upon its release, including on the classified annex, should the strategy include such an annex.

SEC. 5121. WAIVER OF FEES FOR RENEWAL OF IMMIGRANT VISA FOR ADOPTED CHILD IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.

Section 221(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) PERIOD OF VALIDITY; RENEWAL OR REPLACEMENT.—

''(1) IMMIGRANT VISAS.—An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding 6 months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed 3 years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business.

''(2) NONIMMIGRANT VISAS.—A nonimmigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as shall be prescribed by regulations. In prescribing the period of validity of a nonimmigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class, except that in the case of aliens who are nationals of a foreign country and who either are granted refugee status and firmly resettled in another foreign country or are granted permanent residence and residing in another foreign country, the Secretary of State may prescribe the period of validity of such a visa based upon the treatment granted by that other foreign country to alien refugees and permanent residents, respectively, in the United States.

''(3) VISA REPLACEMENT.—An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original number during the fiscal year in which the original visa was issued for an immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that the immigrant—

''(A) was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible;

''(B) is found by a consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa; and

''(C) pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

''(4) FEE WAIVER.—If an immigrant visa was issued, on or after March 27, 2013, for a child who has been lawfully adopted, or who is coming to the United States to be adopted, by a United States citizen, any statutory immigrant visa fees relating to a renewal or replacement of such visa may be waived or, if already paid, may be refunded upon request, subject to such criteria as the Secretary of State may prescribe, if—

''(A) the immigrant child was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity as a direct result of extraordinary circumstances, including the denial of an exit permit; and

''(B) if such inability was attributable to factors beyond the control of the adopting parent or parents and of the immigrant.''.

SEC. 5122. AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN IRAN COMPENSATION FUND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that ensuring justice for United States victims of acts of terrorism by Iran who hold legal judgments against Iran relating to such acts is of paramount importance and should be expeditiously addressed.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the ''American Hostages in Iran Compensation Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''Fund'') for the purposes of—

(1) making payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran and their spouses who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:00–CV–03110 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and

(2) satisfying claims against Iran relating to the taking of hostages and treatment of personnel of the United States embassy in Tehran, Iran, between November 3, 1979, and January 20, 1981.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IMPOSITION OF SURCHARGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is imposed a surcharge equal to 30 percent of the amount of—

(i) any fine or monetary penalty imposed, in whole or in part, for a violation of a law or regulation specified in subparagraph (B) committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(ii) the monetary amount of a settlement entered into by a person with respect to a suspected violation of a law or regulation specified in subparagraph (B) related to activities undertaken on or after such date of enactment.

(B) LAWS AND REGULATIONS SPECIFIED.—A law or regulation specified in this subparagraph is any law or regulation that provides for a civil or criminal fine or monetary penalty for any economic activity relating to Iran that is administered by the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Energy.

(C) TERMINATION OF DEPOSITS.—The imposition of the surcharge under subparagraph (A) shall terminate on the date on which all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) have been distributed to all recipients described in that subsection.

(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require a person that is found to have violated a law or regulation specified in subparagraph (B) to pay a surcharge under subparagraph (A) if that person has not been assessed a fine or monetary penalty described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) or entered into a settlement described in clause (ii) of that subparagraph for that violation.

(2) DEPOSITS INTO FUND; AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) DEPOSITS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in the Fund all surcharges collected pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), all contributions collected pursuant to paragraph (3), and any other funds made available pursuant to paragraph (4).

(B) PAYMENT OF SURCHARGE TO SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—A person upon which a surcharge is imposed under paragraph (1)(A) shall pay the surcharge to the Secretary without regard to whether the fine or penalty with respect to which the surcharge is imposed—

(i) is paid directly to the Federal agency that administers the law or regulation pursuant to which the fine or penalty is imposed; or

(ii) is deemed satisfied by a payment to another Federal agency.

(C) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available, without further appropriation, to make payments under subsection (d).

(3) CONTRIBUTIONS.—The President may accept such amounts as may be contributed by individuals, business concerns, governments, or other entities for payments under this section and deposit such amounts into the Fund.

(4) OTHER RESOURCES.—The President may identify and use other funds available for compensating claims under this section and deposit such amounts into the Fund.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—Payments from the Fund shall be administered by the Secretary of State in accordance with such rules and procedures as the Secretary may prescribe.

(2) PAYMENTS.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), payments shall be made from the Fund to the following recipients in the following amounts:

(A) To each living former hostage identified as a member of the proposed class described in subsection (b)(1), $6,750 for each day of captivity of the former hostage.

(B) To the estate of each deceased former hostage identified as a member of the proposed class described in subsection (b)(1), $6,750 for each day of captivity of the former hostage.

(C) To each spouse of a former hostage identified as a member of the proposed class described in subsection (b)(1) if the spouse is identified as a member of that proposed class, $600,000.

(3) PRIORITY.—Payments from the Fund shall be distributed under paragraph (2) in the following order:

(A) First, to each living former hostage described in paragraph (2)(A).

(B) Second, to the estate of each deceased former hostage described in paragraph (2)(B).

(C) Third, to each spouse of a former hostage described in paragraph (2)(C).

(4) CONSENT OF RECIPIENT.—A payment to a recipient from the Fund under paragraph (2) shall be made only after receiving the consent of the recipient.

(e) PRECLUSION OF FUTURE ACTIONS AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS.—

(1) PRECLUSION OF FUTURE ACTIONS.—A recipient of a payment under subsection (d) may not file or maintain an action against Iran in any Federal or State court for any claim relating to the events described in subsection (b)(2).

(2) RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS.—Upon the payment of all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) to all recipients described in that subsection, all claims against Iran relating to the events described in subsection (b)(2) shall be deemed waived and forever released.

(f) DEPOSIT OF REMAINING FUNDS INTO THE TREASURY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts remaining in the Fund after the date specified in paragraph (2) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(2) DATE SPECIFIED.—The date specified in this paragraph is the later of—

(A) the date on which all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) have been made to all recipients described in that subsection; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Decisions made under this section shall not be subject to review in any judicial, administrative, or other proceeding.

(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON COMPLETION OF PAYMENTS.—Not later than 60 days after determining that a law or regulation specified in subsection (c)(1)(B) is terminated or suspended or that amounts in the Fund will be insufficient for the payment of all amounts described in subsection (d)(2) to all recipients described in that subsection by the date that is 444 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress recommendations to expedite the completion of the payment of those amounts.

SEC. 5123. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ANTI-ISRAEL AND ANTI-SEMITIC INCITEMENT WITHIN THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the 1995 Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, commonly referred to as Oslo II, specifically details that Israel and the Palestinian Authority shall ''abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda, against each other and, without derogating from the principle of freedom of expression, shall take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within their jurisdiction''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) expresses support and admiration for individuals and organizations working to encourage cooperation between Israeli Jews and Palestinians, including—

(A) Professor Mohammed Dajani Daoudi, who took students from al-Quds University in Jerusalem to visit Auschwitz in March 2014 only to return to death threats by fellow Palestinians and expulsion from his teacher's union;

(B) the Israel Palestine Center for Research and Information, the only joint Israeli-Palestinian public policy think-tank,

(C) United Hatzalah, a nonprofit, fully volunteer Emergency Medical Services organization that, mobilizing volunteers who are religious or secular Jews, Arabs, Muslims, and Christians, provides EMS services to all people in Israel regardless of race, religion, or national origin; and

(D) Breaking the Impasse, an apolitical initiative of Palestinian and Israeli business and civil society leaders who advocate for a two-state solution and an urgent diplomatic solution to the conflict;

(2) reiterates strong condemnation of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement in the Palestinian Authority as antithetical to the stated desire to achieve a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace settlement; and

(3) urges President Abbas and Palestinian Authority officials to discontinue all official incitement that runs contrary to the determination to put an end to decades of confrontation.

SEC. 5124. SUPPORT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY, AND INVIOLABILITY OF POST-SOVIET COUNTRIES IN LIGHT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AND INTERFERENCE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

(1) supports the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and inviolability of post-Soviet countries within their internationally recognized borders;

(2) expresses deep concern over increasingly aggressive actions by the Russian Federation;

(3) is committed to providing sufficient funding for the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs of the Department of State to address subversive and destabilizing activities by the Russian Federation within post-Soviet countries;

(4) supports robust engagement between the United States and post-Soviet countries through—

(A) the promotion of strengthened people-to-people ties, including through educational and cultural exchange programs;

(B) anticorruption assistance;

(C) public diplomacy;

(D) economic diplomacy; and

(E) other democratic reform efforts;

(5) encourages the President to further enhance nondefense cooperation and diplomatic engagement with post-Soviet countries;

(6) condemns the subversive and destabilizing activities undertaken by the Russian Federation within post-Soviet countries;

(7) encourages enhanced cooperation between the United States and the European Union to promote greater Euro-Atlantic integration, including through—

(A) the enlargement of the European Union; and

(B) the Open Door policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(8) urges continued cooperation between the United States and the European Union to maintain sanctions against the Russian Federation until the Government of Russia has—

(A) fully implemented all provisions of the Minsk agreements, done at Minsk September 5, 2014 and February 12, 2015; and

(B) demonstrated respect for the territorial sovereignty of Ukraine;

(9) calls on the member states of the European Union to extend the current sanctions regime against the Russian Federation; and

(10) urges the consideration of additional sanctions if the Russian Federation continue to engage in subversive and destabilizing activities within post-Soviet countries.

SEC. 5125. RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA REPORT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Russian Federation is waging a propaganda war against the United States and our allies; and

(2) a successful strategy must be implemented to counter the threat posed by Russian propaganda.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually for the following 3 years, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal officials, shall submit an unclassified report, with a classified annex, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that contains a detailed analysis of—

(1) the recent use of propaganda by the Government of Russia, including—

(A) the forms of propaganda used, including types of media and programming;

(B) the principal countries and regions targeted by Russian propaganda; and

(C) the impact of Russian propaganda on such targets;

(2) the response by United States allies, particularly European allies, to counter the threat of Russian propaganda;

(3) the response by the United States to the threat of Russian propaganda;

(4) the extent of the effectiveness of programs currently in use to counter Russian propaganda;

(5) a strategy for improving the effectiveness of such programs;

(6) any additional authority needed to counter the threat of Russian propaganda; and

(7) the additional funding needed to successfully implement the strategy referred to in paragraph (5).

SEC. 5126. APPROVAL OF EXPORT LICENCES AND LETTERS OF REQUEST TO ASSIST THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—

(A) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to 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.

(B) CONTENTS.—The list submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the date on which the application or request was first submitted;

(ii) the current status of each application or request; and

(iii) the estimated timeline for adjudication of such applications or requests.

(C) PRIORITY.—The Secretary should give priority to processing the applications and requests included on the list submitted under subparagraph (A).

(2) LETTERS OF REQUEST.—The Secretary shall submit to the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all pending Letters of Request for Foreign Military Sales to Ukraine, including—

(A) the date on which each such letter was first submitted;

(B) the current status of each such letter; and

(C) the estimated timeline for the adjudication of each such letter.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the date set forth in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall submit a report to the specified congressional committees that describes the status of the applications, requests for marketing licenses, and Letters of Request described in subsection (a).

(2) TERMINATION DATE.—The date set forth in this paragraph is the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Government of Ukraine has been restored; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Additional Matters

SEC. 5131. 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) to propose policies to integrate the early warning systems of national security agencies, including intelligence agencies, with respect to incidents of mass atrocities and 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 is authorized to have primary responsibility for—

(A) recommending and, if adopted, 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. 5132. 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. 5133. 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 task an existing Deputy Assistant Secretary with 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. 5134. 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 near-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) CONTENTS.—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.

SEC. 5135. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO PREVENT AND RESPOND TO GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE GLOBALLY.

(a) GLOBAL STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter for 6 years, the Secretary of State shall develop or update a United States global strategy to prevent and respond to violence against women and girls. The strategy shall be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and made publicly available on the Internet.

(b) INITIAL STRATEGY.—For the purposes of this section, the ''United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally'', issued in August 2012, shall be deemed to fulfill the initial requirement of subsection (a).

(c) COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION.—In developing the strategy under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult with—

(1) the heads of relevant Federal agencies;

(2) the Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons; and

(3) representatives of civil society and multilateral organizations with demonstrated experience in addressing violence against women and girls or promoting gender equality internationally.

(d) PRIORITY COUNTRY SELECTION.—To further the objectives of the strategy described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall identify no less than 4 eligible low-income and lower-middle income countries with significant levels of violence against women and girls, including within displaced communities, that have the governmental or nongovernmental organizational capacity to manage and implement gender-based violence prevention and response program activities and should, when possible, be geographically, ethnically, and culturally diverse from one another.

(e) COUNTRY PLANS.—In each country identified under subsection (d) the Secretary shall develop comprehensive, multisectoral, and holistic individual country plans designed to address and respond to violence against women and girls that include—

(1) an assessment and description of the current or potential capacity of the government of each identified country and civil society organizations in each such identified country to address and respond to violence against women and girls;

(2) an identification of coordination mechanisms with Federal agencies that—

(A) have existing programs relevant to the strategy;

(B) will be involved in new program activities; and

(C) are engaged in broader United States strategies around development;

(3) a description of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established for each identified country, and their intended use in assessing overall progress in prevention and response;

(4) a projection of the general levels of resources needed to achieve the stated objectives in each identified country, including an accounting of—

(A) activities and funding already expended by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, other Federal agencies, donor country governments, and multilateral institutions; and

(B) leveraged private sector resources; and

(5) strategies, as appropriate, designed to accommodate the needs of stateless, disabled, internally displaced, refugee, or religious or ethnic minority women and girls.

(f) REPORT ON PRIORITY COUNTRY SELECTION AND COUNTRY PLANS.—Not more than 90 days after selection of the priority countries required under subsection (d), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the priority country selection process, the development of specific country plans, and include an overview of all programming and specific activities being undertaken, the budget resources requested, and the specific activities to be supported by each Executive agency under the strategy if such resources are provided.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives of this section.

SEC. 5136. INTERNATIONAL CORRUPTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1 of each year, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as the ''USAID Administrator''), the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of appropriate intelligence agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a Country Report on Corruption Practices, with a classified annex, which shall include information about countries for which a corruption analysis was conducted under subsection (b).

(b) CORRUPTION ANALYSIS ELEMENTS.—The corruption analysis conducted under this subsection should include, among other elements—

(1) an analysis of individuals and associations that comprise corruption networks in the country, including, as applicable—

(A) government officials;

(B) private sector actors;

(C) criminals; and

(D) members of illegal armed groups;

(2) the identification of the state functions that have been captured by corrupt networks in the country, including, as applicable functions of—

(A) the judicial branch;

(B) the taxing authority;

(C) the central bank; and

(D) specific military or police units;

(3) the identification of—

(A) the key economic activities, whether licit or illicit, which are dominated by members of the corrupt network; and

(B) other revenue streams that enrich such members; and

(4) the identification of enablers of corrupt practices, within the country and outside the country.

(c) PUBLICATION AND BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish the Country Report on Corruption and Accountability submitted under subsection (a) on the website of the Department; and

(2) brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the information contained in the report published under paragraph (1).

SEC. 5137. QUADRENNIAL DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) QUADRENNIAL REVIEWS REQUIRED.—Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall every 4 years, during a year following a year evenly divisible by 4, conduct a review of United States diplomacy and development (to be known as a ''quadrennial diplomacy and development review'').

(2) SCOPE OF REVIEWS.—Each quadrennial diplomacy and development review shall be a comprehensive examination of the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States for the next 4-year period until a subsequent review is due under paragraph (1). The review shall include—

(A) recommendations regarding the long-term diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States;

(B) priorities of the United States for diplomacy and development; and

(C) guidance on the related programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In conducting each quadrennial diplomacy and development review, after consultation with Department of State and United States Agency for International Development officials, the Secretary of State should consult with—

(A) the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Director of National Intelligence;

(B) any other Federal agency that provides foreign assistance, including at a minimum the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and, as appropriate, other members of Congress; and

(D) other relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities, including private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

(b) CONTENTS OF REVIEW.—Each quadrennial diplomacy and development review shall—

(1) delineate, as appropriate, the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework of the United States, consistent with appropriate national, Department of State, and United States Agency for International Development strategies, strategic plans, and relevant presidential directives, including the national security strategy prescribed pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a);

(2) outline and prioritize the full range of critical national diplomacy and development areas, capabilities, and resources, including those implemented across agencies, and address the full range of challenges confronting the United States in this regard;

(3) describe the interagency cooperation, and preparedness of relevant Federal assets, and the infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the diplomacy and development policies and programs of the United States required to execute successfully the full range of mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(4) describe the roles of international organizations and multilateral institutions in advancing United States diplomatic and development objectives, including the mechanisms for coordinating and harmonizing development policies and programs with partner countries and among donors;

(5) identify the budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully execute the full range of mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(6) include an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development with the national diplomacy and development policy and strategic framework referred to in paragraph (1) and the diplomacy and development mission priorities outlined under paragraph (2);

(7) review and assess the effectiveness of the management mechanisms of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development for executing the strategic priorities outlined in the quadrennial diplomacy and development review, including the extent to which such effectiveness has been enhanced since the previous report; and

(8) the relationship between the requirements of the quadrennial diplomacy and development review and the acquisition strategy and expenditure plan within the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development.

(c) FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY BOARD REVIEW.—The Secretary of State should apprise the Foreign Affairs Policy Board on an ongoing basis of the work undertaken in the conduct of the quadrennial diplomacy and development review.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the purposes and initiatives under this section.

SEC. 5138. DISAPPEARED PERSONS IN MEXICO, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, AND EL SALVADOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States—

(A) values governance, security, and the rule of law in Mexico and Central America; and

(B) has reemphasized its commitment to this region following the humanitarian crisis of unaccompanied children from these countries across the international border between the United States and Mexico in 2014.

(2) Individuals migrating from Central America to the United States face great peril during their journey. Many go missing along the way and are often never heard from again.

(b) REPORT OF DISAPPEARED PERSONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in close consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, 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 includes—

(1) the number of cases of enforced disappearances in Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador;

(2) an assessment of causes for the disappearances described in paragraph (1);

(3) the primary individuals and groups responsible for such disappearances; and

(4) the official government response in those countries to account for such disappeared persons.

SEC. 5139. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF BAHRAIN OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE BAHRAIN INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an unclassified report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the implementation by the Government of Bahrain of the recommendations contained in the 2011 Report of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (referred to in this section as the ''Bahrain Report'').

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the specific steps taken by the Government of Bahrain to implement each of the 26 recommendations contained in the Bahrain Report;

(2) an assessment of whether the Government of Bahrain has ''fully complied with'', ''partially implemented'', or ''not meaningfully implemented'' each recommendation referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) an assessment of the impact of the findings in the Bahrain Report for the United States security posture in the Arab Gulf and the area of responsibility of the United States Central Command.

SEC. 5140. REPORT ON UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO HAITI AND WHETHER RECENT ELECTIONS IN HAITI MEET INTERNATIONAL ELECTION STANDARDS.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 5(a) of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''December 31, 2022''.

(b) REPORT.—Section 5(b) of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(14) a determination of whether recent Haitian elections are free, fair and responsive to the people of Haiti; and

''(15) a description of any attempts to disqualify candidates for political officers in Haiti for political reasons.''.

SEC. 5141. SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this section referred to as the ''DPRK'') tested nuclear weapons on 3 separate occasions, in October 2006, in May 2009, and in February 2013.

(2) Nuclear experts have reported that the DPRK may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years.

(3) According to the 2014 Department of Defense report, ''Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea'' (in this subsection referred to as the ''2014 DoD report''), the DPRK has proliferated nuclear technology to Libya via the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan.

(4) According to the 2014 DoD report, ''North Korea also provided Syria with nuclear reactor technology until 2007.''.

(5) On September 6, 2007, as part of ''Operation Orchard'', the Israeli Air Force destroyed the suspected nuclear facility in Syria.

(6) According to the 2014 DoD report, ''North Korea has exported conventional and ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, and technical assistance to countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.''.

(7) On November 29, 1987, DPRK agents planted explosive devices onboard Korean Air flight 858, which killed all 115 passengers and crew on board.

(8) On March 26, 2010, the DPRK fired upon and sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew.

(9) On November 23, 2010, the DPRK shelled South Korea's Yeonpyeong Island, killing 4 South Korean citizens.

(10) On February 7, 2014, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on human rights in DPRK (in this subsection referred to as the ''Commission of Inquiry'') released a report detailing the atrocious human rights record of the DPRK.

(11) Dr. Michael Kirby, Chair of the Commission of Inquiry, stated on March 17, 2014, ''The Commission of Inquiry has found systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations occurring in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It has also found a disturbing array of crimes against humanity. These crimes are committed against inmates of political and other prison camps; against starving populations; against religious believers; against persons who try to flee the country—including those forcibly repatriated by China.''.

(12) Dr. Michael Kirby also stated, ''These crimes arise from policies established at the highest level of the State. They have been committed, and continue to take place in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, because the policies, institutions, and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place. The gravity, scale, duration, and nature of the unspeakable atrocities committed in the country reveal a totalitarian State that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world.''.

(13) The Commission of Inquiry also notes, ''Since 1950, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has engaged in the systematic abduction, denial of repatriation, and subsequent enforced disappearance of persons from other countries on a large scale and as a matter of State policy. Well over 200,000 persons, including children, who were brought from other countries to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea may have become victims of enforced disappearance,'' and states that the DPRK has failed to account or address this injustice in any way.

(14) According to reports and analysis from organizations such as the International Network for the Human Rights of North Korean Overseas Labor, the Korea Policy Research Center, NK Watch, the Asian Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for International and Strategic Studies, and the George W. Bush Institute, there may currently be as many as 100,000 North Korean overseas laborers in various nations around the world.

(15) Such forced North Korean laborers are often subjected to harsh working conditions under the direct supervision of DPRK officials, and their salaries contribute to anywhere from $150,000,000 to $230,000,000 a year to the DPRK state coffers.

(16) According to the Director of National Intelligence's 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, ''North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia.''.

(17) The Worldwide Threat Assessment states, ''North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles.''.

(18) On December 19, 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation declared that the DPRK was responsible for a cyberattack on Sony Pictures conducted on November 24, 2014.

(19) From 1988 to 2008, the DPRK was designated by the United States Government as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(20) The DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), and 2094 (2013).

(21) The DPRK repeatedly violated agreements with the United States and the other so-called Six-Party Talks partners (the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China) designed to halt its nuclear weapons program, while receiving significant concessions, including fuel, oil, and food aid.

(22) The Six-Party Talks have not been held since December 2008.

(23) On May 9, 2015, the DPRK claimed that it has test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the DPRK represents a serious threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies in East Asia and to international peace and stability, and grossly violates the human rights of its own people;

(2) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury should impose additional sanctions against the DPRK, including targeting its financial assets around the world, specific designations relating to human rights abuses, and a redesignation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terror; and

(3) the President should not resume the negotiations with the DPRK, either bilaterally or as part of the Six-Party Talks, without strict preconditions, including that the DPRK—

(A) adhere to its denuclearization commitments outlined in the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks;

(B) commit to halting its ballistic missile programs and its proliferation activities;

(C) cease military provocations; and

(D) measurably and significantly improve its human rights record.

TITLE II—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Subtitle A—Organizational Matters

SEC. 5201. RIGHTSIZING ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving 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 submit a response to the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation that describes—

(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.—On the date on which the President's annual budget request is submitted to Congress, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the status of all rightsizing recommendations and responses described in subsection (a) from the preceding 5 years, including—

(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 each accepted recommendation, 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; and

(3) for any rejected recommendations, the justification provided pursuant to subsection (a)(4).

(c) REPORT ON REGIONAL BUREAU STAFFING.—In conjunction with each report required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit a supplemental report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(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) a detailed plan, including an implementation schedule, for how the Department will seek to rectify any significant imbalances in staffing among regional bureaus or between any regional bureau and the overseas requirements of the United States within such region if the Secretary determines that such staffing does not reflect—

(A) the foreign policy priorities of the United States; or

(B) the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States; and

(4) a detailed description of the implementation status of any plan provided pursuant to paragraph (3), including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, the implementation schedule provided with such plan.

SEC. 5202. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Under Secretary of Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, shall establish—

(1) foreign economic policy priorities for each regional bureau, including for individual countries, as appropriate; and

(2) policies and guidance for integrating such foreign economic policy priorities throughout the Department.

(b) DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Within each regional bureau of the Department, the Secretary shall task an existing Deputy Assistant Secretary with appropriate training and background in economic and commercial affairs with the responsibility for 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 given the 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 Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment.

SEC. 5203. REVIEW OF BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS JURISDICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a review of the jurisdictional responsibility of the Bureau of African Affairs and that of the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs relating to the North African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya; and

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(A) the findings of the review conducted under paragraph (1); and

(B) recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility among the bureaus referred to in paragraph (1) should be adjusted.

(b) REVIEW.—The review conducted under subsection (a)(1) 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)—

(A) are distinct between each such region; or

(B) 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—

(A) inefficient, duplicative, or uncoordinated between the North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa regions; or

(B) 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 of transferring jurisdictional responsibility of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya from the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to the Bureau of African Affairs.

SEC. 5204. SPECIAL ENVOYS, REPRESENTATIVES, ADVISORS, AND COORDINATORS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on special envoys, representatives, advisors, and coordinators of the Department, which shall include—

(1) a tabulation of the current names, ranks, positions, and responsibilities of all special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, with a separate accounting of all such positions at the level of Assistant Secretary (or equivalent) or above; and

(2) for each position identified pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) the date on which the position was created;

(B) the mechanism by which the position was created, including the authority under which the position was created;

(C) the positions authorized under section 1(d) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(d));

(D) a description of whether, and the extent to which, the responsibilities assigned to the position duplicate the responsibilities of other current officials within the Department, including 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. 5205. 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:

''(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.

''(3) International human rights law and international humanitarian law.''.

SEC. 5206. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall regularly consult with 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 nongovernment 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.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes in detail—

(1) all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of the systems or networks described in subsection (a) facilitating the use of classified information; and

(2) all known or suspected significant penetrations or compromises of any other such systems and networks that occurred since the submission of the prior report.

(d) CONTENT.—Each report submitted 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 department or agency of the United States Government;

(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; and

(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. 5207. ANALYSIS OF EMBASSY COST SHARING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States 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; and

(4) potential reforms to the ICASS system, including—

(A) the selection of more than 1 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, as appropriate; and

(D) other modifications to the current ICASS system and rules that would incentivize greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

SEC. 5208. PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

Section 433(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 241(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

''(1) INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction, which shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed, officials from—

''(A) the Department of State;

''(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary of State shall convene an advisory committee to the interagency working group established pursuant to paragraph (1), for the

duration of the working group's existence, which shall be composed of not less than 3 left-behind parents, serving for 2-year terms, who—

''(A) shall be selected by the Secretary; and

''(B) shall periodically consult with such advisory committee on all activities of the interagency working group, as appropriate.''.

SEC. 5209. IMPROVING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) 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

(2) make the findings of the research and evaluations conducted under paragraph (1) available to Congress.

(b) DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the 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 shall—

(A) coordinate and oversee the research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs of the Department—

(i) to improve public diplomacy strategies and tactics; and

(ii) to ensure that 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 Department and with other Federal 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 (e), regarding the research and evaluation of all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(4) GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.—Not later than 180 days after his or her 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.—Amounts allocated for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities pursuant to 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 subsection (a)—

(A) 3 to 5 percent of program funds made available under the heading ''EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS''; and

(B) 3 to 5 percent of program funds allocated for public diplomacy programs under the heading ''DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS''.

(d) LIMITED EXEMPTION.—The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) shall not apply to collections of information directed at foreign individuals conducted by, or on behalf of, the Department for the purpose of audience research and impact evaluations, in accordance with the requirements under this section and in connection with the Department's activities conducted pursuant to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.).

(e) ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.—

(1) 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.

(2) REPORT.—The Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall submit an annual report to Congress in conjunction with the Commission on Public Diplomacy'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.

(3) 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''.

(f) 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.

SEC. 5210. ENHANCED INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY OF THE BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall strengthen the institutional capacity of the Bureau of African Affairs to oversee programs and engage in strategic planning and crisis management by—

(1) establishing an office within the Bureau of African Affairs that is separate and distinct from the regional affairs office specifically charged with overseeing strategy development and program implementation related to security assistance;

(2) planning to facilitate the long-term planning process; and

(3) developing a concrete plan to rightsize the Bureau of African Affairs not later than 180 days after the date enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the actions that have been taken to carry out subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this section, and the Secretary shall use existing resources to carry out the provisions of this section.

Subtitle B—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5211. REVIEW OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER COMPENSATION.

(a) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—

(1) 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.

(2) REPORT.—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—

(A) the results of the independent assessment commissioned pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) the views of the Secretary regarding Foreign Service Officer compensation.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all compensation received by Foreign Service Officers assigned domestically or overseas, including base salary and any other benefits, allowances, differentials, or other financial incentives;

(2) for each 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 historical and current use matches its stated purpose; and

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of each form of compensation described in paragraph (1) 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. 5212. REPEAL OF RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE.

Section 305 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3945) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 5213. COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR TRAVEL.

Section 5550b of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The maximum amount of compensatory time off that may be earned under this section may not exceed 104 hours during any leave year (as defined in section 630.201(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations).''.

SEC. 5214. CERTIFICATES OF DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE.

Not later than 7 days after submitting the report required under section 304(a)(4) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3944(a)(4)) to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the President shall make the report available to the public, including by posting the on the website of the Department in a conspicuous manner and location.

SEC. 5215. 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.—Upon full implementation of a right and process for employees to appeal an assignment restriction or preclusion, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) certifies that such appeals process has been fully implemented; and

(2) includes a detailed description of such process.

(c) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall—

(1) publish the right and process established pursuant to subsection (a) in the Foreign Affairs Manual; and

(2) 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 ensure 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. 5216. SECURITY CLEARANCE SUSPENSIONS.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''SEC. 610. SEPARATION FOR CAUSE; SUSPENSION.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) In order to promote the efficiency of the Service, the Secretary may suspend a member of the Service without pay when—

''(A) the member's security clearance is suspended; or

''(B) 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 under this subsection 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 subsection may file a grievance in accordance with the procedures applicable to grievances under chapter 11.

''(4) If a grievance is 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 Board may not exercise the authority provided under section 1106(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 terms 'suspend' and 'suspension' mean placing a member of the Foreign Service in a temporary status without duties and pay.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 610 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 610. Separation for cause; suspension.''.

SEC. 5217. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

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, 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. 5218. 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 since the period covered by 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);

(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—

(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. 5219. 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 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. 5220. RETENTION OF MID- AND SENIOR-LEVEL PROFESSIONALS FROM UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary should provide attention and oversight to the employment, 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.—The Secretary should review past programs designed to increase minority representation in international affairs positions, 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.

SEC. 5221. REVIEW OF JURISDICTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE TO AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN AND THE BUREAU OF SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of State shall conduct a review of the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Special Representative to Afghanistan and Pakistan (SRAP) and the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs (SCA).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the findings of the review conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility between the 2 offices should be adjusted.

SEC. 5222. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 110 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days before the anticipated submission of each annual report under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary of State shall notify and brief the appropriate congressional committees concerning the countries that will be upgraded to a higher tier or downgraded to a lower tier in such report.''.

SEC. 5223. INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by inserting ''REFUGEES'' before ''The Secretary of State'';

(3) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by inserting ''CHILD SOLDIERS'' before ''The Secretary of State''; and

(4) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall develop a curriculum for Foreign Service Officers that includes training on—

''(A) the scope and strategic value of international religious freedom;

''(B) how violations of international religious freedom harm fundamental United States interests;

''(C) how the advancement of international religious freedom can advance such interests;

''(D) how United States international religious freedom policy should be carried out in practice by United States diplomats and other Foreign Service Officers; and

''(E) the relevance and relationship of international religious freedom to United States defense, diplomacy, development, and public affairs efforts to combat violent extremism.

''(2) ROLE OF OTHER OFFICIALS.—The Secretary of State shall carry out paragraph (1)—

''(A) with the assistance of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom appointed under section 101(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411(b));

''(B) in coordination with the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center and other Federal officials, as appropriate; and

''(C) in consultation with the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established under section 201(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(a)).

''(3) RESOURCES.—The Secretary of State shall ensure the availability of sufficient resources to develop and implement the curriculum required under this subsection.

''(b) RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016, the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center shall begin training on religious freedom, using the curriculum developed under subsection (a), for Foreign Service officers, including—

''(A) entry level officers;

''(B) officers prior to departure for posting outside the United States; and

''(C) incoming deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

''(2) ELEMENTS.—The training required under paragraph (1) shall be substantively incorporated into—

''(A) the A–100 course attended by Foreign Service Officers;

''(B) the specific country courses required of Foreign Service Officers prior to a posting outside the United States, with training tailored to—

''(i) the particular religious demography of such country;

''(ii) religious freedom conditions in such country;

''(iii) religious engagement strategies; and

''(iv) United States strategies for advancing religious freedom.

''(C) the courses required of incoming deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

''(c) INFORMATION SHARING.—The curriculum and training materials developed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be shared with the United States Armed Forces and all other Federal departments and agencies whose personnel serve as attachés, advisors, detailees, or otherwise in United States embassies globally to provide training on—

''(1) United States religious freedom policies;

''(2) religious traditions;

''(3) religious engagement strategies;

''(4) religious and cultural issues; and

''(5) efforts to combat terrorism and violent religious extremism.''.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Subtitle A—United States Contributions to International Organizations

SEC. 5301. REPORTS CONCERNING THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) REPORT ON ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIVITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS AGENCIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes—

(1) all activities at the United Nations and its subagencies that can be construed to exhibit an anti-Semitic bias, including official statements, proposed resolutions, and United Nations investigations;

(2) the use of United Nations resources to promote anti-Semitic or anti-Israel rhetoric or propaganda, including publications, internet websites, and textbooks or other educational materials used to propagate political rhetoric regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and

(3) specific actions taken by the United States Government to address any of the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) REPORT ON ALL UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A detailed description of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind contributions, of the United States to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies—

''(i) during the preceding fiscal year;

''(ii) estimated for the fiscal year in which the report is submitted; and

''(iii) requested in the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for the following fiscal year.

''(B) CONTENT.—The description required under subparagraph (A) shall, for each fiscal year specified in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of that subparagraph, include—

''(i) the total amount or value of all contributions described in that subparagraph;

''(ii) the approximate percentage of all such contributions by the United States compared to all contributions to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies from any source; and

''(iii) for each such contribution described in subparagraph (A)—

''(I) the amount or value of the contribution;

''(II) whether the contribution was assessed by the United Nations or voluntary;

''(III) the purpose of the contribution;

''(IV) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution; and

''(V) whether the United Nations or an affiliated agency or related body received the contribution and, if an affiliated agency or related body received the contribution, which such agency or body.

''(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under this subsection to the designated congressional committees, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a text-based, searchable version of the description required by subparagraph (A) on a publicly available Internet website of that Office.''.

SEC. 5302. ANNUAL REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 4(b) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(b)) is amended by striking ''in which the United States participates as a member'' and inserting '', including—

''(1) the amount of such contributions that were assessed by an international organization and the amount of such contributions that were voluntary; and

''(2) the ratio of United States contributions to total contributions received for—

''(A) the United Nations, specialized agencies of the United Nations, and other United Nations funds, programs, and organizations;

''(B) peacekeeping;

''(C) inter-American organizations;

''(D) regional organizations; and

''(E) other international organizations.''.

SEC. 5303. REPORT ON PEACEKEEPING ARREARS, CREDITS, AND CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)), as amended by section 5301(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A complete and full accounting of United States peacekeeping assessments and contributions for United Nations peacekeeping operations, including the following:

''(i) A tabulation of annual United Nations peacekeeping assessment rates, the peacekeeping contribution rate authorized by the United States, and the United States public law that authorized the contribution rate for the United Nations peacekeeping budget for each fiscal year beginning in fiscal year 1995 through the fiscal year following the date of the report.

''(ii) A tabulation of current United States accrued shortfalls and arrears in each respective ongoing or closed United Nations peacekeeping mission.

''(iii) A tabulation of all peacekeeping credits, including—

''(I) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States;

''(II) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States;

''(III) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States from each open and closed peacekeeping mission;

''(IV) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States from each open and closed peacekeeping mission;

''(V) the total amount of peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward shortfalls from previous years that are apportioned to the United States;

''(VI) the total amount of peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward offsetting future contributions of the United States; and

''(VII) the total amount of peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States that could be applied toward offsetting United States contributions in the following fiscal year.

''(iv) An explanation of any claim of unavailability by the United Nations of any peacekeeping credits described in clause (iii)(IV).

''(v) A description of any efforts by the United States to obtain reimbursement in accordance with the requirements of this Act, including Department of Defense materiel and services, and an explanation of any failure to obtain any such reimbursement.

''(B) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'peacekeeping credits' means the amounts by which, during a United Nations peacekeeping fiscal year, the contributions of the United States to the United Nations for peacekeeping operations exceed the actual expenditures for peacekeeping operations by the United Nations that are apportioned to the United States.''.

SEC. 5304. ASSESSMENT RATE TRANSPARENCY.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after each time the United Nations General Assembly modifies the assessment levels for peacekeeping operations, the Secretary shall submit a report, which may include a classified annex, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall describe—

(A) the change, by amount and percentage, of the peacekeeping assessment charged to each member state; and

(B) how the economic and strategic interests of each of the permanent members of the Security Council is being served by each peacekeeping mission currently in force.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF PEACEKEEPING ASSESSMENT DATA.—The Secretary 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 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. 5311. PREVENTING ABUSE IN PEACEKEEPING.

Not later than 15 days before the anticipated date of a vote (or, in the case of exigent circumstances, as far in advance of the vote as is practicable) on a resolution approving a new 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 to reauthorize an existing such mission, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on that mission that includes the following:

(1) A description of the specific measures taken and planned to be taken by the organization related to the mission—

(A) to prevent individuals who are employees or contractor personnel of the organization, or members of the forces serving in the mission from engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse; and

(B) to hold accountable any such individuals who engage in any such acts while participating in the mission.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of each of the measures described in paragraph (1).

(3) An accounting and assessment of all cases in which the organization has taken action to investigate allegations that individuals described in paragraph (1)(A) have engaged in acts described in that paragraph, including a description of the status of all such cases as of the date of the report.

SEC. 5312. INCLUSION OF PEACEKEEPING ABUSES IN COUNTRY REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11)(C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (12)(C)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(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 subparagraph (A);

''(C) any actions taken by such country with respect to personnel repatriated as a result of allegations described in subparagraph (A), including whether such personnel faced prosecution related to such allegations; and

''(D) the extent to which any actions taken as described in subparagraph (C) have been communicated by such country to the United Nations.''.

SEC. 5313. EVALUATION OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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) a comprehensive evaluation of current United Nations peacekeeping missions;

(2) a prioritization of the peacekeeping missions;

(3) plans for phasing out and ending any mission that—

(A) has substantially met its objectives and goals; or

(B) will not be able to meet its objectives and goals; and

(4) a plan for reviewing the status of open-ended mandates for—

(A) the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK);

(B) the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO); and

(C) the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

(b) APPROVAL OF FUTURE PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS.—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 ensure that no new United Nations peacekeeping mission is approved without a periodic mandate renewal.

(c) FUNDING LIMITATION.—The United States shall not provide funding for any United Nations peacekeeping mission beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the mission has a periodic mandate renewal.

Subtitle C—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5321. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 181 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 276c–4) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 181. EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

''Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

''(1) for each international organization that had a geographic distribution formula in effect on January 1, 1991, an assessment of whether that organization—

''(A) is taking good faith steps to increase the staffing of United States citizens, including, as appropriate, as assessment of any additional steps the organization could be taking to increase such staffing; and

''(B) has met the requirements of its geographic distribution formula; and

''(2) an assessment of United States representation among professional and senior-level positions at the United Nations, including—

''(A) an assessment of the proportion of United States citizens employed at the United Nations Secretariat and at all United Nations specialized agencies, funds, and programs relative to the total employment at

the United Nations Secretariat and at all such agencies, funds, and programs;

''(B) as assessment of compliance by the United Nations Secretariat and such agencies, funds, and programs with any applicable geographic distribution formula; and

''(C) a description of any steps taken or planned to be taken by the United States to increase the staffing of United States citizens at the United Nations Secretariat and such agencies, funds and programs.''.

SEC. 5322. 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—

(1) to establish appropriate policies, procedures, and assumptions for—

(A) determining comparable positions between officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations headquarters in New York, New York, and in the United States Federal civil service;

(B) calculating the margin between the compensation of such officials at the United Nations headquarters and the civil service; and

(C) determining the appropriate margin for adoption by the United Nations to govern compensation for such officials;

(2) to make all policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1) available to the public; and

(3) to limit increases in the compensation of United Nations officials to ensure that such officials remain within the margin range established by United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/40/244, or any subsequent margin range adopted by the United Nations to govern compensation for United Nations officials.

(b) REPORT ON SALARY MARGINS.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate congressional committees, at the time of the submission of the budget of the President to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, that

(1) describes the policies, procedures, and assumptions established or used by the United Nations—

(A) to determine comparable positions between officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations headquarters in New York, New York, and in the United States Federal civil service;

(B) to calculate the percentage difference, or margin, between the compensation of such officials at the United Nations headquarters and the civil service; and

(C) to 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 United Nations officials;

(2) assesses, in accordance with the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1), the margin between net salaries of officials in the professional and higher categories of employment at the United Nations in New York and those of comparable positions in the United States Federal civil service;

(3) assesses any changes in the margin described in paragraph (2) from the previous year;

(4) assesses the extent to which any changes in that margin resulted from modifications to the policies, procedures, and assumptions described in paragraph (1); and

(5) provides the views of the Secretary on any changes in that margin and any such modifications.

TITLE IV—CONSULAR AUTHORITIES

SEC. 5401. 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'' at the end and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 5402. 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 ''under the immigration laws.''; and

(3) by striking ''he'' each place such term appears and inserting ''the alien''.

SEC. 5403. 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 V—EMBASSY SECURITY

Subtitle A—Allocation of Authorized Security Appropriations.

SEC. 5501. WORLDWIDE SECURITY PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in fiscal year 2016 for worldwide security protection shall, before any such funds may be allocated to any other authorized purpose, be allocated for—

(1) immediate threat mitigation support in accordance with subsection (b) at facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;

(2) immediate threat mitigation support in accordance with subsection (b) at other facilities; and

(3) locations with high vulnerabilities.

(b) IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION SUPPORT PRIORITIZATION.—In allocating funding for immediate threat mitigation support pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for—

(1) the purchasing of additional security equipment, including additional defensive weaponry;

(2) the paying of expenses of additional security forces; and

(3) any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

SEC. 5502. EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in fiscal year 2016 for ''embassy security, construction and maintenance'' shall, before any funds may be allocated to any other authorized purpose, be allocated in the prioritized order of—

(1) immediate threat mitigation projects in accordance with subsection (b) at facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;

(2) other security upgrades to facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531;

(3) all other immediate threat mitigation projects in accordance with subsection (b); and

(4) security upgrades to all other facilities or new construction for facilities determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531.

(b) IMMEDIATE THREAT MITIGATION PROJECTS PRIORITIZATION.—In allocating funding for immediate threat mitigation projects pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding for the construction of safeguards that provide immediate security benefits and any other purposes necessary to mitigate immediate threats to United States personnel serving overseas.

(c) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated shall be obligated or expended for new embassy construction, other than for high threat, high risk facilities, unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the Department has fully complied with the requirements of subsection (a);

(2) high threat, high risk facilities are being secured to the best of the United States Government's ability; and

(3) the Secretary will make funds available from the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance account or other sources to address any changed security threats or new or emergent security needs, including new immediate threat mitigation projects.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on—

(1) funding for the priorities described in subsection (a);

(2) efforts to secure high threat, high risk facilities as well as high vulnerability locations facilities; and

(3) plans to make funds available from the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance account or other sources to address any changed security threats or new or emergent security needs, including new immediate threat mitigation projects.

Subtitle B—Contracting and Other Matters.

SEC. 5511. LOCAL GUARD CONTRACTS ABROAD UNDER DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 4864(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) in evaluating proposals for such contracts, award contracts to technically acceptable firms offering the lowest evaluated price, except that—

''(A) the Secretary may award contracts on the basis of best value (as determined by a cost-technical tradeoff analysis), especially for posts determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to section 5531 of the Department of State Operations Authorization and Embassy Security Act, Fiscal Year 2016; and

''(B) proposals received from United States persons and qualified United States joint venture persons shall be evaluated by reducing the bid price by 10 percent;''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year 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 includes—

(1) an explanation of the implementation of section 136(c)(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, as amended by subsection (a); and

(2) for each instance in which a contract is awarded pursuant to subparagraph (A) of such section, a written justification and approval that describes the basis for such award and an explanation of the inability of the Secretary to satisfy the needs of the Department by awarding a contract to the technically acceptable firm offering the lowest evaluated price.

SEC. 5512. DISCIPLINARY ACTION RESULTING FROM UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP IN RELATION TO A SECURITY INCIDENT.

Section 304(c) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834 (c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by striking ''Whenever'' in the first sentence immediately following the subsection heading and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever''; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

''(2) CERTAIN SECURITY INCIDENTS.—

''(A) UNSATISFACTORY LEADERSHIP.—Unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a United States Government mission abroad may be grounds for disciplinary action.

''(B) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—If a Board finds reasonable cause to believe that a senior official provided such unsatisfactory leadership, the Board may recommend disciplinary action subject to the procedures in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 5513. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF STATE.—Nothing in this division or in any other provision of law may be construed to prevent the Secretary from using all authorities invested in the office of Secretary to take personnel action against any employee or official of the Department that the Secretary determines has breached the duty of that individual or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or a serious breach of security, even if such action is the subject of an Accountability Review Board's examination under section 304(a) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834(a)).

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 304 of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by inserting ''or has engaged in misconduct or unsatisfactorily performed the duties of employment of that individual, and such misconduct or unsatisfactory performance has significantly contributed to the serious injury, loss of life, or significant destruction of property, or the serious breach of security that is the subject of the Board's examination as described in subsection (a),'' after ''breached the duty of that individual'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY.—Whenever a Board determines that an individual has engaged in any conduct described in subsection (c), the Board shall evaluate the level and effectiveness of management and oversight conducted by employees or officials in the management chain of such individual.''.

SEC. 5514. SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS FOR SOFT TARGETS.

Section 29 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2701) is amended, in the third sentence, by inserting ''physical security enhancements and'' after ''Such assistance may include''.

Subtitle C—Marine Corps Security Guard Program

SEC. 5521. ADDITIONAL REPORTS ON EXPANSION AND ENHANCEMENT OF MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD PROGRAM.

Section 1269(a)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 10 U.S.C. 5983 note) is amended by inserting ''and not less frequently than once each year thereafter until the date that is three years after such date'' after ''of this Act''.

Subtitle D—Defending High Threat, High Risk Posts

SEC. 5531. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, a classified report, with an unclassified summary, evaluating Department facilities that the Secretary determines to be high threat, high risk in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) CONTENTS.—For each facility determined to be high threat, high risk pursuant to subsection (a), the report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a narrative assessment describing the security threats and risks facing posts overseas and the overall threat level to United States personnel under chief of mission authority;

(2) the number of diplomatic security personnel, Marine Corps security guards, and other Department personnel dedicated to providing security for United States personnel, information, and facilities;

(3) an assessment of host nation willingness and capability to provide protection in the event of a security threat or incident, pursuant to the obligations of the United States under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna April 18, 1961;

(4) an assessment of the quality and experience level of the team of United States senior security personnel assigned to the facility, considering collectively the assignment durations and lengths of government experience;

(5) the number of Foreign Service Officers who have received Foreign Affairs Counter Threat training;

(6) a summary of the requests made during the previous calendar year for additional resources, equipment, or personnel related to the security of the facility and the status of such requests;

(7) an assessment of the ability of United States personnel to respond to and survive a fire attack, including—

(A) whether the facility has adequate fire safety and security equipment for safe havens and safe areas; and

(B) whether the employees working at the facility have been adequately trained on the equipment available;

(8) if it is a new facility, a detailed description of the steps taken to provide security for the new facility, including whether a dedicated support cell was established in the Department to ensure proper and timely resourcing of security; and

(9) a listing of any high threat, high risk facilities where the facilities of the Department and other government agencies are not collocated, including—

(A) a rationale for the lack of collocation; and

(B) a description of what steps, if any, are being taken to mitigate potential security vulnerabilities associated with the lack of collocation.

(c) DETERMINATION OF HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK FACILITY.—In determining which facilities of the Department constitute high threat, high risk facilities under this section, the Secretary shall take into account with respect to each facility whether there are—

(1) high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism;

(2) national or local governments with inadequate capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection; and

(3) in locations where there are high to critical levels of political violence or terrorism or where national or local governments lack the capacity or political will to provide appropriate protection—

(A) mission physical security platforms that fall well below the Department's established standards; or

(B) security personnel levels that are insufficient for the circumstances.

(d) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORT.—The Inspector General for the Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall annually—

(1) review the determinations of the Secretary with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including the basis for making such determinations;

(2) review contingency planning for high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures in place to respond to attacks on such facilities;

(3) review the risk mitigation measures in place at high threat, high risk facilities to determine how the Secretary evaluates risk and whether the measures put in place sufficiently address the relevant risks;

(4) review early warning systems in place at high threat, high risk facilities and evaluate the measures being taken to preempt and disrupt threats to such facilities; and

(5) provide to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) an assessment of the determinations of the Secretary with respect to high threat, high risk facilities, including recommendations for additions or changes to the list of such facilities; and

(B) a report on the reviews and evaluations undertaken pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (4).

SEC. 5532. DESIGNATION AND REPORTING FOR HIGH-RISK COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT POSTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives

(2) PRIORITY 1 COUNTERINTELLIGENCE THREAT NATION.—The term ''Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nation'' means a country designated as such by the October 2012 National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF).

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in conjunction with appropriate officials in the intelligence community and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that assesses the counterintelligence threat to United States diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the use of locally employed staff and guard forces and a listing of diplomatic facilities in Priority 1 Counterintelligence Threat Nations without controlled access areas; and

(B) recommendations for mitigating any counterintelligence threats and for any necessary facility upgrades, including costs assessment of any recommended mitigation or upgrades.

SEC. 5533. ENHANCED QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

The Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 206 (22 U.S.C. 4824) the following new section:

''SEC. 207. DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

''The individual serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for High Threat, High Risk Posts shall have 1 or more of the following qualifications:

''(1) Service during the last 6 years at 1 or more posts designated as high threat, high risk by the Secretary of State at the time of service.

''(2) Previous service as the office director or deputy director of 1 or more of the following Department of State offices or successor entities carrying out substantively equivalent functions:

''(A) The Office of Mobile Security Deployments.

''(B) The Office of Special Programs and Coordination.

''(C) The Office of Overseas Protective Operations.

''(D) The Office of Physical Security Programs.

''(E) The Office of Intelligence and Threat Analysis.

''(3) Previous service as the Regional Security Officer at two or more overseas posts.

''(4) Other government or private sector experience substantially equivalent to service in the positions listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).''.

SEC. 5534. SECURITY ENVIRONMENT THREAT LIST BRIEFINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and upon each subsequent update of the Security Environment Threat List (SETL), the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security shall provide classified briefings to the appropriate congressional committees on the Security Environment Threat List.

(b) CONTENT.—The briefings required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an overview of the Security Environment Threat List; and

(2) a summary assessment of the security posture of those facilities where the Security Environment Threat List assesses the threat environment to be most acute, including factors that informed such assessment.

SEC. 5535. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF BENGHAZI ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States 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 describes the progress of the Secretary in implementing the recommendations of the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the progress the Secretary has made in implementing each specific recommendation of the Accountability Review Board; and

(2) a description of any impediments to recommended reforms, such as budget constraints, bureaucratic obstacles within the Department or in the broader interagency community, or limitations under current law.

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

SEC. 5536. FOREIGN AFFAIRS SECURITY TRAINING CENTER.

(a) OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees all documents and materials related to its consideration and analysis concerning the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center at Fort Picket, Virginia, and any alternative facilities.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees all documents and materials related to the determination to construct a new Foreign Affairs Security Training Center at Fort Picket, Virginia, including any that are related to the development and adoption of all related training requirements, including any documents and materials related to the consideration and analysis of such facility performed by the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 5537. LANGUAGE TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 416. LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO HIGH THREAT, HIGH RISK POSTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Diplomatic security personnel assigned permanently to, or who are serving in, long-term temporary duty status as designated by the Secretary of State at a high threat, high risk post should receive language training described in subsection (b) in order to prepare such personnel for duty requirements at such post.

''(b) LANGUAGE TRAINING DESCRIBED.—Language training referred to in subsection (a) should prepare personnel described in such subsection—

''(1) to speak the language at issue with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on subjects germane to security; and

''(2) to read within an adequate range of speed and with almost complete comprehension on subjects germane to security.

''(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors shall—

''(1) review the language training conducted pursuant to this section; and

''(2) make the results of such review available to the Secretary of State and the appropriate congressional committees.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–399) is amended by inserting after the item relating the section 415 the following:

''Sec. 416. Language requirements for diplomatic security personnel assigned to high threat, high risk posts.''.

Subtitle E—Accountability Review Boards

SEC. 5541. PROVISION OF COPIES OF ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW BOARD REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 days after an Accountability Review Board provides its report to the Secretary of State in accordance with title III of the Omnibus Diplomatic and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4831 et seq.), the Secretary shall provide copies of the report to the appropriate congressional committees for retention and review by those committees.

SEC. 5542. STAFFING.

Section 302(b)(2) of the Diplomatic Security Act (22 U.S.C. 4832(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such persons shall be drawn from bureaus or other agency subunits that are not impacted by the incident that is the subject of the Board's review.''.

TITLE VI—MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 5601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited at the ''Improving Department of State Oversight Act of 2015''.

SEC. 5602. COMPETITIVE HIRING STATUS FOR FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any employee of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction who completes at least 12 months of service at any time prior to the date of the termination of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (October 5, 2013), and was not terminated for cause shall acquire competitive status for appointment to any position in the competitive service for which the employee possesses the required qualifications.

SEC. 5603. ASSURANCE OF INDEPENDENCE OF IT SYSTEMS.

The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the Department has made reasonable efforts to ensure the integrity and independence of the Office of the Inspector General Information Technology systems.

SEC. 5604. PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 209(c)(5) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(c)(5)) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) REQUIRED REPORTING OF ALLEGATIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS AND INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each bureau, post or other office (in this subparagraph, an 'entity') of the Department of State shall, within five business days, report to the Inspector General any allegations of—

''(I) waste, fraud, or abuse in a Department program or operation;

''(II) criminal or serious misconduct on the part of a Department employee at the FS–1, GS–15, GM–15 level or higher;

''(III) criminal misconduct on the part of any Department employee; and

''(IV) serious, noncriminal misconduct on the part of any individual who is authorized to carry a weapon, make arrests, or conduct searches, such as conduct that, if proved, would constitute perjury or material dishonesty, warrant suspension as discipline for a first offense, or result in loss of law enforcement authority.

''(ii) INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Inspector General may, pursuant to existing authority, investigate matters covered by clause (i).

''(iii) LIMITATION ON INVESTIGATIONS OUTSIDE OF OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—No entity in the Department of State with concurrent jurisdiction over matters covered by clause (i), including the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, may initiate an investigation of such matter unless it has first reported the allegations to the Inspector General as required by clause (i), except as provided in clause (v) and (vi).

''(iv) COOPERATION.—If an entity in the Department of State initiates an investigation of a matter covered in clause (i) the entity must, except as provided in clause (v), fully cooperate with the Inspector General, including—

''(I) by providing to the Inspector General all data and records obtained in connection with its investigation upon request of the Inspector General;

''(II) by coordinating, at the request of the Inspector General, such entity's investigation with the Inspector General; and

''(III) by providing to the Inspector General requested support in aid of the Inspector General's oversight and investigative responsibilities.

''(v) EXCEPTIONS.—The Inspector General may prescribe general rules under which any requirement of clause (iii) or clause (iv) may be dispensed with.

''(vi) EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.—Compliance with clauses (i), (iii), and (iv) of this subparagraph may be dispensed with by an entity of the Department of State if complying with them in an exigent circumstance would pose an imminent threat to human life, health or safety, or result in the irretrievable loss or destruction of critical evidence or witness testimony, in which case a report of the allegation shall be made not later than 48 hours after an entity begins an investigation under the authority of this clause and cooperation required under clause (iv) shall commence not later than 48 hours after the relevant exigent circumstance has ended.

''(vii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be interpreted to affect any duty or authority of the Inspector General under any provision of law, including the Inspector General's duties or authorities under the Inspector General Act.''.

SEC. 5605. REPORT ON INSPECTOR GENERAL INSPECTION AND AUDITING OF FOREIGN SERVICE POSTS AND BUREAUS AND OPERATING UNITS DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the requirement under section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3929(a)(1)) that the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors inspect and audit, at least every 5 years, the administration of activities and operations of each Foreign Service post and each bureau and other operating unit of the Department.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF MULTI-TIER SYSTEM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall assess the advisability and feasibility of implementing a multi-tier system for inspecting Foreign Service posts featuring more (or less) frequent inspections and audits of posts based on risk, including security risk, as may be determined by the Inspector General.

(c) COMPOSITION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include separate portions prepared by the Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the Comptroller General of the United States, respectively.

SA 1984. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1274. REGIONAL STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THE THREAT POSED BY BOKO HARAM.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a regional strategy to enable the Government of Nigeria and its partners to counter the regional threat of Boko Haram and assist the Government of Nigeria and its neighbors to accept and address grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(2) ELEMENTS.—At a minimum, the strategy must address the following elements:

(A) Enhance, pursuant to existing authorities and restrictions, the institutional capacity, including military capabilities, of the Government of Nigeria and partner nations in the region to counter the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(B) Provide humanitarian support to civilian populations impacted by Boko Haram's activity.

(C) Consider the provision of further assistance in the context of the recipient partner nation's actions in support of human rights and the respect for and implementation of the rule of law.

(D) Seek to provide appropriate assistance to willing and capable partner nations to address the underlying societal factors that contribute to the ability of Boko Haram to radicalize and recruit individuals, including poverty and the lack of economic opportunity and access to education, public health, and infrastructure.

(E) Strengthen the capacity of the civilian police and judicial system in Nigeria to promote the rule of law, enhance public safety, and prevent crime, including gender-based violence, while strengthening accountability measures to prevent corruption and abuses.

(F) Strengthen the long-term capacity of the Government of Nigeria to enhance security for schools to protect girls seeking an education, and to combat gender-based violence and gender inequality.

(G) Support the adoption of a United Nations Security Council Resolution authorizing a regional Multi-National Joint Task Force to counter Boko Haram.

(H) Identify and develop mechanisms for coordinating the implementation of the strategy with the Government of Nigeria, regional partners, and other relevant foreign partners.

(I) Identify the resources required, in an amount not less than $25,000,000, to achieve the strategy's objectives.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment (in classified form) regarding the willingness and capability of the Government of Nigeria to implement the strategy required by subsection (a), including the capability gaps, if any, of the government and military forces of Nigeria that would need to be addressed in order to enable the Government of Nigeria and the governments of its partner countries in the region to counter the threat of Boko Haram and to address grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(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 Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 1985. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON PRIVATE RELOCATION SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDERGOING A PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, 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, in conjunction with work on such matter being conducted by the Comptroller General as of the date of the enactment of this Act, on the use of private sector relocation services to assist members of the Armed Forces and their families with locating and transitioning to off-base or off-post housing in the course of a permanent change of station (PCS).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification of services, not currently available, that would be useful to members of the Armed Forces in undergoing

a permanent change of station as described in subsection (a).

(2) An assessment whether private sector entities are available, or would likely be available, to provide the services described in paragraph (1) if the business opportunity existed.

(3) An assessment of the projected cost, if any, to the Department of Defense, members of the Armed Forces, or both in obtaining the services described in paragraph (1) from private sector entities for members of the Armed Forces relocating during a permanent change of station as described in subsection (a).

SA 1986. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. KIRK) proposed an amendment to the 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, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION E—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

TITLE LI—TAXPAYER PROTECTION PROVISIONS AND INCREASED ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 5101. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'applicable amount', for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, means $135,000,000,000.

''(3) FREEZING OF LENDING CAP IF DEFAULT RATE IS 2 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is 2 percent or more for a quarter, the Bank may not exceed the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding on the last day of that quarter until the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is less than 2 percent.''.

SEC. 5102. INCREASE IN LOSS RESERVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) RESERVE REQUIREMENT.—The Bank shall build to and hold in reserve, to protect against future losses, an amount that is not less than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of disbursed and outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance of the Bank.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5103. REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.

Section 17(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a–6(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

''(1) review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees and the compliance by the Bank with the controls, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions; and

''(2) submit a written report regarding the findings of the review and providing such recommendations with respect to the controls described in paragraph (1) as the Comptroller General deems appropriate to—

''(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 5104. OFFICE OF ETHICS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) OFFICE OF ETHICS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Office of Ethics within the Bank, which shall oversee all ethics issues within the Bank.

''(2) HEAD OF OFFICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office of Ethics shall be the Chief Ethics Officer, who shall report to the Board of Directors.

''(B) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Ethics Officer shall be—

''(i) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

''(I) with a background in law who have experience in the fields of law and ethics; and

''(II) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Ethics Officer; and

''(ii) approved by the Board.

''(C) DESIGNATED AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIAL.—The Chief Ethics Officer shall serve as the designated agency ethics official for the Bank pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.).

''(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Ethics has jurisdiction over all employees of, and ethics matters relating to, the Bank. With respect to employees of the Bank, the Office of Ethics shall—

''(A) recommend administrative actions to establish or enforce standards of official conduct;

''(B) refer to the Office of the Inspector General of the Bank alleged violations of—

''(i) the standards of ethical conduct applicable to employees of the Bank under parts 2635 and 6201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

''(ii) the standards of ethical conduct established by the Chief Ethics Officer; and

''(iii) any other laws, rules, or regulations governing the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities that are applicable to employees of the Bank;

''(C) report to appropriate Federal or State authorities substantial evidence of a violation of any law applicable to the performance of official duties that may have been disclosed to the Office of Ethics; and

''(D) render advisory opinions regarding the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of an employee or contractor of the Bank, and issue general guidance on such matters as necessary.''.

SEC. 5105. CHIEF RISK OFFICER.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by section 5104, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) CHIEF RISK OFFICER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Chief Risk Officer of the Bank, who shall—

''(A) oversee all issues relating to risk within the Bank; and

''(B) report to the President of the Bank.

''(2) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Risk Officer shall be—

''(A) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

''(i) with a demonstrated ability in the general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, financial risk evaluation practices in large governmental or business entities; and

''(ii) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Risk Officer; and

''(B) approved by the Board.

''(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Chief Risk Officer are—

''(A) to be responsible for all matters related to managing and mitigating all risk to which the Bank is exposed, including the programs and operations of the Bank;

''(B) to establish policies and processes for risk oversight, the monitoring of management compliance with risk limits, and the management of risk exposures and risk controls across the Bank;

''(C) to be responsible for the planning and execution of all Bank risk management activities, including policies, reporting, and systems to achieve strategic risk objectives;

''(D) to develop an integrated risk management program that includes identifying, prioritizing, measuring, monitoring, and managing internal control and operating risks and other identified risks;

''(E) to ensure that the process for risk assessment and underwriting for individual transactions considers how each such transaction considers the effect of the transaction on the concentration of exposure in the overall portfolio of the Bank, taking into account fees, collateralization, and historic default rates; and

''(F) to review the adequacy of the use by the Bank of qualitative metrics to assess the risk of default under various scenarios.''.

SEC. 5106. RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by sections 5104 and 5105, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a management committee to be known as the 'Risk Management Committee'.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Risk Management Committee shall be the members of the Board of Directors, with the President and First Vice President of the Bank serving as ex officio members.

''(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Risk Management Committee shall be—

''(A) to oversee, in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank—

''(i) periodic stress testing on the entire Bank portfolio, reflecting different market, industry, and macroeconomic scenarios, and consistent with common practices of commercial and multilateral development banks; and

''(ii) the monitoring of industry, geographic, and obligor exposure levels; and

''(B) to review all required reports on the default rate of the Bank before submission to Congress under section 8(g).''.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United

States shall revise the bylaws of the Bank to terminate the Audit Committee established by section 7 of the bylaws.

SEC. 5107. INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF BANK PORTFOLIO.

(a) AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct an audit or evaluation of the portfolio risk management procedures of the Bank, including a review of the implementation by the Bank of the duties assigned to the Chief Risk Officer under section 3(l) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 5105.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 5108. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REINSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Bank'') may establish a pilot program under which the Bank may enter into contracts and other arrangements to share risks associated with the provision of guarantees, insurance, or credit, or the participation in the extension of credit, by the Bank under that Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF RISK-SHARING.—

(1) PER CONTRACT OR OTHER ARRANGEMENT.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing pursuant to a contract or other arrangement entered into under subsection (a) may not exceed $1,000,000,000.

(2) PER YEAR.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing during a fiscal year pursuant to contracts or other arrangements entered into under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed $10,000,000,000.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2019, the Bank shall submit to Congress a written report that contains a detailed analysis of the use of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a) during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect, impede, or revoke any authority of the Bank.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

TITLE LII—PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTS

SEC. 5201. INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS LENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1)(E)(v) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(E)(v)) is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 5202. REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to Congress under subsection (a) a report on the programs of the Bank for United States businesses with less than $250,000,000 in annual sales.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the report of the Export-Import Bank of the United States submitted to Congress under section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) for the first year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE LIII—MODERNIZATION OF OPERATIONS

SEC. 5301. ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 2(b)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(M) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Bank shall implement policies—

''(i) to accept electronic documents with respect to transactions whenever possible, including copies of bills of lading, certifications, and compliance documents, in such manner so as not to undermine any potential civil or criminal enforcement related to the transactions; and

''(ii) to accept electronic payments in all of its programs.''.

SEC. 5302. REAUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UPDATING.

Section 3(j) of the Export-Import Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2012, 2013, and 2014'' and inserting ''2015 through 2019'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''(I) the funds'' and inserting ''(i) the funds''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''2012, 2013, and 2014'' and inserting ''2015 through 2019''.

TITLE LIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5401. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date on which the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States expires under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f)''.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date on which the authority of the Bank expires under section 7''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SEC. 5402. CERTAIN UPDATED LOAN TERMS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) LOAN TERMS FOR MEDIUM-TERM FINANCING.—Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) with principal amounts of not more than $25,000,000; and''.

(b) COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES RELATING TO INSURANCE.—Section 2(d)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''.

(c) EXPORT AMOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.—Section 3(g)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(g)(3)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.—Section 11(a)(1)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i–5(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 or more'' and inserting the following: ''$25,000,000 (or, if less than $25,000,000, the threshold established pursuant to international agreements, including the Common Approaches for Officially Supported Export Credits and Environmental and Social Due Diligence, as adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Council on June 28, 2012, and the risk-management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing, and managing environmental and social risk in projects (commonly referred to as the 'Equator Principles')) or more''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

TITLE LV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 5501. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (6 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, the Bank may not—

''(A) deny an application for financing based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns; or

''(B) promulgate or implement policies that discriminate against an application based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibitions under paragraph (1) apply only to applications for financing by the Bank for projects concerning the exploration, development, production, or export of energy sources and the generation or transmission of electrical power, or combined heat and power, regardless of the energy source involved.''.

SEC. 5502. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a–5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the 'Secretary')'' and inserting ''President''; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''(OECD)'' and inserting ''(in this section referred to as the 'OECD')''; and

(ii) by striking ''ultimate goal of eliminating'' and inserting ''possible goal of eliminating, before the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015,'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''Secretary'' each place it appears and inserting ''President''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the President shall submit to Congress a proposal, and a strategy for achieving the proposal, that the United States Government will pursue with other major exporting countries, including OECD members and non-OECD members, to eliminate over a period of not more than 10 years subsidized export-financing programs, tied aid, export credits, and all other forms of government-supported export subsidies.

''(d) NEGOTIATIONS WITH NON-OECD MEMBERS.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with countries that are not OECD members to bring those countries into a multilateral agreement establishing rules and limitations on officially supported export credits.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and annually thereafter through calendar year 2019, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (d).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a–5(b)) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5503. STUDY OF FINANCING FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE OF BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Bank'') shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by companies that export information and communications technology services and related goods.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of information and communications technology services and related goods, and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports of such services and related goods.

(2) The reduction in the financing by the Bank of exports of information and communications technology services from 2003 through 2014.

(3) The activities of foreign export credit agencies to facilitate the export of information and communications technology services and related goods.

(4) Specific proposals for how the Bank could provide additional financing for the exportation of information and communications technology services and related goods through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer new products to meet the needs of the information and communications technology industry;

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide increased financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank;

(D) specific proposals that would enable the Bank to provide increased outreach to the information and communications technology industry about the products the Bank offers; and

(E) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide the financing to build information and communications technology infrastructure, in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank, to allow for market access opportunities for United States information and communications technology companies to provide services on the infrastructure being financed by the Bank.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

SA 1987. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. BOXER) 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. PROHIBITION ON DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND COMBAT TROOPS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to support the deployment of the United States Armed Forces for the purpose of ground combat operations in Iraq or Syria, except as necessary—

(1) for the protection or rescue of members of the United States Armed Forces or United States citizens from imminent danger posed by ISIL; or

(2) to conduct missions not intended to result in ground combat operations by United States forces, such as—

(A) intelligence collection and sharing;

(B) enabling kinetic strikes;

(C) limited operations against high value targets;

(D) operational planning; or

(E) other forms of advice and assistance to coalition forces fighting ISIL in Iraq or Syria.

SA 1988. Mr. BLUNT (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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ANNUAL MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the Department of Defense and the Defense Health Agency are currently developing a standardized periodic health assessment tool that incorporates a screening for depression, posttraumatic stress, substance use, and risk for suicide through a person-to-person dialogue using the same question set used for mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces undergoing deployment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces under section 1074n of title 10, United States Code, that includes a description of—

(1) the reliability of such assessments;

(2) any significant changes in mental health concerns among members of the Armed Forces as a result of such assessments;

(3) any areas in which the provision of such assessments to members of the Armed Forces needs to improve; and

(4) such additional information as the Secretary considers necessary relating to mental health screening and treatment of members of the Armed Forces.

SA 1989. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 5701. 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 1990. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1983 submitted by Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) and intended to be proposed to the 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 56___. UNAUTHORIZED DEALINGS IN SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL.

Section 57b.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2077(b)(2)) is amended in the first sentence in the proviso by inserting ''the Director of National Intelligence,'' after ''Commerce,''.

SA 1991. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 811. REPORT ON VALUE-BASED ACQUISITION APPROACHES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics and each of the Service Acquisition Executives shall independently submit to the congressional defense committees reports that propose methodologies for quantitatively measuring and optimizing the targeted and returned value of the acquisition portfolio of each component of the Department of Defense, and the benefits of such assessments in supporting improved acquisition outcomes.

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

(1) An analysis of the applicability of current industry and government best practices in value-centric management.

(2) An analysis of the implications of acquisition-related statutory and policy requirements on the implementation of a value-centric approach to portfolio management.

(3) A description of the impact of processes outside the acquisition system on the value of a delivered capability.

(4) One or more quantitative approaches that could be used to measure and compare the value of disparate programs within the component's acquisition portfolio.

(c) VALUE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Value'' means a quantifiable measure of benefit, which is composed of quantitative assessments of utility, life cycle cost, and development time for a given capability or set of capabilities.

SA 1992. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REPEAL OF PER-AIRCRAFT LIMITATION FOR MODIFYING HC–130H AIRCRAFT FOR FIRE SUPPRESSION PURPOSES.

Section 1098(a)(2)(C) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 882) is amended by striking clause (i).

SA 1993. Mr. REED 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 535 and insert the following:

SEC. 535. LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE WHILE RECEIVING POST-9/11 EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 8525 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) except for an individual described in subsection (c), an educational assistance allowance under chapter 33 of title 38.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) An individual described in this subsection is an individual—

''(1) who is otherwise entitled to compensation under this subchapter;

''(2) who is an individual described in section 3311(b) of title 38;

''(3) who is not receiving retired pay under title 10; and

''(4)(A) who—

''(i) did not voluntarily separate from service in the Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (including through a reduction in force); and

''(ii) was discharged or released from such service under honorable conditions; or

''(B) who—

''(i) voluntarily separated from service in the Armed Forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

''(ii) was employed after such separation from such service; and

''(iii) was terminated from such employment other than for cause due to misconduct connected with such employment.''.

SA 1994. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 419, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 420, line 3 and insert the following:

(2) establish a process by which the contractor may appeal a determination by a contracting officer that an earlier determination was made in error or was based on inadequate information to the head of contracting for the agency; and

(3) establish a process by which a commercial item determination can be revoked by the head of the contracting activity in cases where the contracting officer is no longer able to make an assessment that the prior determination is appropriate and still applicable based on market research and value-based pricing analysis that demonstrates that the Department of Defense would pay more for the item than it had previously or another source could provide a similar item for a lower price.

SA 1995. 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. REPORT 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 submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment 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 1996. Mr. VITTER 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, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Export-Import Bank of the United States administers—

(i) the Working Capital Loan Guarantee Program, which—

(I) facilitates finance for businesses, in particular small businesses, that have exporting potential but need working capital funds to produce or market goods or services for export;

(II) provides repayment guarantees to lenders on short- and medium-term working capital loans made to qualified exporters, which loans are secured by export-related accounts receivable and inventory;

(III) provides a guarantee of up to 90 percent of the principal and interest on a loan

made to an exporter by a private lender for export-related accounts receivable; and

(IV) provides a guarantee of up to 75 percent for export-related inventory;

(ii) the Global Credit Express Loan Program, which provides direct working capital loans to small businesses for a 6- or 12-month revolving line of credit of not more than $500,000; and

(iii) the Export Credit Insurance Program, which—

(I) extends credit terms to foreign customers;

(II) insures against nonpayment by international buyers;

(III) covers both commercial and political losses with a 95 percent guarantee; and

(IV) arranges financing through a lender by using insured receivables as additional collateral;

(B) the export loan programs of the Export-Import Bank of the United States described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) are less appealing to small businesses due to lending restrictions on loans under those programs, which provide that—

(i) the loans may not be used when the export product being financed has less than 50 percent United States content;

(ii) the loans may not be used to finance sales to foreign military buyers, with which a growing number of small businesses are contracting; and

(iii) contracts and purchase orders supported by letters of credit may not be used in determining the borrowing base; and

(C) the Small Business Administration administers—

(i) the Export Working Capital Program, established under section 7(a)(14) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(14)), which provides short-term working capital, including revolving lines of credit, of not more than $5,000,000 with a 90 percent guarantee;

(ii) the International Trade Loan Program, established under section 7(a)(16) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(16)), which provides financing of not more than $5,000,000 with a 90 percent guarantee for fixed assets, or to improve a competitive position that has been adversely affected by import competition; and

(iii) the Export Express Program, established under 7(a)(34) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(34)), under which—

(I) exporters are provided with a streamlined method to obtain financing backed by the Small Business Administration for loans and lines of credit of not more than $500,000;

(II) lenders use their own credit decision process and loan documentation;

(III) the Small Business Administration determines eligibility and provides a loan approval in 36 hours or less; and

(IV) the guarantee is 90 percent for a loan that is not more than $350,000 and 75 percent for a loan that is more than $350,000 and not more than $500,000.

(2) ADDITIONAL FINDINGS.—Congress further finds that—

(A) the export loan programs of the Small Business Administration described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) are not restricted by the limitations described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of paragraph (1)(B); and

(ii) should be commended for their flexibility, quick turnaround times, and the one-on-one assistance from Small Business Administration personnel in structuring loan deals, negotiating payment terms, and ensuring that the financial needs of small businesses are met;

(B) the Export-Import Bank of the United States only has Regional Export Finance Managers co-located in 12 Department of Commerce United States Export Assistance Centers, whereas the Small Business Administration—

(i) has Regional Export Finance Managers co-located in 20 United States Export Assistance Centers; and

(ii) currently has Regional Export Finance Managers co-located in 10 additional United States Export Assistance Center locations that the Export-Import Bank of the United States does not, including in—

(I) Arlington, Virginia;

(II) Boston, Massachusetts;

(III) Charlotte, North Carolina;

(IV) Cleveland, Ohio;

(V) Denver, Colorado;

(VI) Los Angeles, California;

(VII) New Orleans, Louisiana;

(VIII) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

(IX) Portland, Oregon; and

(X) St. Louis, Missouri;

(C) the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 631 note) increased the maximum loan size under the 2 largest export loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration to $5,000,000, which could cover approximately 80 percent of all small business export loans currently guaranteed by taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank of the United States;

(D) the export loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration and the export loan programs administered the Export-Import Bank of the United States are—

(i) duplicative of each other, except for the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; and

(ii) under the current structure, competing against each other for small business clients; and

(E) the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States is a vital component of export loan programs.

(3) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—It is hereby declared to be the policy of this section—

(A) that, should the statutory authority for the export loan programs administered by the Export-Import Bank of the United States lapse, the Small Business Administration shall serve the small business clients of the Export-Import Bank of the United States under existing statutory authority of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.);

(B) to create an Export Credit Insurance Program within the Small Business Administration similar to the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; and

(C) to ensure that small business exporters are served by the programs of the Small Business Administration.

(b) EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.—Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

''(l) EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a program under which the Administration shall provide insurance for the exports of small business concerns, including insurance against nonpayment by international buyers.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to carry out the program established under paragraph (1), which shall be, to the maximum extent practicable, substantially similar to the Export Credit Insurance Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. 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 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Passenger Rail Safety: Accident Prevention and On-Going Efforts to Implement Train Control Technology.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 5 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Verification and Assessment: How do you create a successful Inspections Regime?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Health Information Exchange: A Path Towards Improving the Quality and Value of Health Care for Patients.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Addressing the Need for Victim Services in Indian Country.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining the Federal Regulatory System to Improve Accountability, Transparency and Integrity.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 1:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Wasteful Spending in the Federal Government: An Outside Perspective.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES ON AGING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Ringing Off the Hook: Examining the Proliferation of Unwanted Calls.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Elizabeth Dysart, an intern on Senator LEAHY's personal office staff, be granted Senate floor privileges on Wednesday, June 10, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. HUBER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

NOMINATION OF EILEEN MAURA DECKER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOMINATION OF ERIC STEVEN MILLER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 142, 143, 144; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following the disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations.

VOTE ON HUBER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John W. Huber, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DECKER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eileen Maura Decker, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MILLER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CONSOLIDATED REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 100, S. 253.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 253) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 253

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 13. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the last quarter of every even-numbered year, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the state of the communications marketplace.

''(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, audio, and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332), multichannel video programming distributors (as defined in section 602), broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;

''(2) assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302)), regardless of the technology used for such deployment;

''(3) assess whether laws, regulations, regulatory practices, or demonstrated marketplace practices pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services; and

''(4) describe the agenda of the Commission for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments under paragraphs (1) through (3).

''(c) EXTENSION.—If the Senate confirms the Chairman of the Commission during the third or fourth quarter of an even-numbered year, the report required under subsection (a) may be published on the website of the Commission and submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by March 1 of the following odd-numbered year.

''(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) ASSESSING COMPETITION.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal competition, facilities-based competition, and competition from new and emergent communications services, including the provision of content and communications using the Internet.

''(2) ASSESSING DEPLOYMENT.—In assessing the state of deployment under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall include a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability.

''(3) CONSIDERING SMALL BUSINESSES.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1) and barriers under subsection (b)(3), the Commission shall consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace in accordance with the national policy under section 257(b).

''(e) NOTIFICATION OF DELAY IN REPORT.—If the Commission fails to publish a report by the applicable deadline under subsection (a) or (c), the Commission shall, not later than 7 days after the deadline and every 60 days thereafter until the publication of the report—

''(1) provide notification of the delay by letter to the chairperson and ranking member of—

''(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

''(2) indicate in the letter the date on which the Commission anticipates the report will be published; and

''(3) publish the letter on the website of the Commission.''.

SEC. 3. CONSOLIDATION OF REDUNDANT REPORTS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ORBIT ACT REPORT.—Section 646 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 765e) is repealed.

(b) SATELLITE COMPETITION REPORT.—Section 4 of Public Law 109–34 (47 U.S.C. 703) is repealed.

(c) INTERNATIONAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.—Section 103(b)(1) of the Broadband Data Improvement Act (47 U.S.C. 1303(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''the assessment and report'' and all that follows through ''the Federal Communications Commission'' and inserting ''its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission''.

(d) STATUS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET FOR THE DELIVERY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING REPORT.—Section 628 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 548) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (g); and

(3) by transferring subsection (g) (as redesignated) so that it appears after subsection (f).

(e) REPORT ON CABLE INDUSTRY PRICES.—Section 623(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''annually publish'' and inserting ''publish with its report under section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the heading, by striking ''ANNUAL''.

(f) TRIENNIAL REPORT IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING MARKET ENTRY BARRIERS FOR ENTREPRENEURS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 257 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 257) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(g) STATE OF COMPETITIVE MARKET CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICES.—Section 332(c)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking the first and second sentences.

(h) PREVIOUSLY ELIMINATED ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 9(i), by striking ''In the Commission's annual report, the Commission shall prepare an analysis of its progress in developing such systems and'' and inserting ''The Commission''; and

(B) in section 309(j)(8)(B), by striking the last sentence.

(i) ADDITIONAL OUTDATED REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 4—

(i) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii), by striking ''and shall furnish notice of such action'' and all that follows through ''subject of the waiver''; and

(ii) in subsection (g)—

(I) by striking paragraph (2); and

(II) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(B) in section 215—

(i) by striking subsection (b); and

(ii) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(C) in section 227(e)—

(i) by striking paragraph (4); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (8), respectively;

(D) in section 303(u)(1)(B), by striking ''section 713(f)'' and inserting ''section 713(e)'';

(E) in section 309(j)—

(i) by striking paragraph (12);

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (17) as paragraphs (12) through (16), respectively; and

(iii) in paragraph (14)(C), as redesignated—

(I) by striking clause (iv); and

(II) by redesignating clauses (v) and (vi) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(F) in section 331(b), by striking the last sentence;

(G) in section 336(e), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) REPORT.—The Commission shall annually advise the Congress on the amounts collected pursuant to the program required by this subsection.'';

(H) in section 338(k)(6), by striking ''section 396(k)(6)(B)'' and inserting ''section 396(j)(6)(B)'';

(I) in section 339(c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1);

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively;

(iii) in paragraph (3)(A), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraphs (2) and (4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1) and (3)'';

(J) in section 396—

(i) by striking subsections (i) and (m);

(ii) by redesignating subsections (j) through (l) as subsections (i) through (k), respectively;

(iii) in subsection (j), as redesignated—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (F);

(II) in paragraph (3)(B)(iii)—

(aa) by striking subclause (V);

(bb) by redesignating subclause (VI) as subclause (V); and

(cc) in subclause (V), as redesignated, by striking ''subsection (l)(4)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (k)(4)(B)''; and

(III) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (1)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (k)(3)(B)''; and

(iv) in subsection (k), as redesignated—

(I) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''shall be included'' and all that follows through ''The audit report''; and

(II) in paragraph (4), by striking ''subsection (k)'' each place that term appears and inserting ''subsection (j)'';

(K) in section 398(b)(4), by striking the third sentence;

(L) in section 399B(c), by striking ''section 396(k)'' and inserting ''section 396(j)'';

(M) in section 615(l)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ''section 396(k)(6)(B)'' and inserting ''section 396(j)(6)(B)'';

(N) in section 624A(b)(1)—

(i) by striking ''REPORT; REGULATIONS'' and inserting ''REGULATIONS'';

(ii) by striking ''Within 1 year after'' and all that follows through ''on means of assuring'' and inserting ''The Commission shall issue such regulations as are necessary to assure''; and

(iii) by striking ''Within 180 days after'' and all that follows through ''to assure such compatibility.''; and

(O) in section 713—

(i) by striking subsection (a);

(ii) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (j) as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(iii) in subsection (a), as redesignated, by striking ''subsection (d)'' each place that term appears and inserting ''subsection (c)'';

(iv) in subsection (b), as redesignated, by striking ''subsection (b)'' each place that term appears and inserting ''subsection (a)'';

(v) in subsection (c), as redesignated, by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)'';

(vi) in subsection (e)(2)(A), as redesignated, by striking ''subsection (h)'' and inserting ''subsection (g)''; and

(vii) in subsection (f), as redesignated, by striking ''subsection (e)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(2)''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012.—Section 6401(b) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1451(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(15)(A)'' and inserting ''(14)(A)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''(16)(B)'' and inserting ''(15)(B)''.

(B) TITLE 17.—Title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 114(d)(1)(B)(iv), by striking ''section 396(k)'' and inserting ''section 396(j)''; and

(ii) in section 119(a)—

(I) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

(aa) in subclause (I), by striking ''section 339(c)(3)'' and inserting ''section 339(c)(2)'';

(bb) in subclause (II), by striking ''section 339(c)(4)'' and inserting ''section 339(c)(3)''; and

(cc) in subclause (III), by striking ''section 339(c)(3)'' and inserting ''section 339(c)(2)'';

(II) in paragraph (3)(E), by striking ''section 339(c)(2)'' and inserting ''section 339(c)(1)''; and

(III) in paragraph (13), by striking ''section 339(c)(2)'' and inserting ''section 339(c)(1)''.

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 5. OTHER REPORTS.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the Federal Communications Commission from producing any additional reports otherwise within the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, by read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The bill (S. 253), as amended, was passed.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARIES OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE 13TH, 14TH, AND 15TH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 198, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 198) commemorating the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, often referred to as the ''Second Founding'' of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on September 17, 1787, George Washington, James Madison, and their fellow framers made the momentous decision to sign the Constitution and send it along to the American people for ratification—marking a new beginning in our Nation's profound experiment in democracy.

While the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 established the firm foundation for our democracy, it was not complete because it did not address the vexing issue of slavery. It would take more than seven decades and a bloody civil war before our founding charter would right that wrong.

This year marks the sesquicentennial, or the 150th anniversary, of the Thirteenth Amendment, which, along with the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, has been described by scholars as our Nation's ''Second Founding.'' Ratified by President Lincoln and his generation after the Civil War, these second founding amendments transformed our original charter by ending slavery, banning racial discrimination in voting, and elevating liberty and equality to a central place in our constitutional order. While we rightly celebrate our original founding charter, we have often overlooked the importance of these subsequent amendments, which has served as the bedrock and inspiration to procuring equality for racial minorities and women.

On January 31, 1865, Congress passed the Thirteenth Amendment to end slavery and sent it to the States for ratification. Passage of that amendment was by no means an easy feat. As brilliantly captured by Steven Spielberg in his film ''Lincoln,'' the final vote was every bit as dramatic as the film's portrayal. Doris Kearns Goodwin's award-winning book, ''Team of Rivals,'' noted that before this historic vote: ''Every available foot of space, both in the galleries and on the floor of the House, was crowded at an early hour,'' and the attendees included Chief Justice Chase and the members of the Supreme Court, along with Secretary of State William Seward.

Without the support of five Democrats who became the swing votes, the amendment would never have passed. One Pennsylvania congressman, knowing that his vote could very well cost him his seat, said right before he cast his vote that ''If by my action today I dig my political grave, I will descend into it without a murmur.'' I am proud to say that both of Vermont's Senators voted in favor of the amendment, including Senator Solomon Foot, who served as President pro tempore of the Senate during the Civil War, and Senator Jacob Collamer, who was called the ''Green Mountain Socrates'' by Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Upon the amendment's passage, Secretary of War Edwin Stanton ordered 100 guns to fire with their heaviest charges while the names of those who voted in favor of the amendment were read aloud because ''History [would] embalm them in great honor.''

Upon passage, President Lincoln received praise from even his most ardent critics, including the prominent abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, who once burned a copy of the Constitution while calling it a proslavery document.

While this year marks the 150th anniversary of the passage and ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, we should celebrate the second founding amendments together, for they are inextricably bound. The Fourteenth Amendment, passed in 1866 and ratified in 1868, is perhaps the single most influential amendment passed after the Bill of Rights. This week also marks the 149th anniversary of the passage of the 14th Amendment in the Senate. It was under the command of the Fourteenth Amendment providing equal protection for all citizens that the Supreme Court held that separate was inherently unequal in Brown v. Board of Education; that marriage is a fundamental right that cannot be tainted with racial discrimination in Loving v. Virginia; that women could not be denied admission into an all-male military institute because of their gender in United States v. Virginia; and many others, including hopefully, that the fundamental right to marriage extends to all individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity in Obergefell v. Hodges.

Ratification of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments cannot be separated from the Fifteenth, which outlawed racial discrimination in voting. In 1865, one month after the end of the Civil War, William Lloyd Garrison called for disbanding an anti-slavery society of which Frederick Douglass and others were members. Prescient as ever, and about 100 years before the passage of the Voting Rights Act, Frederick Douglass responded that ''Slavery is not abolished until the black man has the ballot.''

As we celebrate the second founding amendments, we must also take time to recognize that issues of race continue to plague our Nation. And as far as we have come, we still have a lot further to go in our march toward a more perfect union. There are some who would confine the fight for civil rights to a bygone era. They see it as a remnant of the distant past in our Nation's history. And they cite the election of an African American president as evidence that we have somehow achieved full equality under the law. But we know the struggle for equality and for civil rights is ongoing. The fight for a more perfect union is one that every generation must contribute to—including this one.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 11; 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 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the time be equally divided in the usual form; finally, that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FLAKE. 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.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:16 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 11, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CAROLYN PATRICIA ALSUP, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA.

PAUL WAYNE JONES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.

DANIEL H. RUBINSTEIN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED PERSONS OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MAURA BARRY BOYLE, OF NEW YORK
PETER C. TRENCHARD, OF MARYLAND

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BRADLEY DUANE ARSENAULT, OF FLORIDA
BRET THOMAS CAMPBELL, OF TEXAS
KAREN STONE EXEL, OF CALIFORNIA
GLORIA JEAN GARLAND, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL H. HRYSHCHYSHYN, JR., OF VIRGINIA
YING X. HSU, OF CALIFORNIA
STEPHEN S. KELLEY, OF VIRGINIA
MARY CATHERINE LEHERR, OF VIRGINIA
DENISE G. MANNING, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL KARLIS MARKOVS, OF MICHIGAN
SCOTT CURRIE MCNIVEN, OF ARIZONA
HANH NGOC NGUYEN, OF CALIFORNIA
DENISE FRANCES O'TOOLE, OF MAINE
MARISOL E. PEREZ, OF NEW JERSEY
RONALD F. SAVAGE, OF NEW MEXICO
ADAM P. SCHMIDT, OF CONNECTICUT
ANNA TONESS, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL J. TORREANO, OF FLORIDA
NICHOLAS JOHN VIVIO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMSHED ZUBERI, OF CALIFORNIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ELISA RACHEL ADELMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
REID HARMON AHL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JUDE EDMUND AIDOO II, OF MARYLAND
NABIL KHALED ALSOUFI, OF CALIFORNIA
LYLA J. ANDREWS BASHAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CARRIE KRISTIN ANTAL, OF WASHINGTON
LINDA ARMSTRONG, OF ARIZONA
AVANI PATEL BALUCI, OF ILLINOIS
NOEL GEOFFREY BAUER, OF MISSOURI
ALLYSON PERRY BEAR, OF MARYLAND
AMY MARIE BEELER, OF CONNECTICUT
ALISON CORAL BIRD, OF NEW YORK
SANDRA SEO YEON BIRD, OF NEW YORK
JULIE L. BOCCANERA, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW EDWARD BOEGEL, OF FLORIDA
JEREMY D. BOLEY, OF FLORIDA
MARC BONNENFANT, OF CALIFORNIA
JAMES BORGER, OF FLORIDA
PATRICK D. BOWERS, OF WASHINGTON
CRYSTAL N. BYRD, OF MARYLAND
ELIZABETH MICHELLE CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA GOULART CAMPBELL, OF MAINE
MICHAEL FRANCIS CAPOBIANCO, JR., OF FLORIDA
DAWN CHERRIE CARMIN, OF COLORADO
ALISON J. CASE, OF MICHIGAN
JUDY CHANG, OF NORTH CAROLINA
MICHELLE CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA
MARK W. CHILDERHOSE, OF NEW YORK
ZACHARY CRAIG CLARKE, OF IDAHO
LEE COHEN, OF NEW YORK
CHRISTEAN JOSETTE COLE, OF MARYLAND
JOHN M. COLLINS, OF CALIFORNIA
CHAD WILLIAM CONLIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
EUGENE ALVARO COOPER, OF CALIFORNIA
JESSICA HARPER COULIBALY, OF CONNECTICUT
MATTHEW PATRICK CULLINANE, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER J. DALY, OF ILLINOIS
CHRISTINE A. DANTON, OF FLORIDA
ADRIANA KRISTEN DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINA T. DAVIS, OF TEXAS
JEFFRIES BLUNT DE GRAFFENRIED, JR., OF FLORIDA
CURTRICE E. DORSEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ERIN EPSTEIN DOSS, OF FLORIDA
BRIAN R. ELLIS, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER ERIE, OF MARYLAND
BRANDON E. L. FENLEY, OF VIRGINIA
COREY J. FORTIN, OF KANSAS
KEVIN CHRISTOPHER FOX, OF FLORIDA
MEREDITH ANNE FOX, OF TEXAS
CHRISTOPHER JOHN FREY, OF FLORIDA
IRA JOSEPH FRYDMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
BETHANY KATHARINE GADDIS, OF COLORADO
CONRADO A. GARCIA, OF VIRGINIA
TAYLOR HOWELL GARRETT, OF TEXAS
MARK D. GIZZI, OF CALIFORNIA
DION L. GLISAN, OF OREGON
LISA L. GODWIN, OF ALABAMA
JEAN–MARC GORELICK, OF NEW YORK
JESSE GUTIERREZ, OF CALIFORNIA
TRAVIS RAY GUYMON, OF IDAHO
ALEXANDRA MONTEALEGRE HADZI–VIDANOVIC, OF FLORIDA
MALICK HAIDARA, OF COLORADO
COREY A. HANCOCK, OF FLORIDA
KENNETH WOLF HASSON, OF TEXAS
JESSICA FORREST HEALEY, OF TEXAS
MARY TYLER HOLMES, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANN HOPPER, OF VIRGINIA
TIMOTHY M. HURLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MATTHEW LOWELL HUTCHERSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA
STEPHANIE ELISE ICELAND–LEITZEL, OF CALIFORNIA
CHIDINMA U. IKONNE, OF MARYLAND
DEBBIE PATRICE JACKSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JUNO LAWRENCE JAFFER, OF VIRGINIA
LEIGH HAMILTON JONES, OF VIRGINIA
M. THOMAS KALUZNY, OF CALIFORNIA
MISCHERE KAWAS, OF FLORIDA
KISHORI KEDLAYA, OF CALIFORNIA
NANCY H. KLEINHANS, OF NEVADA
RYAN D. KNIGHT, OF COLORADO
BYRON C. KOMINEK, OF TENNESSEE
MICHELLE KOSCIELSKI, OF ILLINOIS
CLAUDIA OLIVIA KOZIOL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HARRY THORNTON KRIZ, OF FLORIDA
JOHN KARL KUEHNLE, OF MAINE
KAROLYN KUO, OF CALIFORNIA
AVIVA ESTHER KUTNICK, OF MARYLAND
JANNIE KWOK, OF CALIFORNIA
CARLOS ANDRES LAMADRID, OF CALIFORNIA
SANG E. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA
GREGORY CARL LEON, OF NEW YORK
BRONWYN BOWEN LLEWELLYN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JAMES G. LYKOS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JOHN P. MACY, OF WEST VIRGINIA
SABINA MALIK, OF NEW YORK
LEROY L. MARSHALL III, OF NEW JERSEY
BRIAN MEHLE MARTALUS, OF NEW JERSEY
KEVIN CHESLEY MARTIN, OF GEORGIA
SUSAN MATHEW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANNA HARRISON MCCREREY, OF VIRGINIA
ANNMARIE MCGILLICUDDY, OF VIRGINIA
JASON EDWARD MCNABB, OF CALIFORNIA
SEAN R. MENDOZA, OF ARIZONA
BELAY ASMAMAW MENGISTU, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER A. MILLER, OF FLORIDA
KIRA MICKIE MITRE, OF VIRGINIA
MONIQUE MURAD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JENNY PARRY NEVILLE, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL W. NICHOLSON, OF KENTUCKY
DANIELE HENRIETTE NYIRANDUTIYE, OF OHIO
NATHAN A. OLAH, OF VIRGINIA
FOLASADE A. OWOLABI, OF NEW YORK
CHRISTINE PAGEN, OF NEW YORK
ROBERT L. PARNELL IV, OF FLORIDA
LINDA JEANNE PERCY, OF FLORIDA
PAUL MICHAEL PLEVA, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA M. PLUCKNETT, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA J. PONS, OF CALIFORNIA
CARRIE RASMUSSEN, OF WASHINGTON
ANDREW REESE, OF TEXAS
TARA M. REICHENBACH, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER RENQUIST HORSFALL, OF TENNESSEE
ERIN MICHELLE RICCI, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN PATRICK ROBERTS, OF CALIFORNIA
JUAN CARLOS RODRIGUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID MARTIN ROGERS, OF CALIFORNIA
EMILY MCCORMICK RUPP, OF VIRGINIA
BRET THOMAS SAALWAECHTER, OF CALIFORNIA
BRENDAN SANDERS, OF MISSOURI
SHANNON MIRIAM SCHISSLER, OF NEW JERSEY
DEREK R. SEDLACEK, OF TEXAS
REBECCA SEMMES, OF TENNESSEE
PAUL AIYONG SEONG, OF VIRGINIA
PALAK VINOD SHAH, OF ILLINOIS
K. PRESTON SHARP, OF CALIFORNIA
MAURICE L. SHINES, OF MARYLAND
GARY SHU, OF NEW JERSEY
ADAM J. SILAGYI, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL SINCLAIR, OF FLORIDA
ERIK M. SINGER, OF TEXAS
B. JAMES SOUKAMNEUTH, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER NAIRN STEEL, OF NEW JERSEY
MOLLY I. STEINBAUER, OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC REED STRONG, OF CALIFORNIA
ROGER KATTIRATH SYDNEY, OF TEXAS
SOPHIE J. TAINTOR, OF TENNESSEE
DANIELLE TEDESCO, OF DELAWARE
ANANTHY MICHELE THAMBINAYAGAM, OF WASHINGTON
ROD THOMPSON, OF FLORIDA
THEOPHILUS ANDREW THORPE, OF DELAWARE
SUZANNE MARIE TRUCHARD, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL A. TRUEBLOOD, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL C. VERSCHNEIDER, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL KWESI VORDJORBE, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY ANN WANN, OF MISSOURI
SHERRY WARD, OF NEVADA
DENNIS MICHAEL WESNER, OF ILLINOIS
SARA A. WESSELS, OF OHIO
KERRY L. WEST, OF ILLINOIS
BRENDAN WHEELER, OF CONNECTICUT
NANCY D. WHITNEY, OF ARIZONA
ANDREW KIRK GERALD WILLIAMS, OF FLORIDA
ANTHONY WOLAK, OF MINNESOTA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER P. AZZANO

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 10, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN W. HUBER, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EILEEN MAURA DECKER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 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.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER VIVIAN WANG

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Vivian Wang of Sugar Land's Cornerstone Elementary for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Vivian Wang, who is currently in the fifth grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Vivian's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Vivian for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

RECOGNIZING SUNNY HILLS SERVICES

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to recognize Sunny Hills Services in San Anselmo, California, on the occasion of their 120th Anniversary Celebration, held on June 5, 2015.

For more than a century, Sunny Hills Services has dedicated itself to protecting, nurturing and healing at-risk youth in Marin County and the greater Bay Area. Originally founded as an orphanage and farm, today Sunny Hills helps children and adolescents across the region grow up in safe, healthy environments, develop life skills, achieve academically, and engage positively with our community. They have worked tirelessly on behalf of our most vulnerable citizens, and remain a leader in best practices for child welfare programs.

Sunny Hills' relentless advocacy on behalf of our youth has left a lasting impact on individuals, families, and neighborhoods. In the past year alone, they have helped more than 1,600 minors and 1,100 families and caregivers—and that does not include the countless friends, teachers, and classmates affected by their work. From providing mental health services for children experiencing behavioral and emotional difficulties to organizing transitional housing for former foster youth, Sunny Hills continues to engender meaningful change in the lives of our young people and enrich the fabric of our community.

Future generations rely upon the support today's children receive. We are all better off because of the vital work Sunny Hills performs by giving youth the tools they need to thrive. Mr. Speaker, we urge our colleagues to join us in congratulating Sunny Hills Services on this milestone and wishing them continued success for years to come.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MRS. SHIRLEY MAE EDDY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Shirley Mae Eddy of Canfield, Ohio who will forever be remembered as a loving wife, mother, and grandmother as well as a devoted Christian. Mrs. Eddy spent the early parts of her life in Pennsylvania, however, when she married the love of her life Bob Eddy, the two relocated to Warren, Ohio. Tomorrow Mr. and Mrs. Eddy would have celebrated their 60th anniversary. Mrs. Eddy valued her family above all else, and she enjoyed spending time with her six grandchildren and great-grandson. All who knew her could attest to her life being built on the strong foundation of her faith. She could always be found lending a helping hand to the less fortunate and giving her all wherever she noticed an unmet need. Mrs. Eddy's carefree laughter and service to the less fortunate are only a few of the attributes that made her special to her friends and family.

Mrs. Eddy was preceded in death by her loving parents, Kenneth and Isabelle; as well as her brother William; she leaves behind her husband of over fifty years Bob; her son, Chuck; daughters Lana and Lindy; brothers Kenneth, Robert, and Tom; sister Nancy; grandchildren Kelly, Chuckie, Bobby, Adam, Morgan, and Paige; and great-grandson, Georgie. Mrs. Eddy was a beloved part of the Canfield community for over forty years, and she will be deeply missed. I extend my condolences to her family and loved ones, rest assured her light will continue to live on through the hearts and lives she has touched.

HONORING RABBI HILLEL COHN

HON. PETE AGUILAR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and work of Rabbi Hillel Cohn, a vital figure in the Inland Empire's Jewish community and of greater San Bernardino. As a representative of Congregation Emanu El of Redlands, Rabbi Cohn worked passionately to honor the precious customs and practices that have been cultivated by the congregation for over one hundred years.

Rabbi Cohn has played a crucial role in our community, making incredible contributions to the interfaith sector of the Inland Empire, bringing our friends and neighbors closer together and fostering a deep respect and admiration for our respective backgrounds and traditions.

Today we thank Rabbi Cohn for his contributions. His story and achievements will live on through those he has inspired and guided. I'm pleased to join members of the Inland Empire community in recognizing his incredible life legacy and wish him the best of luck and much happiness in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, on June 3rd I voted in support of an amendment to H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2016, which I intended to oppose. Let the record show that it was my intention to vote no on roll call vote 280 and oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Oregon.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. QUENTIN BURNETT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Quentin Burnett, who is retiring after four decades of public service. After an exemplary career in education, his expertise will be greatly missed. Dr. Burnett earned both his undergraduate and master's degrees from Texas A&M—Commerce, then obtained a doctorate in Educational Leadership from the University of Texas—Austin.

Beginning his career as a math teacher, Dr. Burnett then served as a coach and a principal. From there, he became a Texas Education Agency administrator before serving as Superintendent of three school districts: Johnson City, Greenwood, and Argyle ISDs. In addition, he has taught at the highest level of education, as an instructor of graduate finance classes at the University of Texas—Permian Basin as well as at the University of North Texas. At the state level, Dr. Burnett served as a trainer for the Texas Association of School Boards and an officer and past-president of the Texas Association of School Administrators. In 2011, after serving for nine

years as the Associate Superintendent for Finance for Birdville ISD, he joined Lewisville ISD as the Chief Financial Officer.

As Dr. Burnett retires, his leadership within the education field and dedication to students and teachers will continue to positively impact Lewisville ISD and Denton County. Best wishes to Dr. Burnett as he enters a well-deserved retirement. It is a privilege to serve such an outstanding public servant in the U.S. House of Representatives.

NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we vote on the bipartisan bill, H.R. 2394, in the House today, I would like to acknowledge the positive impact that our National Forest System has had in my home state of Michigan and throughout our great nation. Comprised of the United States Forest Service and the non-profit National Forest Foundation, our National Forest system encompasses 193 million acres of wilderness. These forests nourish a variety of animal and plant species, provide a wide array of recreational opportunities, and pump $13.5 billion annually into the U.S. economy.

I am encouraged to see the bipartisan consensus around preserving our forests. In Michigan, the work done by the National Forest System has helped preserve two different habitats. In the Hiawatha National Forest on Michigan's Upper Peninsula, workers helped plant more than 96,000 White Pine, Northern Red Oak and Hemlock trees to replenish the disappearing forest in 2012. Additionally, the national forest system helped lead a coalition to repair the disappearing habitat of the Kirtland's Warbler. In 2011, Forest workers planted 180,000 Jack Pine seedlings to help re-populate that species of tree, which is required for the Warbler to produce its offspring. Now, thanks to their efforts, the Kirtland's Warbler population is much more robust within the Huron and Manistee National Forests.

The important contributions made by the National Forest Foundation must not be overlooked, and I wholeheartedly support the program's reauthorization. Our forests are an incredible economic, environmental, and recreational resource for our country. We must remain steadfast and continue the work of preserving these forests and all of the majestic wonders contained within them for not only those alive today, but for all future generations of Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Rollcall No. 319. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CELEBRATING THE ROTARY CLUB OF HILLSBOROUGH

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Rotary Club of Hillsborough for 60 years of tremendous humanitarian service. Rotary has been a major part of community life in Hillsborough.

Rotary International is a global network of community volunteers with reach and influence across many spheres of interest, from service and volunteerism to promoting public health education. Rotary is one of the largest and most influential international service organizations worldwide. Rotary members, from New Jersey to the developing world, conduct projects to address today's humanitarian challenges, including illiteracy, disease, hunger, poverty and lack of clean water while encouraging high standards in all vocations. Rotary members strive to build goodwill and the members of the Rotary Club of Hillsborough are known ambassadors for dedicated public service.

The Rotary Club of Hillsborough has accomplished numerous projects to improve the lives of individuals needing assistance. Through annual fundraising events and community building activities, Rotary outings have assisted the Hillsborough Food Pantry, Homes For Hope, veterans services, families, those with special needs and projects in the public schools. Rotary has played a role in making Hillsborough what it is today—a wonderful place to build a life, raise a family and retire.

Service above self is vital to Rotary and the members of the Rotary Club of Hillsborough have for 60 years been a pillar of community spirit in Hillsborough.

CONGRATULATING MARY KUPRIANCZYK

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cadet Captain Mary Kuprianczyk on earning the Amelia Earhart Award.

The Amelia Earhart Award is presented to individuals upon completion of the first 11 achievements of the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program. These achievements show personal growth in five program areas: aerospace education, leadership, special activities, physical fitness, and moral and ethical values. Once each of these achievements has been satisfied, the cadet must pass a comprehensive 100 question examination covering aerospace topics, leadership theory, and staff duties. To illustrate how prestigious this honor is, only 5 percent of all cadets earn this distinction.

At the young age of 16, Mary Kuprianczyk has proven to be a role model we can all look up to. While working hard to fulfill these requirements, she has been an exemplary honor roll student at Rockover Naval Academy in Chicago. All of these accomplishments have been earned while being the first female Cadet Captain at the Palwaukee Squadron.

After completing her education at Rockover, Mary plans to continue serving her country by pursuing an appointment to a military academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cadet Captain Mary Kuprianczyk and her exceptional accomplishments through the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program.

HONORING THE 2015 AMHERST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SMALL BUSINESS AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the honorees of the 2015 Amherst Chamber of Commerce's Small Business Awards Luncheon here today. Each business and business leader has done their part to lead by example, demonstrating leadership in the business community and a shared dedication to improving the economic conditions of Western New York.

Marketing Technologies of Western New York is dedicated to provide the best technology and services to fellow businesses. In recent years the company has been rapidly growing, in result Marketing Tech has been expanding its services and improving quality of support to businesses across Western New York. I commend this year's Trailblazer Award recipient, Don Papaj, The President and CEO of Marketing Technologies of WNY.

Allen Dembski from Buffalo First Wealth Management, LLC has utilized his expertise to better serve his clients and his strong record of accomplishments have led him to being recognized here today. Mr. Dembski's ability to go beyond his role to ensure the small businesses in the community thrive is exemplary. His contributions promote the continued prosperity of other small businesses in the Western New York community. I am pleased to recognize this year's Small Business Advocate of the Year, Allen Dembski of Buffalo First Wealth Management.

Cure the Blue of the Buffalo Bills Alumni Association sets out to raise awareness of prostate cancer in the Western New York Region and beyond. The foundation has devoted superior dedication to research, awareness and early detection of prostate cancer. It is my honor to recognize Booker Edgerson of the Cure the Blue, Buffalo Bills Alumni Association as this year's Presidents Award recipient.

O'Connell and Company functions as a theatre company, although it exceeds that title by having an expansive impact on the community. O'Connell and Company's mission is to give back to the community which it entertains, by organizing fundraisers to aid women and children's charities. O'Connell and Company invests deeply in its community and strives to make Western New York a better place to work and live. I commend this year's Award of Excellence recipient, Mary Kate O'Connell founder of O'Connell and Company.

Empire Genomics is on the precipitous of genomic research and technology. They strive to utilize the best in genomic technologies to advance research in their field. Empire Genomics is a global leader in the field of personalized medicine and assists clinicians, drug

developers and researchers to answer key questions in disease diagnostics, prognosis and disease therapy. I applaud the work of founder Dr. Norma Nowak, and all those at Empire Genomics and congratulate them on their Sponsor's Award presented by First Niagara Bank.

Tony Martin Awards, Inc. provides high quality services for all customers throughout Western New York. Tony Martin Awards has been serving the Western New York community for over 50 years with extraordinary contributions to the regional economy and professional expertise. I am pleased to recognize Tony Martin Awards, Inc. as the recipient of the Small Business of the Year Award.

Santora's Pizza Pub and Grill has been a staple in Western New York, since 1927. They have been dedicated members of the community since their inception and it is my honor to commend this year's Family Owned Business Award recipient, Paul Santora of Santora's Pizza Pub & Grill.

This impressive list of Small Businesses being honored at this year's Luncheon and Showcase deserve the extra recognition and I thank the Amherst Chamber of Commerce for bringing these distinguished business leaders together. I ask my colleagues to join me and wish the award recipients continued success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY, INC. OMICRON CHI OMEGA CHAPTER

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 30th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Omicron Chi Omega Chapter.

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority was founded on the campus of Howard University January 15, 1908, as the first Greek-letter organization established by collegiate black women. Inaugurated with the founding principle, "To be supreme in service to all mankind," Chapters today continue to be conscientious members of their communities, sensitive to the needs and struggles of underserved populations.

Prince William County's Omicron Chi Omega Chapter was founded August 26, 1984, and chartered May 19, 1985, by five exceptional women: Rosyln Dunn, Venus Miller, Jannette Smithson, Alice Taylor and Mary Williams. During its 30-year history, the Chapter has received many local community awards and recognition from the Commonwealth of Virginia and Alpha Kappa Alpha for its involvement in the Back to School/Stay in School Program, its support of SAVAS (Sexual Assault Victim's Advocacy Services), and its contributions to ACTS and the American Heart Association.

The 2014–2018 International Program focuses on five areas of engagement: Educational Enrichment, Health Promotion, Family Strengthening, Environmental Ownership, and Global Impact. Working under the banner of Environmental Ownership, Omicron Chi Omega recently restored the Dumfries Elementary School playground. In addition to the global program, Omicron Chi Omega provides $10,000 annually in scholastic scholarships to graduating high school seniors, sponsors food drives for the Hilda Barg Homeless Prevention Center and SERVE Family Shelter, provides school supplies and coats to Prince William County Public Schools students, sponsors programs on physical and mental awareness for senior citizens and their caregivers, and established a drive to deliver black dolls to the Children's National Medical Center in Washington, D.C., to reflect the diverse cultures of children in need. In 2014, I had the honor of participating in the Chapter's Restoration of Voting Rights forum.

One of the Chapter's longest standing initiatives, the Little Miss AKA Scholarship Pageant, is now in its sixteenth year. The pageant highlights the Chapter's dedication to the young women of our community. The six-month long program allows for young girls between the ages of five and seventeen to enhance their personal development, build self-esteem, increase social skills, and meet women of diverse professions and positive role models.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the 30th anniversary of the founding of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Omicron Chi Omega Chapter. The Chapter continues the legacy of Alpha Kappa Alpha's founders and continues to be an invaluable force for good in our community.

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER ANNE CHRISTIONO

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Anne Christiono of Sugar Land's Cornerstone Elementary for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Anne, who is currently in the third grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Anne's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Anne for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

INTRODUCTION OF BREAST CANCER AWARENESS COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, every October Breast Cancer Awareness Month is recognized—acknowledging the toll the disease takes on individuals and families, and the importance of continued research and awareness efforts. Since 1989, thanks to earlier detection, increased understanding, and improved treatment, the death rates for breast cancer have continued to decrease. Yet breast cancer remains the second leading cause of cancer death in women, with one in 36 women dying from the disease. Just this year, it is estimated that 231,840 women will be diagnosed with and 40,290 women will die of cancer of the breast in the United States. In addition, it is estimated that 2,350 men will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer and 440 men will die from breast cancer in 2015 in the United States.

We need to do more to combat this disease. In 2014 alone it is estimated that $17.2 billion will be spent on breast cancer care in the United States. While the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program remain the largest funders of breast cancer research in the United States, the National Cancer Institute funding was reduced by nearly $66 million from 2011 to 2013. The funding level for the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program has remained consistent since 2012; however this amount represents a 20 percent decrease from 2011 funding levels.

Additional private sector support will help us find cures for breast cancer even faster. That is why my colleague Representative PETE SESSIONS and I are introducing the Breast Cancer Awareness Commemorative Coin Act. Proceeds from the sale of the coins will benefit the Breast Cancer Research Foundation and Susan G. Komen for the Cure. These two organizations have raised more than $500 million and $847 million, respectively, for research funding. By leveraging the proceeds of the coins we will be able to increase the much needed support for breast cancer research and awareness.

Clearly, more needs to be done to find better treatments and cures for breast cancer. Our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, cannot afford to wait. I encourage you to support this bipartisan legislation.

TRIBUTE TO IOWA WATER ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATION

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Iowa Water Environment Association (IAWEA) on their 100th year anniversary. This is an important milestone in their history of service to the state of Iowa through their efforts to advance water quality and water pollution control techniques.

On June 3, 1915, the first formal training for wastewater operators in the United States was held at Iowa State College in Ames, Iowa. This meeting was an effort to address water quality problems with a personal touch, in order to explain the best practices for the successful operation of the state's water treatment facilities. The association was formally founded in 1927 and except for brief interruptions during times our nation was at war, has continued their legacy of improving the quality of our state's water to this day.

Throughout the many years the IAWEA has thrived to meet the needs of the people in the area by providing excellent information on many aspects of water pollution control, water quality, and protection of the environment. I congratulate the Iowa Water Environment Association on this historic anniversary. It is an honor to represent IAWEA members in the United States Congress, and I wish the Iowa Water Environment Association continued success well into the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF IRA GOLDSTEIN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the retirement of Ira Goldstein, National Director, U.S. Federal Practice at Deloitte LLP. Ira will soon retire after 13 years with Deloitte and a distinguished career serving the public and private sector spanning four decades.

Since joining Deloitte in 2003, Ira created and developed Deloitte's Federal client service capabilities. He has served a broad range of Federal clients, including Cabinet agencies, and has been a member of Deloitte's Federal leadership team—most recently as its Civilian Sector Leader bringing innovative and leading edge solutions to the Federal government.

Ira's roots are embedded in public service where he spent 17 years working for the Federal government, including as U.S. Assistant Comptroller General and Chief Operating Officer at the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO)—now renamed the Government Accountability Office. In this capacity, Ira was responsible for GAO operations, including performance management, strategic planning, financial management, quality assurance, workforce development and information systems. Previously, he served as Acting Associate Commissioner of Social Security and Director of Policy for Family Assistance, with oversight of the $14 billion Aid to Families with Dependent Children (cash welfare) Program. Ira began his Federal career in the Office of Planning and Evaluation at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now Health and Human services) and served as Director of the HEW Secretary's Policy Statement Staff.

Prior to entering government, Ira was Deputy Program Manager for Infiltration Surveillance services at Hazeltine Corporation serving the Naval Air Systems Command during the Vietnam War.

Ira received his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Pennsylvania and his Masters of Business Administration with Distinction from Harvard Business School. He has served on various boards and community organizations and is currently a Fellow at the National Academy of Public Administration, a Director at the National College Access Network, and a Washington Regional Board Member at the Anti-Defamation League.

Ira's passion for improving the way the government works and operates, ultimately to service the citizen, has been a theme throughout his professional career. He is currently working on a book focused on the keys to managing success in the federal government. Ira's federal management experience and private sector insights will help professionals and students better understand how to be effective in the federal environment.

On behalf of the people of the 8th Congressional District in Maryland, I would like to thank Ira for his years of service and wish him, his wife Linda and his family all the best in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE BUFFALO CHAPTER OF THE LINKS FOR ITS OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMUNITY FOR 65 YEARS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor the Buffalo Chapter of the Links for its work in the Buffalo community. The Buffalo Chapter of the Links has dedicated their time to aiding the Buffalo area through individual and collective volunteerism, as well as charitable giving and scholarship awards.

The Buffalo Chapter of the Links is one of 281 chapters in the United States that encompasses national and area initiatives while addressing the needs of the local community through 6 main facets: Services to the Youth, the Arts, National Trends and Services, International Trends and Services, Health and Human Services, and Women's Issues. Several members of the Buffalo Chapter have held area and national offices, including Link Thelma Hardiman, who served as National Vice President and Eastern Area Director, and Link Cecilia Henderson, who served as Eastern Area Vice Director, Eastern Area Director, and National Secretary. Being the 14th chapter chartered in the East and the 20th chapter chartered nationally, the Buffalo Chapter has a long history of service to the community, now celebrating 65 years.

Throughout the Chapter's 65 years, they have collected over $600,000 in money for scholarships and have performed 150,200 hours, collectively, of service to the community. The Buffalo Chapter of the Links has worked on various projects in the Western New York region. They have supported local school districts through projects including but not limited to after school book clubs. As well, the Buffalo Chapter has also volunteered with the Buffalo Philharmonic Fund Drive for membership, with an emphasis on enrolling people of color; built 2 schools in South Africa, and have assisted women transitioning from service to their county to reentering the community.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize the Buffalo Chapter of the Links. I ask that my colleagues join me congratulating the Buffalo Chapter of the Links on an accomplished history of charitable giving, and to commend them for the exemplary work they have done to enrich the communities of Western New York for the last 65 years.

RECOGNIZING THE KOREA TIMES 10,000TH ISSUE AND 46TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Korea Times as the newspaper celebrates its 10,000th edition and its 46th anniversary of providing news to the Korean-American community. It is the Korean-American community's largest and oldest newspaper.

In my congressional district, across Northern Virginia and the Washington region, and across the nation, the Korea Times fills an invaluable role in providing the community with a daily mix of news and features highlighting local, regional, national, and international issues of interest to Korean-Americans.

Here in the United States, the Korea Times provides its readers with insightful coverage of the latest news and events from the Korean Peninsula. When 304 people, many of them secondary school students, perished in the tragic sinking of the ferry MV Sewol in April of 2014, the Korea Times served as a lifeline to those Korean-Americans seeking information about family and friends involved in the disaster.

During my more than 20 years of elected office as a district supervisor and Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and as the current Congressman for the 11th District of Virginia, I've had considerable interaction with the professional staff of the Korea Times, based in my district and in Washington, D.C.

On issues I have worked on as co-chair of the Congressional Korea Caucus and as a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee ranging from Korean family reunification and North Korea sanctions to the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, Korea Times' journalists have diligently reported on the importance of these matters to their readers.

In print, on the Internet, and via social media, the Korea Times is an important asset to the Korean-American community in my Northern Virginia district and across the nation. I join my Korean-American constituents and community leaders in congratulating the Korea Times on its 46 years of service and wish the newspaper many more years of success.

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER JESSICA CHAI

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jessica Chai of Katy's Roosevelt Alexander Elementary School for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Jessica, currently in the fourth grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Jessica's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Jessica for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

IN RECOGNITION OF DÍA DE PORTUGAL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. VALADAO of California, Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island, Mr. NUNES of California, Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts, and Mr. HONDA of California to recognize Día de Portugal and to champion the strong bond between the United States and Portugal. Celebrated on June 10 each year, Día de Portugal recognizes Portugal's beautiful heritage and culture.

Día de Portugal honors the death of the revered Portuguese poet Luís Vaz de Camões in 1580. Camões is famously known for Os Lusíadas, one of Portugal's most treasured literary works. The poem pays tribute to Portugal's golden age of exploration and celebrates the many monumental discoveries made by Portuguese explorers in the 15th century.

Vibrant Portuguese American communities can be seen across our nation from Massachusetts, New Jersey and Rhode Island, to California and Hawaii. These communities are filled with over 1.3 million Americans of Portuguese descent who have been making positive contributions to our society for generations. We are a nation of immigrants, and celebrations like Día de Portugal remind us all that it is important to remain connected to our own individual heritage.

The United States and Portugal maintain a robust relationship, and have been connected ever since the Portuguese were among the first to recognize the U.S. as an independent nation at the conclusion of the Revolutionary War. President George Washington formalized diplomatic relations on February 21, 1791, and our oldest continuously-operated U.S. Consulate in the world is located in Ponta Delgada on the island of São Miguel in the Azores.

Mr. Speaker, on this Día de Portugal, we are reminded that our special relationship with Portugal must be continuously strengthened. As U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry has said, "The strong partnership between our two countries is more vital than ever." This day celebrates the accomplishments of Portuguese and Portuguese Americans, and we congratulate these communities on their global impact and achievement.

IN HONOR OF ALAN SLOBODIEN, UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM VERNON YOUTH SERVICES

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize an exceptional public servant from my hometown of Vernon, Connecticut, Mr. Alan Slobodien, and mark his retirement from Vernon Youth Services.

Over the past 20 years, Alan has ably served as the director of Vernon Youth Services, an organization devoted to ensuring that "all Vernon children birth to age 18 are safe, healthy, and productive." It is with this goal in mind that Alan has developed forward-thinking programming and policies to engage young people in our town, ensure that they have safe places to learn and play, and have opportunities for success in the future. His commitment to Vernon's youth is unparalleled, and his optimism about Vernon's future has resulted in real, recognizable benefits for our community. With Al at the helm, Vernon Youth Services through summer nutrition programs, to mentoring, to homework support, has continued to make Vernon an ideal place to raise children.

On a personal note, I first met Al over 30 years ago when I was the Assistant Public Defender at the Rockville Superior Court and Al was an invaluable contact to get help for young clients. He was incredibly resourceful, sizing up the needs of young people in trouble with the law and designing treatment programs that helped both the community and the person. He had a wonderful combination of compassion and smarts that I really admired. Despite the sometimes hopeless circumstances he tried to fix, he never lost his optimism about people and their potential to change for the better. What an inspiration to all of us.

Please join me in congratulating Alan on his decades of remarkable service to his community, and wishing him and his family a rewarding, and well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL MESSINA

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life and achievements of my friend, Michael Messina, former Mayor and City Councilmember of Alhambra, who passed away on April 10, 2015.

Michael was devoted to his city and his community. A lifelong resident of Alhambra who attended Ramona Elementary School and Alhambra High School, he graduated from California State University Los Angeles, and remained a resident of Alhambra until his passing.

In 1979, Michael began his public service career, serving on the Alhambra City Council from 1979 to 1986, and as Mayor in 1982 and 1986. During this time, Michael dedicated himself to improving the city and community he loved.

Michael was driven to help businesses to flourish in Alhambra and thanks to his efforts, downtown Alhambra is now a thriving commercial center with restaurants and businesses, giving the intersection of Main and Garfield streets a "Main Street USA" feel. Michael worked to expand development, tackling things as instrumental as repaving streets and sidewalks to paving the way for Price Club (now Costco) to come to Alhambra, which has become the largest retail tax producer in the city. He also personally led a city delegation to meet with the founder and CEO of Mervyns Department stores, as he was convinced that such an addition would bring even more business to the city center, and he was right. Mervyns planted its roots in Alhambra, and stores followed, including the Alhambra Place shopping center, which is still the center of retail in the city today, and every year hosts the "Taste of Alhambra" Festival. This is all thanks to Michael's vision for his city.

As the population of Los Angeles County grew in the past 20 years, Michael fought to increase his community's access to transportation and to bring down congestion in the area. He was a champion of seniors, expanding programs like Senior Ride and Senior Housing, and he believed deeply in the public spaces of Alhambra, increasing the capacity of the Parks and Recreation department, so everyone in the city could enjoy the beautiful outdoor spaces in the San Gabriel Valley. For him, civil service was about the people and the community he loved.

Even when he left the Alhambra City Council, Michael remained as a key figure in the community, eventually sitting on the Oversight Board for the city. He was a devoted parishioner of All Souls Church, and volunteered with Meals on Wheels, Knights of Columbus, the Alhambra Exchange Club, the Foundation for the Blind, and was president of the local St. Vincent de Paul Society. No matter what he did, Michael was determined to give back. Michael's dedication to Alhambra was an inspiration, and when I was first elected Mayor of the neighboring city of Monterey Park in 1988, I looked to Michael as an example of a true public servant.

There is no doubt that Alhambra has lost one of its most devoted citizens and most stalwart champions. We are thankful for his many years of service, and will continue to honor his legacy of leadership and commitment to our community.

RECOGNIZING BILL MURPHY FOR HIS OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE SOUTH BUFFALO COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mr. Bill Murphy for his work in the South Buffalo community. Mr. Murphy has dedicated his career to helping area labor unions and injured workers in their legal battles against insurance companies and those that caused them harm.

Mr. Murphy is a Bishop Timon high school class of 1989 graduate as well as a graduate of Medaille College where he earned his Bachelor's Degree. He would then go on to enroll in the University at Buffalo Law School where he developed the skills which made him a partner at the law firm Maxwell Murphy. Mr. Murphy prides himself on his Buffalo roots and on his ability to help those who live in his native town.

The contributions that Mr. Murphy has made to the South Buffalo community are many and varied. He has served as a Chairman of the Timon Lawn Fete and Timon Sports Night. Both he and his law firm have donated to various community events throughout Western New York, and they have supported such events as the ''Run Jimmy Run'' Charity Race, the annual Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Golf Outing, and the Mount Mercy Academy 5K. Additionally Mr. Murphy's law firm helped the students of Saints Peter and Paul Grade School to purchase new hockey uniforms to replace their worn jerseys.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mr. Bill Murphy. I ask that my colleagues join me congratulating Mr. Murphy on an accomplished career, and to commend him for the exemplary work he has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

RECOGNIZING DR. LUKE TORIAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 20TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY AT FIRST MOUNT ZION BAPTIST CHURCH OF DUMFRIES

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my dear friend, the Reverend Dr. Luke E. Torian, on the occasion of his 20th Pastoral Anniversary at First Mount Zion Baptist Church of Dumfries, Virginia.

First Mount Zion Baptist Church has a long, prosperous history starting with its founding in 1867, which now continues under the tutelage of Dr. Torian, who became its first and only full time pastor in 1995. Since his installation, Dr. Torian has served an instrumental role in the growth of the church. More than 4,000 now call First Mount Zion Baptist Church their religious and spiritual home and approximately 70 different ministries now serve the needs of the congregation and community.

Not only has Dr. Torian served his congregation, but he also has dedicated his time to serve the community at large. He is currently a member of the Prince William County Ministerial Association. He has served on the Cardinal Bank Advisory Board; the Board of Directors of the Baptist General Convention, and is a member of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. In June 2004, former Governor Mark Warner appointed Dr. Torian to the Virginia Board of Counseling. He also served on the ACTS Board of Directors for three years. In addition, in 2009 he was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates, representing the 52nd District.

Dr. Torian's dedication to his faith and his congregation, combined with his exceptional leadership abilities have been recognized by others. In 2002, Howard University presented him with the James Floyd Jenkins Pillar of Faith Award in recognition of the outstanding contributions that he has made to his church and the community. In the fall of 2003 and 2004, Dr. John Maxwell, renowned expert in leadership development, selected Dr. Torian as one of 50 leaders from across the country to participate in a special leadership institute in Atlanta.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my Colleagues join me in recognizing Dr. Luke E. Torian and the First Mount Zion Baptist Church congregation as they celebrate this significant milestone in their history and in wishing them continued success and prosperity.

DON'T MESS WITH TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ART CONTEST WINNER ANNABELLE DU

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Annabelle Du of Katy's James E. Williams Elementary School for being one of only thirteen winning students of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

Annabelle, who is currently in the fourth grade, is one of the thirteen winners selected from the 8,228 elementary school students from across Texas who entered the contest. Keep Texas Beautiful and the Texas Department of Transportation selected the contest winners who displayed tremendous artistic talent, dedication, and creativity. Annabelle's submission will appear in the 2016 Don't Mess with Texas Calendar and will be displayed on the Keep Texas Beautiful and Don't Mess with Texas websites. Her work will even be showcased at the Keep Texas Beautiful's 2015 Annual Conference.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Annabelle for being selected as one of the winners of the Don't Mess with Texas Elementary School Art Contest.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 2015 I was absent for recorded votes #309–#318 due to a flight cancellation from Knoxville. I would like to reflect how I would have voted had I been present:

On Roll Call #309, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #310, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #311, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #312, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #313, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #314, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #315, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #316, I would have voted No.
On Roll Call #317, I would have voted Yes.
On Roll Call #318, I would have voted Yes.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,778,985,959.44. We've added $7,525,901,937,046.36 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF HONOR DOLD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish my daughter, Honor Dold, a happy birthday.

Honor turned eight years old yesterday. She was born in Evanston, Illinois, and since that day in 2007, has kept me, her mother, Danielle, her sister Harper, and brother Bobby always smiling.

Honor's favorite subject is math and always puts her best effort forward into everything she does. Honor excels not only in soccer and lacrosse, but also in dance. She brightens every room she walks into with a truly contagious smile. Honor is the perfect amount of smart, silly, and funny that makes everyone around her happy.

Honor enjoys spending time with her proud grandparents, Nana and Chief, Papa and Granma, her aunts and uncles, and all of her cousins.

I look forward to watching Honor grow and mature into a fine independent young woman, and a shining light to our family and community. Happy Birthday, Honor.

RECOGNITION OF MARLENE ISBELL DEVINE

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marlene Isbell Devine who retired

from Allianz of America on April 10, 2015 after working for over 38 years at the firm and its antecedent companies, most notably Allianz Life, which is headquartered in my district in Golden Valley.

Marlene began her career in the typing and steno pool of North American Life Insurance and Casualty Company on August 16, 1976 and moved up in fast order to become the Executive Assistant to CEO Howard Barnhill. Her tenure with the company coincided with its purchase by the German Insurance giant Allianz AG in 1979. Marlene served four other company CEOs and at the time of her retirement she was the Personal Assistant to Allianz of America Chairman and Member of the Allianz SE Board of Management, Gary Bhojwani.

Office technology, fashion styles and even eating habits have changed dramatically since Marlene started in the mid-1970s, sometimes for the better and sometimes not. However, one thing that is constant is that every CEO and organization needs a person like Marlene Devine who can be counted on to keep things organized, communicate information, and serve as a friend and counsel to everyone around them. As we all know, today's work life can at times be all-consuming, and Marlene's greatest strength was her ability to make everyone feel special and appreciated. In doing so, she was mentor to hundreds of people within the company, many of whom rose to the highest executive positions within Allianz. Marlene's personal warmth, integrity, good judgment, dedication, and humor made her very valued and beloved.

Marlene is married to Dan Devine, and they reside in Savage, Minnesota. They have three grown children, Stephanie, Kyle, and Whitney; and two grandsons, Joshua Stewart and Hunter Johnson, who are all a source of pride and happiness. Marlene is an avid gardener, enjoys her cats and reading, and loves a good day on the river fishing with Dan. She and her twin sister Marilyn Wille are known for their long "Thelma and Louise" automobile excursions that have taken them all across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a period of time of fast movement where people change jobs and companies regularly during the course of their careers. However, as we all know from our own offices, institutional knowledge is essential, and those dedicated people who have it are the key to our success. Marlene Devine deserves our praise for an exemplary life that touched so many people. I offer my best wishes to her and Dan on the next chapter of their lives, and for many years of good health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING KAREN ERICKSON FOR HER OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mrs. Karen Erickson for her work in the South Buffalo community. Mrs. Erickson has dedicated her career to acting as a public servant as well as giving back to her native community.

Mrs. Erickson is a South Buffalo native who attended Mt. Mercy Academy in 1963 and received her Associate Degree from Erie Community College and her Bachelor's Degree from Houghton College. It was during the Jack Donohue 5K Race that Mrs. Erickson began the tradition of serving hot dogs along with her sorority sisters, a tradition which has continued after the retirement of "Jack's 5K" into the Mount Mercy Alumnae Race.

Besides her contributions to Mount Mercy Academy Mrs. Erickson has also been the Athletic Director for Most Precious Blood School and the organizer of the George Leather, MPB Invitational Basketball Tournament for 25 years. She has also served on the Diocesan School Board, the School Board at St. Francis High School, Community Concern, and various organizations in the Town of Evans. She currently serves on the Board of the Business and Finance Academy at Lake Shore Central High School, Vice President of the Evans Democratic Club and serves on the Evans Economic Development Committee. Additionally she has, for the past five years, organized the Connors' 5K Wiener Run to benefit the Boys and Girls Club of Lake Shore. Finally Mrs. Erickson was the Deputy Supervisor in the Town of Evans for 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mrs. Karen Erickson. I ask that my colleagues join me congratulating Mrs. Erickson on an accomplished career, and to commend her for the exemplary work she has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF SHIRLEY JEANNE MOSCOV STARK

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Shirley Jeanne Moscov Stark. Mrs. Stark passed away May 4, 2015, and, during her nearly 85 years, she impacted the lives of everyone she touched.

Trailblazer is a word we hear often about those who pave the way for future generations. Rarely has that term been more fittingly used than now as we pay tribute to Shirley. Shirley Jeanne Moscov was born October 18, 1930, and raised in Canonsburg, PA, a small town outside of Pittsburgh. She was the daughter of Polish Jewish immigrants who first arrived in New York and eventually settled in Western Pennsylvania. Her parents ran one of the few grocery stores in town and lived above the store. As was true with so many immigrants of that era, they never took a vacation or attended family events together—the store had to be open to serve the community. This was the Great Depression; her parents would extend credit to their neighbors who couldn't afford to pay for needed food and supplies, and Shirley learned from a young age the value of charity and serving the needs of others.

Shirley was an exceptionally bright and curious child. She read every book in the local library and excelled at school. But in a small coal town, educational opportunities were scarce. Few boys went to college and even fewer girls. In her early teens, one of her teachers recognized her abilities and potential and encouraged Shirley to apply to a very select program for gifted high school students offered by the University of Chicago. Shirley took the entrance exam and earned not only a perfect score, but admittance to the University. At the age of 15, Shirley boarded a train to Chicago to begin her studies. Two years later, at 17, she had earned a Bachelor's Degree. Shirley returned to Pennsylvania where she enrolled at the University of Pittsburgh earning a Masters Degree in Mathematics. She was recruited by Westinghouse and heralded by the press as "The World's Youngest Nuclear Physicist at 19." While working at Westinghouse, she continued her studies and received yet another Masters Degree in psychology. A few years later, she married Sidney Stark, Jr. and decided to postpone her professional career in favor of raising a family.

Parallel to Shirley's love of science was her passion in the fields of travel, music, art, and architecture. When her children, Seth and Sid, entered elementary school, she decided to pursue her passions and enrolled in graduate studies at the University of Pittsburgh Fine Arts Department. She spent summers and vacations in Europe expanding her knowledge and expertise. During her life she traveled to five continents and dozens of countries. Shirley was an inspiring teacher; she chaired the Art Department at Chatham College for seven years and taught various courses in Art and Architectural History at Carnegie Mellon University well into her later years. During this time, she also opened a small business, Travel Bound Books, and served as a consultant to specialized tours throughout Europe that focused on mankind's greatest artistic and architectural creations.

With all of these achievements, Shirley is best remembered as charming and vivacious. Her home was always full of laughter, music, loved ones, and of course, great food. New Year's Eve parties, Seders, crab and lobster feasts, and holiday dinners at the Stark house were legendary. Shirley was a loving and devoted daughter, wife, mother, grandmother, sister, aunt, and friend, and she made every person she met feel special and unique. Her sharp wit and sparkling spirit were infectious, and all who met her felt they were lucky and blessed to have known her.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of Shirley Jeanne Moscov Stark and in extending my deepest condolences to her family and friends. She will be greatly missed.

KILLUM PEST CONTROL, INC.

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate all members of the Killum Pest Control, Inc. team who were honored with the Winner of Distinction Award at the Better Business Bureau Awards for Excellence.

Killum Pest Control, Inc. is one of 314 companies recognized by the Better Business Bureau Awards of Excellence for their commitment and integrity. They have now been recognized twice for their achievements. We are extremely proud of the dedication of Killum

Pest Control's employees and the leadership it provides in the small business community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Killum Pest Control, Inc. for earning this esteemed award.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SPEECH OF

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we vote on H. Res. 295, I would like to address the need for body cameras worn by on-duty law enforcement.

As a result of the influx of controversial reports citing alleged inappropriate behavior by police officers, body cameras will provide more transparency in what can be otherwise confounding cases. In instances like the Walter Scott shooting, the McKinney incident, and the Trayvon Martin case, video footage from a body-worn camera may have provided critical, tangible evidence regarding the events that transpired. Such technology has the capability to reduce the number of complaints of excessive use of force by officers. It also provides the power to dismiss officers from false, malicious complaints. Additionally, footage from body cameras can be utilized as a teaching tool in which officers review video in an attempt to learn from their mistakes and improve their performance. Both exemplary and inappropriate police behavior can be analyzed in order to build greater trust between law enforcement and the communities they are tasked with serving.

Furthermore, there are studies that show improved behavior occurs with both police officers and potential suspects when both parties know they are being recorded. Detroit's significantly higher crime rate when compared with the U.S. average makes this topic of particular concern to me and my District. The violent crime rate in 2012 was nearly six times that of the U.S. average. The implementation of body cameras will help ensure the safety of my constituents by recording interactions between officers and civilians. I urge support for this bill for the protection and interests of all involved.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman GREEN for this bipartisan legislation to reform our nation's law enforcement policies and procedures by promoting transparency while protecting citizens and officers.

HONORING RICHARD C. EHLKE

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, Jr.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Richard C. Ehlke, Senior Advisor to the Director and Senior Specialist, of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress. Mr. Ehlke retired on May 29, 2015 after a distinguished career of over four decades with CRS.

During his tenure, Mr. Ehlke served in many roles at CRS. He began his career as a legislative attorney with the American Law Division of CRS, and Members of Congress and staff actively sought his thoughtful, objective analyses of some of the most complex and nuanced legal issues facing the Congress. His highly regarded and much relied upon briefs often focused on potential points of friction between Congress and the Executive Branch. At the behest of his Congressional clients, he analyzed the legal intricacies of legislative vetoes, Congressional access to agency and presidential information, the interplay of the President's constitutional powers under the Appointments Clause and of Congress' legislative and advice and consent prerogatives, and the transparency in government provided for by the Freedom of Information Act. He was routinely called upon by Congressional offices to clarify the legal complexities arising out of the federal government's relationship with Native Americans.

Following his many years of providing direct legal counsel to Congress as a legislative attorney, Mr. Ehlke was promoted to serve as the head of CRS' American Law Division. In this role, he guided the work of a generation of Division attorneys and paralegal assistants, instilling in them the rigorous, careful legal research and analytical skills that had always been the hallmark of his own work. He was instrumental in establishing the Division's Law Recruit Program in 1988, which has attracted new hires, contributing to a vibrant and diverse workforce of legislative attorneys.

Following his tenure as head of the American Law Division, a succession of CRS Directors called upon Mr. Ehlke for his sage advice and leadership skills in the service of Congress in a number of critical roles. His accomplishments during this part of his career were significant. Mr. Ehlke played a leading role in the development of a new performance assessment system for CRS. He also advised the Director on the establishment of the position of Section Research Manager (SRM) (first-line supervisors) in the Service and assisted with the recruitment, hiring, orientation, and performance expectations of the initial cohort of these SRMs. Additionally he oversaw a complete redesign of the CRS website and served as a member of the website governance board to streamline services for our Congressional offices. Given his long-term interest in ensuring CRS' objective of providing the best service to Congress, Mr. Ehlke assisted with the Congressionally mandated CRS customer satisfaction survey. And as the Senior Advisor to the Director and as a Senior Specialist, he advised on significant legal issues relating to ethics, media policy, CRS relations with the Library of Congress, speech or debate privilege, CRS reorganizations, and personnel actions.

Whatever his role, the result has always been the same—a highly competent, skillful performance for the benefit of Congress, its Members, and staff. CRS has been fortunate to have had such a person of high intellect dedicated to the institution's mission of providing objective, authoritative service to Congress in an unfailing patient and courteous manner for over forty years. We wish him the very best in his retirement, and thank him for his exceptional record of service to CRS and to the Congress of the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 9, 2015, I missed several roll call votes due to undergoing a medical procedure in Oregon. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

Roll Call vote 309, On Passage of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call vote 310, On Agreeing to the Blackburn Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call vote 311, On Agreeing to the Gosar #1 Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 312, On Agreeing to Gosar #2 Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 313, On Agreeing to Posey #1 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 314, On Agreeing to Sessions #1 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 315, On Agreeing to Sessions #2 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 317, On Agreeing to Posey #2 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 318, On Agreeing to Posey #3 Amendment, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 319, On Agreeing to Yoho Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Yes.

Roll Call 320, On Agreeing to Brooks Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Yes.

Roll Call 321, On Agreeing to Hultgren Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 322, On Agreeing to Meehan Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 323, On Agreeing to Garrett Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 324, On Agreeing to Ellison Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Aye.

Roll Call 325, On Agreeing to Emmer Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call Vote 326, On Agreeing to Peters Amendment, I would have voted Aye.

Roll Call Vote 327, On Agreeing to Issa Amendment to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Nay.

Roll Call 328, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 2577, I would have voted Aye.

Roll Call 329, On Passage of H.R. 2577 would have voted Nay.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF BEAU BIDEN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of a friend, a public servant, and a good man—Beau Biden. I joined the Biden family last weekend to mourn his loss, which is felt by all who knew him, and celebrate his life, which has left an indelible impact.

Beau was a gifted lawyer who was twice elected attorney general in the state of Delaware and served his country in the National Guard in Iraq. But more than that, he was a devoted son, a loving husband, and a caring father.

JOE and his boys lived through great personal tragedy with the loss of his wife, Neilia, and daughter, Naomi. They have an unbreakable bond. And they, along with the rest of the family, have found the greatest joy in spending time together. No one who has come in contact with the Biden family can miss the deep love and devotion they have for one another.

I had the privilege of getting to know Beau better during the Obama-Biden reelection campaign. We were together on several occasions, including in the immediate aftermath of the Biden-Ryan debate. A very proud son was beaming about his dad's stellar performance. In that moment, you could see Beau's competitive spirit fuse with his devotion to his dad.

I extend my deepest sympathies to my friends JOE and Jill, to Beau's wife, Hallie, and their two children, his siblings, Hunter and Ashley, and the entire Biden family. I hope that they can take comfort in the love they share and the knowledge that they do not walk alone in their grief. We have lost Beau far too soon, but his memory lives on until we meet again.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. PENNY REDDELL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Penny Reddell upon her retirement after 38 years of exemplary public service. She earned her first of many degrees at Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches. From there, she went onto the University of Texas at Tyler to obtain her master's degree before finally earning her doctorate from Baylor University.

Dr. Reddell began her education career as a teacher and has capably served in multiple capacities including diagnostician, assistant principal, principal, gifted and talented program consultant, and adjunct college professor. She is retiring from Lewisville ISD as the Associate Superintendent for Learning and Teaching, a position she has held for the last six years. Her areas of responsibilities have included: Strategic Design implementation, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, Early Childhood, Literacy Intervention, Program Evaluation, District Grant Writing, Gifted and Talented, Advanced Academics, Assessment and Accountability and Federal Programs, ESL, Dual Language, Bilingual, and World Languages. Dr. Reddell's leadership has had a positive and profound impact on all the programs that she has overseen.

As Dr. Reddell retires, her commitment and hard work on behalf of the students and faculty of Lewisville ISD will be greatly missed. After almost four decades as an educator and administrator, Dr. Reddell retires as a professional beloved by her colleagues and leaves an indelible mark to be emulated. It is a privilege to honor such an esteemed constituent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING ANDREW McLEAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew McLean. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 362, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and became a Brotherhood Member in the Order of the Arrow. Andrew has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Andrew completed a garden around a statue of Mary at Little Sisters of the Poor, an elder care facility in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew McLean for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING CHABAD JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF PLACER COUNTY

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chabad Jewish Community Center of Placer County on the momentous occasion of completing its Community Torah.

Led by Rabbi Yossi Korik, Chabad Jewish Community Center opened in 2005 to educate and support the local Jewish community and inspire people from all walks of life.

As part of this effort, the Chabad of Placer County commissioned a professional scribe in Israel to write a Torah scroll in the traditional method, which dates back thousands of years.

The Torah contains the Five Books of Moses and is the most precious article in Jewish life. Its guidance provides a strong foundation for morals in today's global society.

In October of 2014, members of the Jewish community gathered with rabbis and public leaders in Placer County to witness the first letters of the Torah being inscribed. This weekend, many months after the project's inception, the same community will once again gather—this time to celebrate the scroll's completion.

This tremendous accomplishment will be celebrated on Sunday, June 14, 2015, with a festive parade. The Torah will travel down Douglas Boulevard under a Chuppah, led by a local marching band.

Mr. Speaker, George Washington stated in his Farewell Address: "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports." We are fortunate to have the Chabad Jewish Community Center as a pillar of religious and moral teachings in the Fourth Congressional District of California, and I am honored to share in this occasion.

I thank members of Chabad for their continued positive impact on the Placer County community, and I am proud to stand with them in celebration.

RECOGNIZING LISA PURCELL FOR HER OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE BUFFALO COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Mrs. Lisa Purcell for her work in the Buffalo community. Mrs. Purcell has dedicated her time to aiding various charity organizations in the Buffalo area.

As the founder of the Ryan Purcell Foundation, Mrs. Purcell has organized the annual Purcell Memorial 5K race. The Foundation is dedicated to her son Ryan Purcell who was killed in a hit and run accident in October of 2011. The Foundation is committed to honoring the life and memory of Ryan Purcell and raises funds to give to scholarships to high school students in the Buffalo area.

Mrs. Purcell has also been a large supporter of the Mount Mercy Academy 5K race as well as their scholarship program. Mount Mercy Academy has been educating the young women of Western New York for over 110 years. Their Alumnae have grown to over 10,000 members, 70% of whom still live and work in Western New York. Mrs. Purcell is married to Dr. Peter Purcell D.D.S. and has five children as well as three grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Mrs. Lisa Purcell. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mrs. Purcell on an accomplished history of giving to charitable organizations, and to commend her for the exemplary work she has done to enrich the communities of Western New York.

CONNECTING HOUSTON AND TAIPEI

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a new connection between Taipei, Taiwan and Houston, Texas. Beginning on June 19th, 2015 a new direct flight will connect these cities and allow Houstonians to travel to Taiwan and Asia more easily. This new opportunity will also promote business and tourism, which means economic benefits for both Texas and Taiwan.

The United States and Taiwan already enjoy a robust economic partnership. Taiwan is our 10th largest trading partner. Our bilateral trade amounts to more than $67 billion in 2014. I am confident this important relationship will continue to thrive and will continue to support our close friend and ally.

REUNIFICATION OF CYPRUS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Cyprus has made great strides in the past decade. It turns out that, just like the United States, Cyprus has a lot of natural gas. Let's hope they don't have as much bureaucracy to get through to export their gas as we do. But the country is held back because it is still divided by a foreign power. Turkey still has 30,000 troops in Cyprus. Erdogan thinks he is still in control. The beauty of democratic elections is that you can see what the people really want.

And faced with the choice between a candidate that wanted to keep Cyprus divided and one that wanted to reunify Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots chose reunification.

It is encouraging to hear that negotiations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots are getting back on track. You know, I was a judge in my former life. I dealt a lot with one word: justice. And as a judge I would never have allowed the kind of bullying that is seen by Turkey. The Turkish Cypriots should be able to negotiate on their own behalf. If they want peace, they should be able to get it. They don't need another foreign country like Turkey telling them what they can and cannot agree to. They do not want to be dependent on Turkey. They want to enjoy the economic freedom of the EU.

Reunification will require a lot of work, but ultimately it will only happen if the two sides talk to each other. This time next year I hope we can come together to celebrate the reunification of Cyprus and the end of over 40 years of Turkish occupation.

And that's just the way it is.

H.R. 1493, THE PROTECT AND PRESERVE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY ACT

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit the thoughts of my friend, Matthew Polk, regarding the consideration of H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act. Matthew Polk is deeply involved in the preservation of cultural heritage and I believe his comments are both insightful and valuable to the ongoing effort to preserve the cultural heritage of civilizations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I first wish to thank Congressman Issa for his interest in this matter and the opportunity to provide a statement for the Congressional Record.

With regard to H.R. 1493, I applaud this bipartisan effort to protect Syrian cultural property as well as to coordinate our Government's enforcement efforts to protect international cultural property. I also applaud Mr. Chabot's and Mr. Engel's understanding that this bill is not meant to target the lawful trade in Syrian or other cultural goods and that it only authorizes import restrictions on artifacts illegally removed from Syria after the start of its civil war. Nonetheless, it must be emphasized that the burden remains on the Government to prove that the artifact in question is illicit. While protecting Syrian cultural artifacts from looting is important, it is also important that we stay true to our own values. Our tradition of due process requires that the Government meet its burden of proof before private property may be seized or forfeited. This legislation does not change the burden placed on the Government under the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act. Here, as under the CPIA, the Government must establish: (1) the item is of a type that appears on the designated list of Syrian artifacts that will be created; (2) the item was ''first discovered'' in Syria and is subject to Syrian export control; and (3) the item was illegally removed from Syria after the effective date of the restrictions, which in this case is March 15, 2011. The fact that an object's ''country of origin'' or manufacture may be ''Syria'' cannot constitute the sole basis for its seizure and forfeiture under either this legislation or the CPIA.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW S. POLK, Jr.,
Board Member—The Committee for Cultural Property, Former Trustee—The Baltimore Museum of Art, Member—The Museum Trustees Association, Member—The Walters Art Museum Collections Committee, President—Historic Textile Research Foundation.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT PARK GEUN-HYE AND U.S.-KOREAN ALLIANCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened to hear that South Korean President Park Geun-Hye's visit to Washington, D.C. was postponed due to the growing threat of the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus (MERS) outbreak in the Republic of Korea. I know this is a very difficult time for the South Korean people and would like to send my deepest sympathy to the victims of this deadly virus. I express my utmost confidence in President Park's ability to lead the people of her beautiful country out of this crisis.

As always, the success and future of the Peninsula remain a priority for me. As a Korean War veteran, I have a very personal tie to Korea and its people. Since returning home from my service in the Korean War over six decades ago, I have proudly witnessed South Korea's rise as a war-torn nation to becoming an international giant, which is a testament to the resilience and industriousness of the Korean people. All across America, Koreans have inspired us with their entrepreneurialism and perseverance toward strengthening the fabric of our nation.

I commend President Park and Ambassador Ahn Ho-Young for further strengthening U.S.-Korean ties. As you know, the relationship between our country and the Republic of Korea is deeply rooted in our unbreakable bloodshed alliance. As we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Korea from Imperial Japan, I will continue working to help promote peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula—in hopes that the two Koreas will be reunified in my lifetime.

RETIREMENT OF DR. JAMES HADLEY BILLINGTON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary leadership of Dr. James Hadley Billington, the 13th Librarian of Congress and renowned scholar of Russia. Following 28 years of tireless service, Dr. Billington announced that he will be retiring from his post as the Librarian of Congress. During his tenure, Dr. Billington made significant contributions by providing visionary leadership as he ushered the Library of Congress into the digital age.

Since being unanimously confirmed by the Senate in 1987, Dr. Billington has overseen the expansion of the Library's collection size. It has roughly doubled, from 85.5 million items in 1987 to more than 160 million items today. Dr. Billington dedicated much of his efforts to ensuring that our nations historic items and collections be made readily available to the American public. In his early years, at the dawn of the internet age, he worked to facilitate an innovative program for the Library of Congress known as the National Digital Library (NDL) Program, which ensured that American historical and cultural information was available online. As a result of his efforts, projects such as the NDL, Congress.gov, and numerous pieces of information from the U.S. Copyright Office have become frequently used in K–12 education systems across America.

In addition to efforts ensuring the spread of the richly diverse history of the United States, Dr. Billington is also responsible for the development of the World Digital Library. A project similar to the NDL, the World Digital Library compiles cultural materials from the 193 countries listed in the UNESCO into one database for public access. I can say without question that throughout his decades of service, Dr. Billington has been firmly dedicated to the spread of information.

Dr. Billington has been an outstanding leader and educator to both our nation and the world. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors. I have no doubt that his contributions to our global society will have a significant impact on scholastic achievement for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the service and sacrifice of Dr. James Hadley Billington.

COBDEN HIGH SCHOOL CAPTURES STATE BASEBALL TITLE

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Cobden High School for capturing the Illinois

Class 1A state baseball title. The Appleknockers defeated Okawville Rockets 9 to 3 in Peoria.

Cobden made its third state tournament appearance and first since 1987, when it lost 12–1 in five innings to Columbia in the state title game.

CHRISTIAN PASTOR DUONG KIM KHAI JAILED IN VIETNAM

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since the early 1990's, Pastor Duong Kim Khai has been detained or arrested thirteen times. The first time he was arrested he was just 14 years old. Usually, he is arrested for simply organizing Christian prayer sessions. Most recently, he was arrested in August 2010 for his efforts to advocate for religious freedom and social justice. The trumped up charge? Attempting to overthrow the government.

For this, he was sentenced to 2–8 years in prison and 3–5 years probation and house arrest.

Unfortunately, his wife, who was denied permission to visit him in prison, died before she could see him again. In 2011, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention ruled that the Vietnam government's detention and conviction of Pastor Duong Kim Khai and six other activists were in violation of international law.

But the State Department refuses to include Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern for religious freedom. The Pastor is not only a spiritual leader in his community but he also works to promote democracy and help victims of injustice. For example, he has served as an advocate for Vietnamese farmers whose land was confiscated by the government.

Pastor Duong Kim Khai's trial was a sham and imprisonment is unacceptable. Freedom to worship is a human right and the Vietnamese government should immediately release him. Until they do, the State Department should call it like it is and recognize Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF LARNELL SAWYER

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Larnell Sawyer, of Chino Valley, Arizona.

Larnell Sawyer recently received the Teacher of the Year award for outstanding work as a teacher at Lincoln Elementary. Lincoln is recognized as a haven for academic achievement and growth. Ms. Sawyer has played a crucial role in creating this reputation.

Larnell Sawyer has deep ties to Chino Valley. She grew up and attended school there from kindergarten through high school. She then moved to Tucson and attended the University of Arizona, where she received her Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education. After teaching 1st grade for a year in Tucson, she got married to her high school sweetheart and moved back to Prescott. After her own initial academic successes, Larnell was hired in Chino Valley to teach an English Language Development kindergarten class, which she taught for two years. Realizing that she wanted to expand her knowledge, Larnell started her Master's program at Northern Arizona University and received her advanced degree in Early Childhood Education. Afterwards, she continued to teach in Chino Valley for another two years and was ultimately hired at Lincoln Elementary in 2012, where she continues to roar with pride as a Lincoln Lion kindergarten teacher. When the dedicated Ms. Sawyer is not shaping the minds of her students, she is spending quality time with her husband and two daughters.

Ms. Sawyer is a prime example of a great educator, and the positive influence that she has on her students will resonate for years to come.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 15

5 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing on lifting sanctions on Iran, focusing on practical implications.

S–116

JUNE 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jonathan Elkind, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs), and Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine health information technology, focusing on what providers and the Department of Health and Human Services can do to improve electronic health record user experience.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Federal real property reform, focusing on how cutting red tape and better management could achieve billions in savings.

SD–342

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2016 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill.''

SD–138

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2016 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations.''

SD–124

JUNE 17

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's final rule to regulate disposal of coal combustion residuals from electric utilities.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine CBO's analysis of the Federal government's deepening fiscal challenges.

SD–608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

SR–253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on evaluating accreditation's role in ensuring quality.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine governing through goal setting, focusing on enhancing the economic and national security of America.

SD–342

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic exposure of Federal credit programs.

SH–216

2 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration.

SD–342

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine the EPA's management of the renewable fuel standard program.

SD–342

JUNE 24

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine demanding results to end Native youth suicides.

SD–628

JULY 9

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3977–S4062

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1535–1550, and S. Res. 198. **Pages S4021–22**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016". (S. Rept. No. 114–61)

S. 552, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control, with an amendment.

S. 957, to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs.

S. 958, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for team and joint venture offers for certain contracts, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 966, to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 967, to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 999, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 1000, to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 1001, to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

S. 1292, to amend the Small Business Act to treat certain qualified disaster areas as HUBZones and to extend the period for HUBZone treatment for certain base closure areas.

S. 1470, to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance to small business concerns for disaster recovery, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4020–21**

Measures Passed:

Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act: Senate passed S. 253, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4059–61**

150th Anniversary of the "Second Founding": Senate agreed to S. Res. 198, commemorating the 150th anniversaries of the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, often referred to as the "Second Founding" of the United States. **Page S4061**

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: **Page S3986**

Withdrawn:

Ayotte (for Kirk) Amendment No. 1986 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1463), to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States. (By 31 yeas to 65 nays (Vote No. 206), Senate failed to table the amendment.) **Pages S4012–16, S4017–18**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3986**

McCain Amendment No. 1456 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels. **Page S3986**

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 S3986**

Vitter Amendment No. 1473 (to Amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units. **Pages S3986, S3996, S3998**

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. **Page S3986**

Reed (for Blumenthal) Amendment No. 1564 (to Amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. **Page S3986**

McCain (for Paul) Modified Amendment No. 1543 (to Amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government. **Page S3986**

Reed (for Durbin) Modified Amendment No. 1559 (to Amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations. **Page S3986**

McCain (for Burr) Modified Amendment No. 1569 (to Amendment No. 1463), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats. **Page S3986**

Feinstein (for McCain) Amendment No. 1889 (to Amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture. **Page S3986**

Fischer/Booker Amendment No. 1825 (to Amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. **Page S3986**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McCain (for Burr) Modified Amendment No. 1569 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, June 12, 2015. **Pages S3987–92, S4016–17**

During consideration of this measure today, the following action also occurred:

Burr/McCain Amendment No. 1921 (to Amendment No. 1569), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, rendered moot due to its incorporation into the modification of McCain (for Burr) Amendment No. 1569 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above). **Pages S3986–87, S3996–98**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of bill at approximately 11 a.m., on Thursday, June 11, 2015. **Page S4061**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–19) **Page S4020**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Eileen Maura Decker, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years. **Pages S4059, S4062**

John W. Huber, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years. **Pages S4059, S4062**

Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years. **Pages S4059, S4062**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Carolyn Patricia Alsup, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of The Gambia.

Paul Wayne Jones, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland.

Daniel H. Rubinstein, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

A routine list in the Foreign Service. **Pages S4061–62**

Messages from the House: **Page S4020**

Measures Referred: **Page S4020**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4021**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4022–25**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4025–33**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4019–20**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4033–58**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4058–59**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4059**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—206) **Page S4016**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:16 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday,

June 11, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4061.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies approved for full committee consideration an original bill entitled, "Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

PASSENGER RAIL SAFETY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine passenger rail safety, focusing on accident prevention and on-going efforts to implement train control technology, after receiving testimony from Robert C. Lauby, Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety and Chief Safety Officer, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation; Charles Mathias, Associate Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; T. Bella Dinh-Zarr, Vice Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; and DJ Stadtler, Amtrak, Washington, D.C.

PENDING LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 145, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, S. 146, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, S. 319, to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali, S. 329, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 403, to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, S. 521, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland, S. 610, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland and for other purposes, S. 782, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park, S. 873, to designate the wilderness within the Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska as the Jay S. Hammond Wilderness Area, and S. 1483, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, after receiving testimony from Senator Murphy; and Victor Knox, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1140, 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", with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

VERIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on verification and assessment, focusing on how to create a successful inspection regime from Joseph R. DeTrani, Intelligence and National Security Alliance, Washington, D.C., and Gary Samore, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, and David S. Shapira, of Pennsylvania, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, for a term expiring December 8, 2019, who was introduced by Senators Casey and Toomey, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

SPENDING IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management concluded a hearing to examine spending in the Federal government, focusing on an outside perspective, after receiving testimony from Romina Boccia, The Heritage Foundation Institute for Economic Freedom and Opportunity, Chris Edwards, Cato Institute, Steve Ellis, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and Thomas A. Schatz, Citizens Against Government Waste, all of Washington, D.C.; and Donald F. Kettl, University of Maryland School of Public Policy, Annapolis.

HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine health information exchange, focusing on a path towards improving the quality and value of health care for patients, after receiving testimony from Thomas H. Payne, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, on behalf of the American Medical Informatics Association; Craig D. Richardville, Carolinas HealthCare System, Charlotte, North Carolina, on behalf of the Premier Healthcare Alliance Member Technology Improvement Committee; Christine Bechtel, National Partnership for Women and Families, Olney, Maryland, on behalf of the Health IT Policy Committee Consumer Work Group; and Neal L. Patterson, Cerner Corporation, Kansas City, Missouri.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 248, to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act.

VICTIM SERVICES IN INDIAN COUNTRY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine addressing the need for victim services in Indian Country, after receiving testimony from Darren Cruzan, Director, Office of Justice Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Gerad Godfrey, Office of the Governor of Alaska Rural Business and Intergovernmental Affairs Senior Advisor, Anchorage; A.T. Stafne, Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation, Poplar, Montana; and Dianne Barker Harrold, Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma, Ft. Gibson.

FEDERAL REGULATORY SYSTEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Federal regulatory system to improve accountability, transparency and integrity, including S. 1178, to prohibit implementation of a proposed rule relating to the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'' under the Clean Water Act, or any substantially similar rule, until a Supplemental Scientific Review Panel and Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams Advisory Committee produce certain reports, after receiving testimony from William L. Kovacs, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Robert Weissman, Public Citizen, Ellen Steen, American Farm Bureau Federation, and Charles J. Cooper, Cooper and Kirk, PLLC, all of Washington, D.C.; and Patrick Parenteau, Vermont Law School Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, South Royalton, Vermont.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Casey and Toomey, and Travis Randall McDonough, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and Waverly D. Crenshaw, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, who were both introduced by Senators Alexander and Corker, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

UNWANTED CALLS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the proliferation of unwanted calls, after receiving testimony from Lois Greisman, Associate Director, Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Joe Dandurand, Missouri Deputy Attorney General, Jefferson City; Henning Schulzrinne, Columbia University, New York, New York; and Linda Blase, Dallas, Texas.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 2709–2727; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 56; and H. Res. 306–308 were introduced. **Pages H4135–36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4137–38**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 305, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory (H. Rept. 114–146). **Page H4135**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Jolly to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4007**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:11 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4015**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Claudio Kogan, Temple Emanuel, McAllen, Texas. **Page H4015**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 256 yeas to 168 nays with two answering ''present'', Roll No. 332. **Pages H4015, H4031–32**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Palazzo wherein he resigned from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. **Page H4015**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 304, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H4015**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, June 9th:

Supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike: H. Res. 295, supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 421 yeas to 6 nays with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 331. **Pages H4030–31**

Authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 54, authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution. **Page H4032**

Permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 292, permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker. **Page H4032**

Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 2393, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, by a yea-and-nay vote of 300 yeas to 131 nays, Roll No. 333. **Pages H4032–39, H4105**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Page H4032**

H. Res. 303, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2685) and (H.R. 2393), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 330, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H4020–30**

Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016: The House began consideration of H.R. 2685, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, June 11th. **Pages H4020–30, H4040, H4105**

Agreed to:

Gosar amendment that reduces funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, by $3,200,000 and increases funding for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, by $2,000,000; **Page H4060**

Pascrell amendment that redirects $5,500,000 in funding within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide; **Pages H4060–61**

Delaney amendment that reduces funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, by $7,463,000 and increases funding for Fisher House Foundation, Inc. by $5,000,000; **Pages H4061–62**

Franks (AZ) amendment that redirects $2,000,000 in funding within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide; **Page H4062**

Nolan amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program, by $1,000,000; **Pages H4062–63**

McKinley amendment that redirects $5,000,000 in funding within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide; **Page H4063**

Grayson amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program related to Gulf War Illness, by $10,000,000; **Page H4064**

Grayson amendment that increases funding, by offset, for prostate cancer research, by $10,000,000; **Pages H4064–65**

Speier amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program, by $5,000,000; **Page H4065**

Takai amendment that redirects $25,000,000 in funding within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide; **Page H4065**

Conyers amendment that reduces funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, by $15,000,000 and increases funding for United Service Organizations by $10,000,000; **Pages H4065–66**

Keating amendment that increases funding, by offset, for research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program, by $1,000,000; **Pages H4066–67**

Jackson Lee amendment that increases funding, by offset, for research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program related to PTSD, by $1,000,000; **Pages H4067–68**

Jackson Lee amendment that increases funding, by offset, for breast cancer research, by $10,000,000; **Pages H4073–75**

Pascrell amendment that increases funding, by offset, for research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program, by $25,000,000; **Pages H4075–76**

Aguilar amendment that redirects $1,000,000 in funding within research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Defense Health Program for suicide prevention; **Pages H4076–81**

McCollum amendment that redirects $80,000,000 in funding within Operation and Maintenance, Army; **Pages H4094–95**

Huffman amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2015) that strikes section 8053, relating to cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community (by a recorded vote of 252 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 335); **Pages H4081–86, H4106–07**

Forbes amendment that strikes section 8122, which prohibits the transfer of funds to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund (by a recorded vote of 321 ayes to 111 noes, Roll No. 339); **Pages H4092–94, H4109–10**

Walberg amendment that prohibits funds from being used for the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' (by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 341); **Pages H4097–98, H4110–11**

MacArthur amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2015) that prohibits the use of funds to divest or retire, or to prepare to divest or retire, KC–10 aircraft; **Page H4113**

Walberg amendment that prohibits the use of funds to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs; **Pages H4114–15**

McSally amendment that prohibits the use of funds to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any EC–130H aircraft; **Pages H4117–18**

Hunter amendment that prohibits the use of funds in contravention of section 2483(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code; **Page H4119**

Yoho amendment that prohibits the use of funds under the heading ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems; **Page H4120**

Yoho amendment that prohibits the use of funds under section 9014 for ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems; **Page H4120**

Conyers amendment that prohibits the use of funds to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion; **Page H4123**

Cole amendment that prohibits the use of funds to carry out furloughs of Working Capital Fund civilian employees; **Page H4124**

Grayson amendment that prohibits the use of funds to enter into contracts with entities who are convicted of fraud; **Pages H4124–25**

Gosar amendment that prohibits the use of funds for Government Travel Charge Card expenses by military or civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for gaming, or entertainment that includes topless or nude entertainers or participants; **Page H4125**

McClintock amendment that prohibits funds from being used to carry out specified sections of Executive Order 13423, Executive Order 13514, and Executive Order 13963; specified subsections of section 2911 of title 10, U.S.C.; sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act; section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992; and section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005;

Pages H4126–27

Jackson Lee amendment that prohibits the use of funds in contravention of the authority of the President pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the Constitution; **Page H4129**

Guinta amendment that prohibits the use of funds to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round;

Pages H4129–30

Nugent amendment that prohibits the use of funds to retire conventionally armed air launch cruise missles (AGM–86 C/D); and **Pages H4132–33**

Forbes amendment that provides that notwithstanding section 8005 and 9003, of the unobligated funds authorized to be appropriated in FY 2016 and made available in this Act, $3,500,000,000 is available to transfer to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund. **Page H4133**

Rejected:

Bridenstine amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, by $25,000,000;

Page H4072

Rothfus amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to transfer or divest AH–64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the active Army prior to June 30, 2016 and to prohibit the allocation of funds for operation and maintenance and personnel connected with such aircraft (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the earlier request for a recorded vote to the end that the amendment stand disposed of in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon); **Pages H4089–92, H4104–05**

Lowenthal amendment that sought to redirect $5,000,000 in funding within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 334); **Page H4106**

Visclosky amendment that sought to strike section 8100, which prohibited the use of funds to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or other detainee (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 336); **Pages H4086, H4107–08**

Nadler amendment that sought to strike section 8101, which prohibited the use of funds on any modification of facilities at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 259 noes, Roll No. 337);

Pages H4086–88, H4108

Nadler amendment that sought to strike section 8102, which prohibited the use of funds to transfer any individual detained at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country (by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 338); **Pages H408889, H4108–09**

Poe (TX) amendment that sought to reduce funding for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide by $430,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 117 ayes to 315 noes, Roll No. 340); **Pages H4095–97,4110**

Nolan amendment that sought to eliminate funding for the Iraq Train and Equip fund and apply the $715,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 56 ayes to 375 noes, Roll No. 342); **Pages H4098–H4100, H4111–12**

Clawson amendment that sought to eliminate funding for the Syria Train and Equip fund and apply the $600,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 107 ayes to 323 noes, Roll No. 343); **Pages H4100–04, H4112**

Poe (TX) amendment that sought to strike subsection (b) of section 9015, relating to the waiver used by the Secretary of Defense with respect to the Government of Pakistan (by a recorded vote of 114 ayes to 318 noes, Roll No. 344);

Pages H4104, H4112–13

Huizenga (MI) (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2015) amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the Small Business Administration interim final rule titled "Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2012 North American Industry Classification System" with respect to the procurement of footwear (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the earlier voice vote in which the amendment stand adopted be vacated to the end that the amendment stand disposed of);

Pages H4115–16, H4118–19

Grayson amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided under the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act; and **Pages H4126–26**

Rohrabacher amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to provide assistance to Pakistan.

Page H4132

Withdrawn:

Jackson Lee amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Military Personnel, Navy, by $2,000,000; **Pages H4057–59**

Sablan amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, by $21,300,000;

Pages H4063–64

Lamborn amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, by $10,290,000;

Pages H4068–70

Heck (NV) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have redirected $100,000,000 in funding within Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army;

Pages H4070–72

Latta amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for Other Procurement, Air Force by $35,000,000 and reduces funding for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, facilities and equipment by $49,000,000; and

Page H4072

Michelle Lujan Grisham (NM) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have redirected $3,543,000 in funding within Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide. **Page H4075**

Point of Order sustained against:

Gosar amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for operation and maintenance of the Defense Health Program, by $1,500,000; and

Page H4061

Ellmers amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to deactivate the 440th airlift wing, or to move the personnel or aircraft of the 440th airlift wing, or to otherwise degrade the capabilities of the 440th airlift wing. **Pages H4131–32**

Proceedings Postponed:

Schiff amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant; **Pages H4113–14**

Lee amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force after December 31, 2015; **Pages H4116–17**

Lee amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002;

Pages H4118–19

Sablan amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; **Pages H4119–20**

Gosar amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of the Navy to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any search and rescue units from the Marine Corps;

Pages H4120–21

Johnson (GA) amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to transfer a flash-bang grenade;

Pages H4121–22

Gosar amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms; **Pages H4122–23**

Johnson (GA) amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle; **Pages H4123–24**

Ellison amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act'' and such disposition is listed as ''willful'' or ''repeated''; **Pages H4127–28**

Smith (MO) amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to provide for defense counsel for any individual described in section 8101(c); and

Pages H4128–29

Massie amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds for Section 702 programs of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. **Pages H4130–31**

H. Res. 303, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2685) and (H.R. 2393), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 330, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H4020–30**

Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015—Order of Business: Agreed by unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 1295, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House 1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title and 2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule 18 and numbered 1; that the Senate amendments and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question. **Page H4117**

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representatives Larson (CT), David Scott (GA), Frankel (FL), and Connolly. **Page H4133**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–42). **Pages H4039–40**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H4032.

Senate Referrals: S. 653 was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources and S. 611 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. **Page H4133**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and eleven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4030, H4030-31, H4031, H4105, H4106, H4106-07, H4107-08, H4108, H4108-09, H4109-10, H4110, H4110-11, H4111-12, H4112, H4112-13. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 1:48 a.m. on Thursday, June 11, 2015.

Committee Meetings

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF SNAP: THE MEANS TO CLIMBING THE ECONOMIC LADDER

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Past, Present, and Future of SNAP: The Means to Climbing the Economic Ladder". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a markup on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2016. The Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2016, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

REVIEWING THE RULES AND REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING FEDERAL WAGE AND HOUR STANDARDS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled "Reviewing the Rules and Regulations Implementing Federal Wage and Hour Standards". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a markup on H.R. 805, the "Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015". H.R. 805 was forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

IRAN'S ENDURING BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled "Iran's Enduring Ballistic Missile Threat". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEFENSE SUPPORT OF CIVIL AUTHORITIES: A VITAL RESOURCE IN THE NATION'S HOMELAND SECURITY MISSIONS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled "Defense Support of Civil Authorities: A Vital Resource in the Nation's Homeland Security Missions". Testimony was heard from Robert J. Fenton, Jr., Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Robert G. Salesses, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Homeland Defense Integration and Defense Support of Civil Authorities, Department of Defense; Brigadier General Joseph E. Whitlock, Deputy Director, Western Hemisphere, Joint Staff, J–5, Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate, Department of Defense; Joseph W. Kirschbaum, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office; Major General Michael T. McGuire, Adjutant General, Department of Emergency and Military Affairs, State of Arizona; Peter Gaynor, Director, Emergency Management Office, State of Rhode Island; and a public witness.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 487, to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; H.R. 2212, to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2387, to amend the Alaska Native Claims

Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans. Testimony was heard from Michael Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 387, the ''Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act''; H.R. 521, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; H.R. 1289, the ''John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act''; H.R. 1992, the ''American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act''; H.R. 2295, the ''National Energy Security Corridors Act''; H.R. 2358, the ''Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act''; and H.R. 2647, the ''Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015''.

THE IMPACT OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13658 ON PUBLIC LAND GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on the Interior held a hearing entitled ''The Impact of Executive Order 13658 on Public Land Guides and Outfitters''. Testimony was heard from Representative Stewart; Michael Lazzeri, Assistant Administrator for Government Contracts, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

THE FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REFORM ACT'S ROLE IN REDUCING IT ACQUISITION RISK

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on Government Operations, held a joint hearing entitled ''The Federal Information Technology Reform Act's Role in Reducing IT Acquisition Risk''. Testimony was heard from David A. Powner, Director, IT Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; Tony Scott, U.S. Chief Information Officer, Office of E-Government and Information Technology, Office of Management and Budget; Anne Rung, Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget; and a public witness.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO THE TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015; SENATE AMENDMENTS TO THE TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015; SENATE AMENDMENTS TO THE TRADE ACT OF 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on Senate Amendments to H.R. 644, the ''Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015''; Senate Amendments to H.R. 1295, the ''Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015''; and Senate Amendment to H.R. 1314, the ''Trade Act of 2015''. The committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule that provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule provides that the question on adoption of the motion shall be divided as follows: (1) concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment (relating to Medicare); (2) concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment (TAA); and (3) concurring in the matter preceding title II of the Senate amendment (TPA). The first portion of the divided question shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides that if any remaining portion of the divided question fails, then the House shall be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment. In section 2, the rule provides for the consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 644. The rule makes in order a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House: (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion and provides that the motion is not subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule provides that the Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule provides that if the motion is adopted, the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee is then authorized to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 644 and request a conference with the Senate thereon. Testimony was heard from Chairman Ryan of Wisconsin and Representatives Levin, Doggett, Polis, Mulvaney, Kaptur, King of Iowa, Kildee, Clawson of Florida, Pocan, Dingell, McDermott, Edwards, and Grayson.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2499, the "Veterans Entrepreneurship Act of 2015"; H.R. 208, the "Superstorm Sandy Relief Act of 2015"; H.R. 1023, the "Small Business Investment Company Capital Act of 2015"; and H.R. 2670, the "Microloan Modernization Act of 2015". The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2499 and H.R. 208. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1023 and H.R. 2670.

ONE YEAR ANNIVERSARY AFTER ENACTMENT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2014

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled "One Year Anniversary after Enactment: Implementation of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014". Testimony was heard from Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works; and Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army Corps of Engineers.

PRESCRIPTION MISMANAGEMENT AND THE RISK OF VETERAN SUICIDE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Prescription Mismanagement and the Risk of Veteran Suicide". Testimony was heard from Carolyn Clancy, M.D., Interim Under Secretary for Health, Department of Veterans Affairs; Randall Williamson, Director, Health Care Issues, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

OBAMACARE IMPLEMENTATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FY16 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing on Obamacare implementation and the Department of Health and Human Services FY16 Budget request. Testimony was heard from Sylvia Burwell, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

Joint Meetings

FOREIGN FIGHTERS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the escalating threat of ISIL in Central Asia, after receiving testimony from Daniel Rosenblum, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs; and Frank J. Cillufo, The George Washington University Center for Cyber and Homeland Security, and Jennifer Leonard, International Crisis Group, both of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016", an original bill entitled, "Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016", and an original bill entitled, "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2016", 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Ann Elizabeth Dunkin, of California, and Thomas A. Burke, and Jane Toshiko Nishida, both of Maryland, all to be to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine accounts of current and former federal agency whistleblowers, 10:30 a.m., SD–342.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, hearing entitled "Implementing the Agricultural Act of 2014: Conservation Programs", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, markup on Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, FY 2016, 9 a.m., 2358–B Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for FY 2016, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled "The Department of Defense Views on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's Recommendations for Military Health Care Reform", 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Examining H.R. 1786, James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act", 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Future of Housing in America: Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "Examining Legislative Proposals to Preserve Consumer Choice and Financial Independence", 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''Retreat or Revival: A Status Report on Democracy in Asia'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The Goldman Act to Return Abducted American Children: Assessing the Compliance Report and Required Action'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 9, the ''Innovation Act'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 387, the ''Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act''; H.R. 521, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; H.R. 1289, the ''John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act''; H.R. 1992, the ''American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act''; H.R. 2295, the ''National Energy Security Corridors Act''; H.R. 2358, the ''Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act''; and H.R. 2647, the ''Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015'' (continued), 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules, hearing entitled ''Examining Fraud, Waste, and Abuse at the Export-Import Bank'', 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space, hearing entitled ''Transforming America's Air Travel'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, hearing entitled ''Squeezed: Current Challenges for Small Citrus Operations'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing entitled ''Exploring VBA's Fiduciary Program'', 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, June 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 11

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 2685—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016 (Subject to a Rule). Motion to Concur in the Senate amendments with an amendment to H.R. 1295—Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aguilar, Pete, Calif., E865
Beyer, Donald S., Jr., Va. E872
Bost, Mike, Ill., E874
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E865, E873
Chu, Judy, Calif, E869
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E870
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E867, E868, E870, E871
Costa, Jim, Calif., E869
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E869
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E872
Dold, Robert J., Ill., E870
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E870
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E875
Graves, Sam, Mo., E873
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E866, E868, E870, E871, E873
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E865
Hurt, Robert, Va., E866
Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E874
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E874
Jolly, David W., Fla., E865
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E866
Lawrence, Brenda L., Mich., E866, E872
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E867
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E873
Olson, Pete, Tex., E865, E867, E869, E870, E871, E873
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E870
Poe, Ted, Tex., E874, E875
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E866
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E874
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E865
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E868, E872
Young, David, Iowa, E867

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.