United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2016 No. 95

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 15, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, 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.

JOCELYN DORSEY

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I thank my colleague and fellow Georgian, Mr. DAVID SCOTT, for inviting me to share some words and congratulations toward a great Georgian who is here today. That Georgian is Jocelyn Dorsey, who was recently inducted into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame.

Jocelyn has served our community for more than 43 years as an employee of Atlanta's number one local station, WSB-TV Channel 2 Action News. Jocelyn now serves as the director of editorials and public affairs at WSB, where she is responsible for all community and public service outreach programs. Over the years, she has become not only an accomplished and trusted news anchor but a person who gives her money and her time and who is a friend to all who have ever met her.

Aside from her work at the station, Jocelyn uses her free time to bring awareness to the Atlanta area nonprofits and assists them with fundraising. I have been involved with her many times at some of these fundraising opportunities that she takes. Jocelyn serves on the advisory board of many charitable organizations in Atlanta, working to improve the lives of those with developmental disabilities and to improve the lives of the children of the community. She is also a mentor to teens and is an advocate for family values. Jocelyn has been a pioneer for women in journalism in our State, especially for African American women. She is a leader and has been recognized by the city of Atlanta and county commissioners for all of the work that she has done.

Many people want to make Atlanta better, but what makes Jocelyn special is that she actually works hard every day to make our city a better place. Whether it is at the TV studio or during her free time, she is committed to making Atlanta a great place to work, live, and raise children. Jocelyn knows and embodies the best values of Georgians—hard work, service, and, of course, leadership. There cannot be improvement without action, and Atlanta's next generation is fortunate to have a strong, active leader in the community like Jocelyn to look up to and to try to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Jocelyn on her induction into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame. I also thank her for her commitment to Atlanta and to the State of Georgia. I wish Jocelyn and her family all the best, and I know that she will continue to do great things for our city and our State.

JOCELYN DORSEY

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress today gives great and special recognition to an extraordinary Georgian and a great American, Ms. Jocelyn Dorsey, for her pioneering and trailblazing career with WSB Television, the flagship station in Atlanta, Georgia, of Cox Enterprises, and also for her induction into the prestigious Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, as we share with the Nation Ms. Dorsey's remarkable contributions and her high nobility of purpose.

Jocelyn Dorsey was the very first African American to anchor a television newscast in the Atlanta market, ushering in the New South. She broke down racial barriers in television—in anchoring, in reporting, in management, in producing. Jocelyn Dorsey is a one-of-a-kind because she was able to put together an award-winning public affairs television program called ''People to People.''

Truly, through this program, Jocelyn Dorsey has done and is doing God's work, which is in helping those who need help the most: children who need shelter, children with disabilities, and disabled veterans. As well, her work in breast cancer and prostate cancer and for Sisters By Choice is absolutely legendary. Every year, Jocelyn Dorsey is a major partner in Georgia's largest job fairs and health fairs, bringing

Printed on recycled paper.

badly needed jobs to thousands of Georgians and to our military veterans.

What an extraordinary person Ms. Jocelyn Dorsey is. She has been with this station, WSB, for 43 years. That is very significant because WSB Television has been in existence for 67 years—43 years out of the station's 67 years of existence. As famous WSB sportscaster Chuck Dowdle said, Jocelyn Dorsey is the backbone of WSB Television.

Mr. Speaker, she loves her motorcycle, and she rode that motorcycle all the way from Alaska to Key West, Florida, and raised $250,000 for the Special Olympics. You talk about God's work. That is it that she is doing—7,680 miles. It took her 21 days.

I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that God gives us His loving kindness and His grace by His divine calling to certain persons. Such a person is Jocelyn Dorsey, and we in the United States Congress today take great pride in having her story, which is a great American story, enshrined into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and into the congressional Library of Congress for all times, for generations to come—forever.

God bless Jocelyn Dorsey with WSB Television, and God bless the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame, and God bless the United States of America.

JOCELYN DORSEY

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. DAVID SCOTT, for coordinating this tribute to Jocelyn Dorsey.

I am honored to recognize Jocelyn Dorsey, who is being inducted into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame, for her steadfast commitment to journalism excellence.

Jocelyn has served the Atlanta, Georgia, region for over 40 years in her reporting for WSB-TV. During her career, she has been recognized for her work ethic and devotion to the field of journalism. Jocelyn's commitment to excellence quickly advanced her career, and she has served as the director of editorial and public affairs at Channel 2 since 1983.

She has received numerous awards for her work with WSB-TV, including seven Southeast Regional Emmys for Editorial Excellence from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. Jocelyn was also the first woman and the first African American to receive the Georgia Association of Broadcasters' Citizen of the Year Award, which is a lifetime achievement award.

Her work speaks for itself, but she is more than a reporter, anchor, and director. Jocelyn is the mother of two sons and is a grandmother. She is also an active volunteer in her community, and she rode her Harley-Davidson around the country, raising thousands of dollars for the Special Olympics of Georgia.

As the Atlanta Magazine puts it, Jocelyn is a ''woman making a mark.'' She is truly an inspiration to the journalism community.

Congratulations, Jocelyn Dorsey, on your well-deserved induction into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame.

JOCELYN DORSEY

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

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to say a few words about Jocelyn Dorsey.

Jocelyn Dorsey has won some of the highest honors the field of broadcasting has to offer, and, in many categories, she has been the first one to do it. She is an Emmy award-winning journalist and is the first African American woman to appear on a daily news show in Atlanta. She is the first woman and the first African American to receive the Georgia Association of Broadcasters' lifetime achievement award, Citizen of the Year, among many other honors. She has achieved so much. I will not have enough time here to mention it all.

I have known Jocelyn ever since she first came to Atlanta so many decades ago. How do you put into a few short words the gift that is 40 years of one person's life? It is not easy to sum up all we have seen together, all she has done, and what she means to our community, to our city, to our State, and to our Nation. But when you boil it all down, Jocelyn Dorsey stands for trust and credibility, generosity and human kindness.

Jocelyn is a professional who shines in the spotlight, who deserves the fame and the acclaim. But the reason she lasted 40 years in a tough business is that she loved the people and the institution she served. We could feel it, and we loved her back.

Jocelyn wants to touch people. She wants to do something that helps create life-changing outcomes for those around her. Her work was not a job; it was a way of life. She has traveled the length and breadth of America on her motorcycle, even as far away as Fairbanks, Alaska, meeting people as she went.

She served on community boards in Atlanta that help the disabled, that mentor young girls, that support minority businesses, children's shelters, voter empowerment, and many other worthy causes. She gave her time and used her power as a broadcaster, not because it was fashionable but because it was the right thing to do. It was right. Jocelyn Dorsey has won just about every accolade she could have won in her region.

I don't know whether I can offer any words that would surpass what she has already heard. But we brought her here to the House of Representatives to celebrate her retirement because she is committed and dedicated to the citizens of this country—a woman who took her responsibility as an American seriously and did all she could to help others in any way she could.

I know and truly believe that WSB is so sorry to see her go, but, as a community, we are glad to know where she will stay—in our hearts. She will be forever in the hearts of all of our people and at the center of public service in our community.

Thank you, Jocelyn Dorsey, for all of your great and good work, and may the blessing of the Almighty be with you.

□ 1015

SUPREME COURT RULING

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago the United States Supreme Court issued a ruling on an important case that deals with private property rights, the Clean Water Act, and the ability of Americans to challenge administrative decisions made by Federal agencies.

In the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers v. Hawkes decision, a private company wanted the ability to dispute a proposed determination by the Corps before they were put through the burdensome and costly process of applying for a section 404 permit. When the Hawkes Company, which wanted to harvest peat from a tract of land that is 120 miles from the Red River in Minnesota, began the process with the Corps, the Corps provided a jurisdictional determination—also called a JD—that stated there was a ''significant nexus'' between the Red River and the acreage Hawkes expected to harvest. Thus, requiring a permit.

But there was no guarantee that the permit would even be approved. The Hawkes Company believed they should not be forced to spend thousands of dollars in permit applications only to be denied and then go through the long process of appealing the decision.

The government's lawyers tried to argue that the approved jurisdictional determination is not the same as the final agency action, which is required before any legal or judicial review can even begin.

This is one of several important points made in the Supreme Court's unanimous decision siding with the Hawkes Company. While the Federal Government argued to the Court that an approved JD is not a final agency action, the Court found that the Army Corps considers it so in other Federal regulations. Using conditions set by previous court precedents, the Supreme Court sided with Hawkes and agreed that an approved JD essentially constitutes a final agency action. This now gives Hawkes and other entities applying for Clean Water Act permits

in the future the ability to dispute rulings by the Corps before spending thousands and thousands of dollars for permits.

The Federal Government's arguments in this case were unconvincing at best and repugnant at worst. Army Corps lawyers contended that Hawkes had an alternative to the expensive permit application. They argued the company could simply begin their operations without a permit, face the wrath of the Environmental Protection Agency, and attempt to argue in court that a permit isn't necessary. The problem with these alternatives is that Hawkes would be facing fines as much as $37,500 a day by operating without a permit.

In their 8–0 decision, the Court rightly sided with reason and sanity. American citizens and private companies should not be at the mercy of a bureaucracy that is effectively extorting them to have their day in court.

On the surface, this court case was about a peat company in Minnesota trying to sell some turf to golf courses, but it represents much more than that. We have a government that is too large, spends too much, and interferes with the private sector, especially at a time when our economy is stagnant and millions of Americans are struggling to find the work they are eager to take on. We have the ability to return the government's role in the economy to its original and appropriate place by creating the conditions for economic growth for all Americans rather than attempting to pick winners and losers through a centrally planned economy.

Yesterday, Speaker RYAN introduced a proposal by House Republicans that provides a better way toward economic prosperity for all Americans. One of those ways is to reduce the regulatory and administrative burdens placed on the private sector. If we modernize the regulatory framework, provide real and aggressive oversight of major regulations by requiring an up-or-down vote by Congress, and give the American people a larger role in the development of the Federal rules and regulations that affect them, we can set our economy on a path towards prosperity. More importantly, we can make sure all Americans have the opportunity to improve their lives, to live out their own version of the American Dream, and allow their children and grandchildren to inherit a more confident and prosperous Nation.

MASS SHOOTING IN ORLANDO

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with other Members of this body and tens of millions of Americans in every corner of our Nation, to express my profound sympathy and heartfelt condolences to the families and friends of the 49 beautiful young people of Orlando whose lives were stolen Sunday morning. We may never know the kind of hatred, what kind of sickness moves an individual so vehemently with such unchecked racism and homophobia to commit mass murder allegedly in the name of one or more terrorist causes.

My mind constantly returns to those who lost their lives at the Pulse, along with the 53 who were wounded, in an attempt to understand how one individual came to have the power to wreak such destruction and havoc. These innocent souls now join those lost at Blacksburg, Virginia; Newtown, Connecticut; Killeen, Texas; San Ysidro, California; San Bernardino, California; Edmund, Oklahoma; Fort Hood, Texas; Binghamton, New York; and Aurora, Colorado, as victims of modern warfare.

So far 2016 has seen 136 mass shootings, according to the Gun Violence Archive.

How can we countenance the continued ownership, availability, and use of semiautomatic weapons such as the AR–15? What legitimate purpose can they serve? What legitimate need do they fulfill? How many more must die before we rise up as a Nation and reinstate the ban on such weapons in civilian life? Would that have an impact? Would such a ban save lives?

We don't have to guess. We can look to the experience of Australia, a nation with some significant parallels to the United States. In 1996, after the worst mass shooting in Australian history, then-Prime Minister John Howard led the battle for what was to become the National Firearms Agreement, which banned certain semiautomatic and self-loading rifles and shotguns and required all firearm license applicants to show a genuine reason for owning a gun, which couldn't include self-defense.

The country instituted a mandatory federally financed gun buyback program, which led to the repurchase of 700,000 guns, which halved the number of gun-owning households and reduced the number of guns in circulation by about 20 percent. The firearm homicide rate fell by 59 percent and the firearm suicide rate fell by 65 percent without increases in other types of deaths. Australia hasn't had another mass shooting on that scale since.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close on another even more critical note: addressing the deadly end result of racism, homophobia, and male chauvinism.

The self-serving notion that any individual or group is superior to another has plagued America from our earliest days as a Nation. Slavery was a cancer on our people. Justified by the crudest, cruelest, most vicious ideology, which proclaimed persons of African or Native American ancestry to be inferior and subhuman and persons of European ancestry to be their natural masters, it was the basis of a vicious system of social oppression and economic exploitation. No people will endure such oppression and exploitation forever. Indeed, it inevitably led to the deadliest and most divisive war in our Nation's history: the Civil War. 204,070 people died in battle or from injury in battle, and 414,152 died from disease or accident, a total of 618,000 souls.

Yet here we have these evils lingering in our society today. They continue to express themselves in so many different ways.

What kind of deranged mind leads itself to believe that it can pass judgment on other individuals or groups? What kind of mind raised in the United States places itself above our constitutional declarations of equality for all? What kind of mind finds the basis to declare other individuals or groups defective or inferior? What kind of mind declares other individuals unworthy or unqualified to share the protections of our Constitution? What kind of mind asserts they are above judgment by a member of another group? What kind of mind envisions a world where one people are superior to another people and believes that such notions can lead to anything other than enduring conflict, death, and destruction?

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of thoughts can no longer linger. The answer rests, to a real degree, with us.

CALLING ON SENATE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the Senate to act now to send to the President's desk several important bills that I have introduced in this Chamber, which have all now passed this House.

In Congress, I have been working hard to pursue my New Era of American Strength agenda to protect America's security at home and abroad, help grow our economy, support our veterans and first responders, improve the quality of education, repair our Nation's infrastructure, improve health care in America, and safeguard our environment.

Working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House and Senate, I have been able to secure a number of important victories for my district. These include a 5-year fully funded transportation bill, including my Safe Bridges Act, which was passed and signed into law.

My proposal to allow States to opt out of Common Core without penalty from the Federal Government was also passed and signed into law.

Working with Peconic Bay Medical Center, I was able to open a new veterans healthcare clinic in Manorville.

I also helped lead the effort to permanently reauthorize the Zadroga Act for our 9/11 first responders and stop the Medical Device Excise Tax for 2 years.

Additionally, my office has successfully resolved over 3,000 cases in favor of New York's First Congressional District constituents.

While I am very proud of the victories I have been able to secure thus far for New York's First Congressional District, I have introduced a number of other bills that have now passed this House.

The Senate should act to pass all of the following bills:

My Counterterrorism Screening and Assistance Act, which is H.R. 4314. With the rise of terrorism across the world, the need for an improved security clearance process and increased border security has become even more apparent. The free movement of those who would commit horrific acts of terror is one of the greatest threats to America's safety, both at home and abroad. My bipartisan bill, H.R. 4314, would help close gaps in foreign borders by establishing international security standards while also guaranteeing that U.S. resources are utilized in the most efficient way possible wherever they are needed the most. H.R. 4314 would also put in place a monitoring system to screen for infectious diseases abroad, like Zika, in order to contain and prevent any potential outbreaks.

The Senate should also pass my three bills for our Nation's veterans: H.R. 2460, H.R. 1569, and H.R. 1187. One of my greatest priorities is ensuring that the veterans of our Armed Forces receive the treatment and benefits that they have earned and deserve. In Congress, I have introduced several pieces of legislation to provide for our heroes, including H.R. 2460, which would provide adult day health care for disabled veterans at no cost; H.R. 1569, to require the VA to pay accrued benefits to the estate of deceased veterans; and H.R. 1187, to eliminate the loan limit that the VA can guarantee for a veteran. Passing all these bills, all of which have received enormous support from Democrats and Republicans alike, are essential to increase our veterans care and assistance.

I also introduced a bill to save Plum Island: H.R. 1887. This island is a critical natural, cultural, and historical treasure that has been cherished by our local community since before the 1700s. Rather than allow the Federal Government to sell the island to the highest bidder, H.R. 1887 would safeguard the island from development to preserve this beautiful land, almost all of which is completely undeveloped. Additionally, we can ensure good-paying research jobs are on the island while allowing public access for more Long Islanders and others to experience this great land that is right in our own backyard.

Another one of my bills, H.R. 3070, would allow striped bass fishing off the coast of Montauk. Just this month, H.R. 3070 passed the House with unanimous bipartisan support. My bill would clarify Federal laws governing the management of the striped bass fishery in the exclusive economic zone between Montauk, New York, and Block Island, Rhode Island. Fishermen are desperately pleading for commonsense relief, and the EEZ Transit Zone Clarification and Access Act is one way that Congress can help.

The Senate should act quickly on all of these essential pieces of legislation. I will continue doing everything in my power to bring home more victories for Long Island through my New Era of American Strength agenda.

□ 1030

A TIME COMES WHEN SILENCE IS BETRAYAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind this House that Martin Luther King, Jr. said: A time comes when silence is betrayal.

Early Sunday morning, 49 Americans were murdered and 53 wounded, gunned down at a gay nightclub in Orlando.

As a nation, we grieve for the 49 Americans who were taken from us that day. Our hearts and prayers are with their loved ones and with all those who were wounded. Yet while we grieve, we must also act. This heinous, hateful attack had three important aspects, each of which we must acknowledge and address. Orlando was a hate crime. It was a terrorist attack, and it was committed with a gun that this individual should never have had.

This terrorist attack was a hate crime, and if we ignore that brutal reality, if we are silent about it, then we disrespect the victims of this tragedy, their families, and LGBT Americans across this Nation. So let's be very clear. On Sunday, an individual set out to kill LGBT Americans simply because of who they are. It was a direct attack on the LGBT community in a place where they gathered for safety and fellowship, and it was an attack on the Latino and Hispanic community as well.

As the sister of a gay man, this attack is personal to me, but in reality, this attack is personal to all Americans. It is an attack on our families, our friends, our values. It is an attack on our diversity and our freedom. As Americans, we do not back down from our values. We unite around them. We do not respond to hatred with hatred.

Today it is more important than ever to stand up proudly against discrimination in all forms, whether it is based on sexual orientation, on gender identity, religion, race, or anything else.

This was also a terrorist attack that requires a counterterrorism response. We need to strengthen our intelligence efforts at home and abroad. At home we need to identify potential lone wolf attackers and stop them before they become radicalized. Our political leaders, or those seeking to become political leaders, need to stop singling out Muslim Americans for hatred and violence.

Targeting Muslim Americans with violence and discrimination isn't just unAmerican; it makes our entire Nation less safe. It gives ISIS a recruiting tool to radicalize individuals in this country and around the world. It puts families in this country in greater danger, and it puts our troops at greater risk. We need the Muslim communities throughout this country that are standing up against terrorism and against dangerous radical perversions of their faith. We rely on their cooperation to identify potential attackers before they attack.

Finally, we need to close the gaping hole in our laws that allow suspected terrorists who are on the FBI's terrorist watch list to walk into a store and buy a firearm. This issue is only controversial in this House and in Congress. Among our constituents, it is common sense. If you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to own a gun. Quite simply, no fly, no buy.

The time for silence is over. We in Congress have a sworn obligation to protect the people of the United States. Every day we fail to act is a failure to carry out our most basic duty.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1076, the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the House is in session solely for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate. Therefore, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I will stand here for the remainder of my time to protest the appalling silence of this House and its refusal to act in the face of this terrorist act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

REMEMBERING JERRY McCLOSKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, Laguna Niguel councilman and former mayor Jerry McCloskey passed away unexpectedly.

Jerry, a United States Navy veteran, continued his service to the military and his community through his volunteer work with Laguna Niguel Military Support Foundation and the American Legion Post 281. He was also involved in the local Rotary Club, Lions Club and Historical Society, and served as the president of the Orange County Watershed and Environmental Center.

I met Jerry when I ran for city council in 1996, and in all the years I knew Jerry, he truly exemplified what it means to serve. He will be sorely missed.

Jerry leaves behind his beloved wife Marilyn, his two daughters, and his four grandchildren. We join them in their mourning and hope that they can find comfort in knowing that his impact on the Orange County community will live on for decades to come.

HONORING JOCELYN DORSEY ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the great servants, a truly great servant in Atlanta broadcasting history. Her name is Jocelyn Dorsey. She has been working at WSB-TV in Atlanta for the last 40 years. She was the first regularly scheduled Black female anchor on Atlanta TV in the history of our great city. She is truly a pioneer. She was inducted into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame among her many accolades and recognitions in the industry.

Throughout her more than 40-year award-winning career, Jocelyn Dorsey has collected more hardware in terms of awards than I could possibly take 5 minutes to recite. It certainly would take us all day to recite the many awards that she has received, but my point is that in every professional recognition category that she has been considered under, she has won awards, and her recognition is duly noted by the professionals and her peers throughout the country.

She has been giving back to her community in ways that have been unseen. While she started her career out in front of the camera, she is ending her career behind the cameras. She has been behind the cameras promoting community awareness, community service, making the station itself, WSB, which is the top-ranked station in the Atlanta market, truly representative of the community and truly responsive to the community.

There are just so many things that have transpired as a result of her behind-the-scenes work that have helped so many individual Atlantans and not just Atlantans, people who are served by the Atlanta television market. She has truly left a great impact. We hate to see her go. She has been a true warrior for good and for fairness and inclusion as well.

I will leave with the words of someone who has worked closely with Jocelyn for more than 40 years. His name is Mark Winne, who is an award-winning investigative reporter in his own right.

> She has found her calling in life, the way to use the distinctive suite of gifts God has given her in a way that serves others, and at the same time she makes a living doing it. She lives and breathes the work, rolling up her sleeves, and sticking her arms all the way into the dirt to plant, harvest, and plant again year in, year out. She brings zest and joy to it. She digs new technology, and she uses it, but her keen people sense has enabled her to be such an effective steward of the considerable resources WSB-TV invests in the community. She is a personal heroine and role model, and I think she may have the best—and in some ways toughest—job in the Atlanta television market.

I will rest on those words of Mark Winne, and I will say to Jocelyn Dorsey: Work well done. I hope you enjoy your tremendous retirement. You are still a young woman. You have a lot to offer, but you deserve to have some fun. So have fun.

By the way, she is an avid motorcyclist, and she rode—or, actually, piloted her motorcycle all the way from Anchorage, Alaska, to, I think, Tampa, Florida, in a ride to raise money for various charitable events and causes.

So you will have a lot more time to ride now. When the group tells you, Hey, we are getting ready to go to Nevada, you won't have the excuse of having to go to work anymore. You will be able to jump on the bike and ride. So ride peacefully, ride strong, and we will see you soon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

RECOGNIZING DICK RAMSAY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of one of Monroe County's most respected and decent public servants. Richard ''Dick'' Ramsay, a former Marathon mayor and city councilman, small-business owner and airline pilot, passed away on June 2 at the age of 74.

A true visionary who worked tirelessly to better his community, Mayor Ramsay played a pivotal role in the incorporation of Marathon, Florida. He possessed a genuine passion for the Florida Keys, a passion that was reflected in his dedication to public service.

Dick's contributions to Marathon are both significant and extensive. He served three 2-year terms on the city council and expressed great interest in issues concerning the Florida Keys Marathon International Airport. One of his many successful projects was the newly installed U.S. Customs and Border Protection facility, which now allows international flights to clear customs in Marathon for the first time in decades.

Beloved by his family, his friends, and his community, Dick Ramsay will be dearly missed by all. I am honored to have been able to call him my friend. My thoughts and prayers go out to the Ramsay family and to the Florida Keys for the loss of such an active and caring member of the community.

RECOGNIZING ED KNIGHT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edward B. Knight of the Florida Keys. Ed, as he is known, is a true staple in our community. During his time in Key West, he and his wife opened one of the first U.S. Volkswagen dealerships, operated a successful real estate company, and served as an executive on several boards, including the Rotary Club of Key West and the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Knight also created an annual Rotary scholarship program to help students attend Florida Keys Community College.

Edward Knight is a leader, a businessman, and the definition of a philanthropist, so much so that Key West Mayor Craig Cates led a naming ceremony of the White Street Pier in Mr. Knight's honor on June 9.

I want to personally congratulate Ed Knight. Thank you for all you have done for the Florida Keys community throughout the years. Your service is deeply appreciated.

□ 1045

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

There are more than 5 million Americans in the United States who have been diagnosed with Alzheimer's. It is a devastating disease for patients and their families and is currently the sixth leading cause of death for individuals living in the United States.

This disease, unfortunately, cannot be prevented, cured, or slowed, but as lawmakers, we have the ability to support patients and their families. I have cosponsored the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, which would amend Medicare to cover comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care-planning services.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help move toward finding a cure for this awful disease.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today marks 100 years since the Boy Scouts of America received their Federal charter. This week also represents an important anniversary for my hometown council in Pennsylvania.

For three-quarters of a century, the Ockanickon Scout Reservation in Pipersville, Bucks County, has fulfilled the goals of its early founders and provided adventure and fun for scouts from States as far away as Arizona, Texas, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and hosted many scouts from across the globe. While the site is busy year-round, more than 3,000 young people arrive each summer, with more than 3,800 expected this year alone.

Ockanickon Scout Reservation's objectives are simple: character, citizen training, and personal fitness. But there is also a rich scouting history of meeting the spiritual, developmental, and social needs of young people and instilling lifetime values that will help them reach their full potential.

As a former camper and counselor myself, I want to offer my congratulations to Camp Ockanickon, the Washington Crossing Council, and Ajapeu Lodge on this anniversary marking 75 years. I hope there are many, many more years ahead of providing an outstanding experience to tomorrow's leaders.

STATESVILLE IS A GREAT PLACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the city of Statesville, North Carolina, which was recently named one of North Carolina's Great Places by the State's American Planning Association chapter.

The Great Places in North Carolina program honors the best planning efforts in the State. The selected cities are celebrated for their active main streets and serve as models for vision, partnerships, and collaboration.

Statesville is a dynamic town located in the foothills of North Carolina at the intersection of Interstates 77 and 40. Its vibrant main street is the intersection of Center and Broad Streets, which is known affectionately as ''The Square.''

The Square serves as the center of this charming community known for its beautiful buildings, historic homes, terrific quality of life, and incredibly friendly people. The 223-year-old city boasts a variety of retail, dining, and entertainment options, with art at every corner. It is an honor to represent Statesville in North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District.

HONORING THE ORLANDO SHOOTING VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming grief that America now feels warrants this body to continue to offer our sympathies and concern to those families now in the most dire of conditions; that is, those families whose loved ones are no more, who died on what was to be a joyous occasion, socializing, as we do as Americans, and those families who are hovering over sickbeds for those who are injured.

I rise this morning to again give them my sympathy and my respect. What the American people want to see from this body is action.

I rise as well to pay tribute to the LGBTQ community all over the Nation. In my hometown of Houston, Texas, over these last tragic days, we have come together with them and the Muslim community. The Muslim community is making a very strong stand that they stand with those fallen and killed, those who were part of the LGBTQ community. The Muslims were strong. They were Americans. They were prayerful. They were imams, and they were civilians.

We prayed. We heard from a Catholic deacon. We heard from a Christian Presbyterian minister in a press conference when we came together on Sunday in the midst of the unbelievable. We came together in Houston and advocated for unity and respect. We quoted scriptures that said to love one another.

We joined President Barack Obama in taking the moment not to politicize but to speak that we must come together. Calling names and defining what a radical religion is or not will not answer any question. It may make some feel good, but it will not answer for the basis of the violence of Mr. Mateen.

I do believe that the American people are mourning and giving our love and letting them know that they are not alone; they will not walk this place alone. I use that because I listened to that rendition by an Orlando choir as the names and faces of the 49 were shown on television. In the quietness of my office, the emotion was overwhelming.

So I think it is immoral. It is clearly a response to the depravity of this Nation if my colleagues cannot come together and do something this week. Ban the assault weapons. Join us in recognizing that this is not a violation of the Second Amendment. Pass the no fly, no buy bill. If you are on the terrorist watch list, why are you getting assault weapons?

Then H.R. 5470, introduced by my colleague, Congresswoman BROWN, the Representative of Orlando—where the tragedy and terrorist act occurred—and myself, gives added tools to the FBI that says that if you have had any encounter with Federal law enforcement, as you purchase a gun, you must make that known so that it can be a trigger; and if you do not respond, you still must have that reported to the FBI so that a thorough investigation can be had.

I don't believe that we can leave this week without answering the concerns of the American people. I make a plea to organizations that we know have consistently stood in blocking the door of sensible, responsible gun safety legislation, to go on their knees and pray for humility and guidance and to be able to seek some other place of responsibility than their own selfish interests.

Dead people cannot speak. Their families are overwhelmed with grief. The injured are filled with grief and are trying to recover.

This Congress must pass the no fly, no buy bill. It must pass a ban on assault weapons. It must enhance the various tactics that our law enforcement can have to stop a heinous terroristic and horrible killing—a massacre, a slaughter.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we will be in the band of the immoral if we do not do something today. To those who mourn in Houston, I wish I could be with you. I thank the mayor and all of those who will come together this evening. My spirit is with you. I love you.

JOSEPH MUSSOMELI ARTICLE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Mussomeli spent 35 years in the U.S. Foreign Service, including serving as our Ambassador to both Cambodia and Slovenia.

Ambassador Mussomeli wrote a column for The Washington Post, which, frankly, I am very surprised that the paper published in its June 10 edition. I would like to quote at length from this very important column.

Ambassador Mussomeli wrote as follows:

> Most of my former colleagues at the State Department will be appalled by the assertion, but much of the media-fed angst about Donald Trump's dearth of foreign policy expertise is contrived.
>
> Our cadre of neoconservative foreign policy experts, unhumbled after marching us into a reckless war in Iraq and a poorly conceived one in Afghanistan, who applauded as we bombed Libya and bitterly resent our having failed to bomb Syria, are frightened.
>
> Wisely, they often focus on comments that Trump has made on issues that are of less genuine interest to them. But what really troubles them is his generally level-headed and unmessianic attitude untoward foreign affairs. Trump has no desire to make the rest of the world in our image.
>
> The neocons bemoan Trump's rejection of a global role for the United States, but Trump has no intent to withdraw the United States from the world stage. He only rejects the wanton use of our young men and women on foreign adventures of questionable value.
>
> The neocons have two clear foreign policy objectives, and Trump may grant them neither. For many of them, their deepest yearning is an air campaign against Iran.
>
> Trump doesn't like the Iran nuclear agreement, but his instinct is to make a better deal rather than attacking, while Hillary Clinton has a strong record of supporting the prodigal misuse of military force.
>
> Clinton is just another neocon, though wrapped in sheep's clothing. But clothing makes a huge difference. Most Americans don't want the United States to be disrespected, and they want a muscular military that doesn't take any nonsense—but they also don't want military adventurism.
>
> Trump succeeds in having it both ways: he reassures that the United States will be respected and also that we will not employ our troops as cannon fodder on distant battlefields.
>
> Underneath all the tirades against illegal immigration and the need to be tough with our adversaries, there is an inward focus. There is a sense that America—in order to be great again—needs to relinquish its role as global cop and tend first to its needs at home.
>
> By sounding caustic, Trump is able to appear more militaristic and tougher than the far more reckless Clinton. Calculating and cavalier, Clinton would agree with her old pal, then-U.N. Ambassador Madeline Albright, ''What's the point of having this superb military . . . if we can't use it?'' The stern rebuke to that question later provided by General Colin Powell that the military is not a toy is lost on the neocons and Clinton. Among Clinton's weaknesses, her fear of appearing weak may be her most damning.
>
> The second neocon priority? A new cold war with Russia. Vladimir Putin, unlikable and increasingly uncooperative and antagonistic, admittedly makes this objective more within reach, but Trump might avoid it as well. Clinton repeats over and over that Russia only understands a tough and determined opponent, while Trump may have a more sophisticated and mature approach.
>
> Far less petulant than most of the former Republican candidates, Trump says he would

actually talk with Putin. That takes real courage, given the general view among Republican elites.

Contrast that with Clinton, who thinks we should not be talking too much to Putin and that we ought to further expand NATO because, in her view, Russia would be an even greater threat had it not been for NATO expansion. Of course, to admit that NATO expansion triggered the current crisis would be admitting that her husband is largely responsible for it.

Trump seems to understand George Kennan's warning that NATO expansion would directly lead to a more paranoid and aggressive Russia.

Trump, for all his bizarre commentary on domestic issues, better grasps the subtleties of global politics and the dangers of thinking ourselves infallible and invincible.

It is quite an irony: The ostensibly more reckless, infantile, inexperienced and bombastic candidate may actually be more mature, level-headed, and reasonable on foreign policy than his critics who, against all the good advice our parents gave us as children, pout and refuse to talk to those they don't like, escalate arguments to violence when they are upset, lack any remorse for the harm caused by their past opinions and actions, and fail repeatedly to see that there might be two sides to any disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I think these words of Ambassador Mussomeli should be considered very seriously by all of our Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of President.

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 a.m.), the House stood in recess.

The following proceedings were held before the House convened for morning-hour debate:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2016 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Martin Frost, Secretary of Former Members of Congress Association, at 8:30 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God of history, we thank You for this day when former Members return to Congress to continue in a less official manner their service to our Nation and to this noble institution.

May their presence here bring a moment of pause, where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died since last year's meeting. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning and forever know our gratitude for the sacrifices made in service to the House.

Finally, bless those gathered here, that they might bring joy and hope to the present age and supportive companionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your Holy Name now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARTIN FROST 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.

Mr. FROST. The Chair is happy at this point to recognize the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. First of all, welcome everybody. I see a lot of familiar faces, a lot of folks I served with, people I know who came here before I served.

I came here when I was 28, in 1998, and never thought I would be doing what I am doing. And it is just funny how this place can work its will.

I would say a couple of things.

I grew up with mentors. I lost my dad when I was young, so I went from mentor to mentor to mentor. When I came here to this job at a young age, I had a lot of mentors. Jack Kemp was my original mentor, who taught me about public service and politics and policy. A lot of you, like Jim, you served with Jack; you knew him well from the delegation and the rest.

But then when I came here, I had mentors. I don't know if McCrery is here or not. Jim is a part of the organization, I assume; right? So Jim McCrery.

Bill Thomas was a mentor of mine. Even though that is hard to imagine, he really was because he taught me to be scrutinous, how to really pay attention to detail.

I see Tim Petri is here. Tim Petri was a mentor. He taught me kindness. He taught me how to relate to people. He taught me how to be like a nice person and still be a nice person after years in Congress. I try.

But all I would say is it is great to have you home. So welcome home.

I look at you, and I see relaxed faces. I see the lines have kind of gone away. I see happy people. I see people in a great phase and stage of life. So know that when we see you, it gives us happiness and hope because we know that, in the mix of the day and all the tumult we go through around here, a lot of this is just a tempest in the teapot; a lot of this is just noise that doesn't take us off the horizon where we are all going to.

So I would say a couple of things. Thank you for being the mentors you have been, on behalf of the people you have been mentored to, number one. Number two, thank you for your passion and for keeping your dedication to the causes you believed in and the causes you came here to fight for.

I came young, idealistic, you know, thinking I kind of knew everything. And then as time got on, in the ninth term, I realized discernment, temperament, and just good judgment is what matters the most. And I realized that there is so much we have yet to learn from people who have walked the same path and have been in the same kind of shoes. And because you are here giving the rest of our Members—on our side of the aisle, 65 percent of our people are first- or second-termers. So we have so many new people for whom it is important that they learn from those who have been through this. It is important that you make new friendships with new people so that they can get a little discernment and get a little wisdom from your pearls that you can drop them. So thank you for being here and being involved in doing that. Please mentor some of our folks.

And the last point I would say is just thanks for showing that this life of public service continues on in a very graceful way, in a very relaxing way, in a way where you can really be in control of your own destiny in your own time. I mean, probably you look back at this and you remember time was my problem, time management, having time to do this, having time to do that. That is one of the big frustrations of the day to day around here. And just knowing that you can get back in control of your own time and your own life after these days of public service, that, to me, is very comforting. It is a very comforting thought.

So your presence helps our Members kind of get their keel, get their groove, get their sense of peace and calm so that they can focus on what is really important and not get distracted by the things that knock us off our game. So all I would say is welcome. It is great having you, and thanks for doing what you do. I appreciate it.

Mr. FROST. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, we all wish you well in the months ahead.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I am glad I got here to hear the Speaker talk a little bit. And I am so glad that you guys have brought calm and consideration to us junior Members. I happen to be one of the old junior Members, as all of you know—I am older than some of you—but I am still here.

Mr. FROST. We wish you a happy birthday.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you so much.

I always loved so many of you with whom I had the opportunity to serve.

I remember a time many years ago when I got into the Members' elevator on floor seven, which my office is on floor seven in the Longworth. I have got an office here, too, obviously, as you know. But anyway, this young kid gets on, tall, dark, nice-looking kid got on, and I sort of looked at him and wondered who he was. He thought I was looking at him as if he shouldn't be on

the elevator, which I, by the way, think is a pretty kind of arrogant thing to have. This is a Members' elevator.

In any event, I said, ''Hi.'' He said, ''I am PAUL RYAN. I am a Member.'' And he has since been calling me ''old man'' for a number of years now, which I highly resent, which I don't think is very bipartisan and not good camaraderie. But in any event, he does it anyway.

All of you have seen the House for a long period of time. I came in 1981. Some of you came before, and I have been here since. I remember Jim and I serving together on the Appropriations Committee, others of you—Jo Bonner. Bev Byron I have known since—there was just censorship there. She said, ''All right. That is enough.''

She is like NANCY. I start telling stories about NANCY, and NANCY says, ''Nope. Nope. That is not when it happened. It happened 20 years later than you are saying it happened.''

But in any event, it is lamentable what has happened to the House. You know, we can have a lot of happy talk, and we can talk about all this. It is lamentable—it is manifest, frankly, in our Presidential campaign—and our country deserves better.

ELIJAH CUMMINGS, our colleague, whom many of you know, he says, ''We are better than that.'' And we are better than that.

I remember serving with so many of you for such a long period of time where, yes, there was an aisle, but there was much greater diversity of sentiment in terms of working together than exists today—in part, because a lot of Members are new. We have had great turnover.

Remember, we talked about term limits. You have got to have turnover. There has been extraordinary turnover. Has it been helpful? I am not so sure. I am not so sure because Members come, and before they get to know people as individuals, as opposed to just Republicans or R's on this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle, they want to confront.

Now the longer you get to know people—you know, Chris Shays. Sure, he was a Republican, I am a Democrat, but we had an opportunity to sit down and talk. And Jim and Chris are sitting next to one another now. You know, they are friends. We are all friends.

I mentioned Jo's name. But a lot of Republicans that I have been very close to—as many of you know, ROY BLUNT is one of my best friends, and he was the minority whip and then the minority leader for a while, and we worked very closely together.

You know what I tell my staff? I say, when they leave—all to make more money than I am making, for the most part, or that you made when you were here. I say, ''I let my staff go off the payroll, but not off the staff.''

You are off the payroll. But I hope none of you—and obviously your presence here in this Chamber reflects that you think you are off. And that is what PAUL was talking about. PAUL was talking about those of you who have served.

Connie and I—and Connie and I were on different sides of the aisle in our State; but Connie and I have been good friends, with great respect for one another. And I know that Bev and Connie are good friends. They represented sort of the same part of our State, the western part of our State.

We have lost that. And, frankly, I want to tell my Republican former colleagues that your side of the aisle now is having great difficulty working together with one another—forget about the other side of the aisle—and that is why John Boehner wasn't speaking to you today. John Boehner ultimately said, look, if you don't want to work with me, I am out of here. Not to us. John and I worked very closely together. We had a great relationship.

And I think a lot of PAUL RYAN, but he has got a lot of Members who think that they are not part of a team but they are part of a different group that is outside, that wants to confront. I don't want to be too negative here, but we would be silly and we would be Pollyannaish if we didn't look at this and say this is a problem for our country and we need to resolve it.

We need to let our citizens know that, yes, each of us has ideas in our own districts, but we come here in a body of 435 people. It wasn't that large when our Founding Fathers constructed it, but they constructed it so that it would be a crucible to which we could bring all the differences and different perspectives and different interests that we have in the country and try to bring them together, sort of grind them up so they would come out as a positive substance together.

Barb is shaking her head. Barbara and I came in special elections, and we came just sort of back-to-back in special elections. Bev was already here. Some of you were already here when I got here. We were able to work together.

I tell people, you know, even in the Gingrich years, when it was perceived to be really—you know, Gingrich came in on fire, and he worked us about 9,000 hours a week. My Republican friends were coming over here and saying, ''He is going to kill us.'' I mean, we were working around the clock, some of you who were here. But the fact is there was a large number of people who were in the body at that point in time who were used to working together.

Of course those of us who served on the Appropriations Committee, on the Appropriations Committee, it was pretty easy to make a deal. You know, if you have got $100 and you are in the majority, you get $60, the minority gets $40. There is not a philosophical issue here. It is easy just to divide it up. On the authorizing committees, it is a little tougher. But, frankly, all the committees now, as you have seen, have become sort of partisan confrontations—not good for the country, not good for the Members.

By the way, the working conditions of Members has been sorely tested. And I will tell you—and I tell my Republican friends, if I were the Speaker or the leader, I would work very hard to get earmarks back, make sure that Members get COLAs so they don't have to be living in their offices, and make sure that we go back to the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. Not only have Members not gotten COLAs for 7 years, but they are paying $4,000, on average, more for their health insurance, because GRASSLEY thought it would be a fun thing to do to say, okay, you want the Affordable Care Act, all of you guys are going to have to be in, in effect, the D.C. small market.

So, Members, when you see Members, they are getting $4,000 or $5,000 less in take-home pay because the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program is no longer available to them. We are not serving Members well or this institution well.

My view, as a leader, was to try to protect Members from themselves. I am serious. You know, if a leader can't take the heat and say, look, this is what we are going to do for Members who cannot take the heat because they will be demagogued by taking a 1.5 percent COLA—what a lot of baloney that is. We don't have the press here, but I say this publicly.

Members are feeling put upon—I don't mean some of the ideologues who think it is great to beat their chest and wear a sack cloth and black ash all over them. But we need you to speak up on that because you can speak up on that, and you can say, if you don't have respect for your Members, you are not going to have respect for your institution.

I forget which Member said—we were talking about pay at one point in time. He said, ''Well, pay then was probably, you know, maybe $120,000 or something.'' And I said, ''Well, you may not think I am worth it, but the job is worth it. And elect somebody you think is worth the job.''

I think former Members can do a great deal, given your perspective, given your experience, and given the fact that it no longer has political consequences for you, that you can speak up to make the institution stronger by respecting our Members and making it affordable for all but the rich to serve here.

So I thank you for staying in touch, for staying on the staff—not on the payroll, but staying on the staff—and for making sure that the public understands what a great institution this is.

And I tell people the Congress of the United States, right now, in my view, is less than the sum of its parts. And I tell people there are great Members on both sides of the aisle, but together we are not, as a board of directors for the greatest country on the face of the Earth, doing what we need to do for our country and for our people.

Thank you for staying involved. Thank you for raising up the message of what a great institution this is and how critically important it is to have respect for our institutions if our democracy is going to be all that we want it to be.

God bless you. Thank you very much.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

The Chair now calls upon the Honorable Jim Walsh, vice president of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, to present the Association's annual report to Congress.

Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Chair and ask the Clerk to call the roll of former Members.

Mr. Altmire of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Blanchard of Michigan.
Mr. Bonner of Alabama.
Ms. Byron of Maryland.
Mr. Carr of Michigan.
Mr. Edwards of Texas.
Mr. Ferguson of New Jersey.
Mr. Frost of Texas.
Mr. Gordon of Tennessee.
Mr. Gingrey of Georgia.
Mr. Hertel of Michigan.
Mr. Horsford of Nevada.
Mr. Hughes of New Jersey.
Ms. Kennelly of Connecticut.
Mr. Konnyu of California.
Mr. Kramer of Colorado.
Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina.
Mr. Lungren of California.
Mr. McIntyre of North Carolina.
Mr. Mezvinsky of Iowa.
Mr. Moran of Virginia.
Ms. Morella of Maryland.
Mr. Petri of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rahall of West Virginia.
Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut.
Mr. Shays of Connecticut.
Mr. Slattery of Kansas.
Mr. Stearns of Florida.
Mr. Tanner of Tennessee.
Mr. Walsh of New York.

Mr. FROST. The Chair announces that 30 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you all for coming here and being with us this morning. It is always a great privilege to be back in this Chamber and to reconnect with so many friends and colleagues, and there are many here.

I am honored to represent the Association today in my capacity as vice president of the organization. I am a nonascending vice president. I ask that I not be considered as president, and I am delighted that Cliff Stearns will be the new president. So I suspect this will be my last opportunity to speak from the well, other than perhaps with a tour of family and friends and so forth.

My dad served here before I did, so it is a great, great pleasure to make this presentation with you this morning, to have the associations that I have had with you all over the years. It is a huge and distinct honor to serve in this place. You all have experienced that. Very few people do. You all know the purpose of this place and the importance of this place, and we, every day, even as retired Members, represent those values.

So I have had the great pleasure of serving with Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut. I am very proud of the many impactful things that we have been able to accomplish through the Association this year.

We have many, many programs. And over the next 20 minutes or so, Barbara and I will report on our work. Unlike other years, we are a bit pressed for time, so Barbara and I will submit for the RECORD a more in-depth report covering our activities since the 2015 annual meeting. I encourage you to go online in a day or two and take a look at the additional information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because we really are delighted with how much our Association accomplishes, both domestically and abroad.

Our Association is bipartisan. It was founded in 1970 and chartered by the Congress in 1983. The purpose of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, abroad and in the United States. About 600 former Senators and Representatives belong to the Association. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are united in this organization's desire to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy.

We are proud to have been chartered by Congress, and we are proud to receive no funding from Congress. All the activities which we are about to describe are financed via membership dues—thank you—program-specific grants and sponsors, or via our major fundraising dinner, which many of you have helped with, and we would welcome even more.

Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, our most recent audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running our Association in a fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

It has been another successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have developed new projects and are expanding others. And we again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to teach about public service and representative democracy at universities and high schools, both in the United States and abroad.

Our most important domestic undertaking is teaching America's next generation about their government and their responsibility of citizenship. We do so via our Congress to Campus program. And I would like to thank Larry LaRocco of Idaho and Jack Buechner of Missouri, who co-chair the Congress to Campus program, for the terrific job that they are doing with this program.

The Congress to Campus program sends bipartisan teams of former Members to colleges and universities across the country and around the world. The program engages our Members from all over the country, to educate the next generation of leaders about the institution of Congress, the duties and responsibilities of being a Member of Congress, and, most importantly, the value of public service. And since our visits always involve a bipartisan team, they demonstrate that civil discourse can be—and should be—respectful and dynamic, all while remaining courteous.

The former Members volunteer their time leading classes, meeting with student leaders and campus organizations, speaking to campus media, sharing meals with students and faculty, joining in student government meetings and holding community forums and interacting with local citizens.

The schools are encouraged to offer the program to the entire campus community, and even to reach out into the community at large, to show how decisions in Congress affect their areas of study, and their everyday lives. The former Members also ask the students to look at the importance of public service and to consider whether they would like to engage in public service.

We are delighted to report that this year we have added some new schools to our roster as well as having returned to visit some of our favorites. During the 2015–2016 academic year, the Congress to Campus program visited over 22 schools, including Palm Beach State, Missouri Western University, Boise State University, Waubonsee Community College, both the U.S. Naval Academy and West Point, and, I am proud to say, my alma mater, St. Bonaventure University, where I was joined by Richard Stallings of Idaho. It was fun. That is just to name a few of the colleges. More than 40 former Members participated during the academic year, including a few who had never participated in the Congress to Campus program before, but have vowed to participate more in the future. Most of the former Members wonder who gets more out of the visits, they or the students.

I hope the Members in attendance this morning will consider volunteering and inviting a friend from across the aisle to join them on a visit. If your time is limited, you can still help the program, for example, by connecting us with your alma mater or a school located in your old congressional district.

We are thrilled that we continue our outstanding partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service in the administration of the program, and we are grateful particularly to its associate director, Brother Rogers. The Stennis Center has been a great partner in bringing the program to schools all around the country.

Internationally, the Congress to Campus program was again able to send two delegates to the U.K. for a week-long visit where the former Members met with hundreds of British students and also participated in town

hall meetings open to the public. It has been reported that this is one of the highlights of their semester, and we want to thank Philip Davies with the British Library in London for all he does to make the U.K. program so successful.

Also thanks to David Skaggs, our colleague from Colorado, who was able to arrange for a Congress to Campus visit to Oman, Jordan. I understand it was a fascinating experience. We hope to arrange for more international Congress to Campus visits. We find that students around the world are deeply interested in the U.S. Government and the political system. Who better to explain how Congress truly works than former Members. The students of the host countries are extremely inquisitive and immensely appreciative of the visit. We hope to have more international Congress to Campus visits on the roster in the future.

Sadly, after years of partnering with the People to People program, the organization is no longer in existence. However, Former Members of Congress has expanded its partnership with Envision, which brings hundreds of middle school students from around the country to our Nation's capital to learn about leadership and the American government. We have 12 days this summer for a bipartisan pair of former Members to speak to hundreds of middle school students. In fact, Jason Altmire from Pennsylvania and Ann Marie Buerkle from my old district of upstate New York addressed a group of students this morning here in the House Chamber. Thank you to all of the Members who have been available to the students, and if there are any former Members here now willing to talk with these young people this summer, please tell our staff.

We also partnered with the Ford's Theatre and their oratory programs, by being an example of how public speaking is critical to influencing people and getting across a point of view. We have recently begun to work with the D.C. Public Schools system to bring former Members into the D.C. high school U.S. Government classes.

An informed and engaged citizenry helps our democracy prosper. As former Members, I hope that you will consider becoming involved in this program and all of the programs that FMC has to offer to inspire and educate America's young people and future leaders.

Since our last annual meeting and our last report to Congress, we have added a number of projects to expand our outreach in civic education. One is a series of webinars which brought a condensed version of Congress to Campus to community colleges across the country. Bipartisan teams of former Members were assembled here in Washington and spent 2 hours via Internet connecting with a number of community colleges.

The schools brought the former Members team either into a specific class or had a large group of students meet as an extracurricular activity. After making some opening remarks focused on a specific topic, for example our environmental policy, the students were given the opportunity to question our former Members via email.

While this certainly cannot replace the value of a person-to-person visit, it is a cost-effective and abbreviated way of bringing Congress to Campus to audiences we would not normally reach.

At our last annual meeting, we began an effort to engage former Members across the Nation in an effort to restore civics to our Nation's public school curriculum. Working with the University of Central Florida, where the Lou Frey Institute is housed, as well as with the Civic Mission of Schools, we positioned the Association to become an umbrella group connecting former Members across the country with like-minded NGOs in their States. Through us, former Members in any State can team up with a statewide effort to incorporate basic civics back into the State's public school system. Who better than former Members, who have public service and civic responsibility in their DNA, to become an advocate at the State level for increased civic understanding.

Our Common Ground work also continued to bring bipartisan groups of former Members together with the public for a constructive and productive dialogue on the issues that affect all of us. We achieve this mostly via a wonderful partnership with the National Archives. And we thank the Archivist of the United States, David Ferriero, for his many years of supporting our public outreach in this manner. Those are great programs.

Since our last report to Congress, we assembled former Member panels on the topics of The Partisan Divide, based on the book of same title written by our chair, Martin Frost, and also Tom Davis. There was a program on D.C. Statehood and Representative Democracy, a panel on which I participated. I was chair of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee when we set up the Financial Control Board, and all of the emotions came back. It was pretty cool. I was joined by former D.C. Mayor Tony Williams and D.C. Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. There were panels Caring for Our Veterans, a panel that included Purple Heart recipient Charles Eggleston; also Money and Politics, in partnership with a great organization called Issue One; and a conversation about Congress with former Members Lee Hamilton and Ray LaHood. It was a wonderful evening.

Again, this is one of our most impactful ways to connect with the public, and all of our programs are carried live—if not by C–SPAN then on the YouTube channel of the National Archives.

Next I will cover our charitable golf tournament. Another great example of how powerful and productive bipartisanship can be is our Annual Congressional Golf Tournament. It is chaired by our past president, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, and by fellow board member Ken Kramer of Colorado. We benefit two great charities, Disabled Sports USA's Warfighter Sports and Tee It Up for the Troops.

The mission of Warfighter Sports is simple: to provide adaptive sports to severely wounded warriors free of cost. The organization was founded by Vietnam War veterans in 1967 and now offers 30 sports as part of its rehabilitative programs. In 2015 alone, over 1,500 wounded warriors received support. Their experience includes a family member, so that in addition to improving the warrior's self-confidence and independence, the program also helps unite families through shared healthy activities. I encourage you to find out more about this outstanding organization at www.disabledsportsusa.org.

Please also get to know Tee It Up for the Troops. Tee It Up believes in engaging and inspiring communities across the United States to do great things on behalf of the military men and women who have served and sacrificed so much for our freedoms. Tee It Up for the Troops targets its efforts across the most pressing areas of need, with priority emphasis in supporting PTS research and treatment, suicide prevention, employment, rehabilitation, and athletics equipment and services. You can find them at www.teeitupforthetroops.org.

The Members Charity Golf Classic was held in April this year, which turned out to be a great decision. We had fabulous weather, the course at Army and Navy Club was outstanding, and we had one of the best turnout of sponsors and players in many years. There were 25 current and former Member players and over 30 wounded veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq.

This tournament gets better and better every year. Nine years ago we converted the event from a highly competitive tournament with just former and current Members of Congress to a fun and meaningful and inspiring charity event. It is still a great day of golf on a great course, and the tournament continues to have a friendly competition with the Speaker's Cup. This year, I am proud to say, this side of the aisle won that trophy. Actually, I believe JIMMY DUNCAN from Tennessee, one of the honorary co-chairs of the tournament, was here a few weeks ago making note of the Republican win. Congressman GENE GREEN, our good friend from Texas, the Democrat honorary co-chair, assures us that he will be back and the Democrats will bring home the trophy next year.

Over the past 9 years, we have raised nearly three-quarters of a million dollars for our beneficiaries. One of our beneficiaries has been with us since the very beginning, Warfighters Sports, a program of Disabled Sports USA, and this was our third year with a second beneficiary, Tee It Up for the Troops. Both of these organizations use golf to help severely wounded veterans. At the tournament this year, several wounded

warriors spoke to the group and explained how warfighters are competitive at their core, and using sports profoundly helps them with their readjustment to civilian life.

I want to thank our tournament cochairs Ken Kramer and Dennis Hertel and everyone at the Association for all they have done to make this tournament such a great success. I would also like to thank all of our sponsors for their generous contributions. We look forward to continuing to raise money and awareness, and having a little bipartisan fun with the tournament again next year. We hope all current and former Members will consider joining us.

And we should also thank our great corporate partners who make the event such a success and help us support this highly deserving constituency. They include Lockheed Martin, AIG, PING, Trijicon, Oshkosh Defense, Anthem, Robert Trent Jones Charitable Golf Foundation, Ernst and Young, Willis Group Holding, Ariel Corporation, The Club Foundation, AVI Systems, International Council of Shopping Centers, Geoffrey Feldesman, Master Electric, B–3 Solutions, Trinity Logistics, Northrup Grumman, BMW of Fairfax, Hanger and the Congressional Federal Credit Union. Our sincere thanks to all of them for making such an impactful contribution to a very worthy cause.

Let me add one more veterans-oriented group which our Association supports and which you should take a closer look at: Veterans Campaign. Veterans Campaign's goal is to demystify the process of running for public office, and make it accessible to veterans who are interested in continuing their service as elected officials. The organization encourages, mentors, and prepares veterans for a second service in civic leadership. Veterans Campaign works with potential candidates from both parties, as well as independents. In addition to love for country, leadership, and commitment to service, veterans are united by a common bond that has historically encouraged bipartisanship, cooperation, and better government. We strive to connect former Members from both sides of the aisle with veterans interested in running for office, regardless of party affiliation. Our former Members serve as mentors and sounding boards to these outstanding men and women. We are pleased that there exists an organization aimed at recruiting highly qualified candidates for elected office, and we hope you will consider getting involved in this effort. Please check out their website at www.veteranscampaign.org.

In addition to the National Archives panels which we already reported on earlier, our Association continues to identify opportunities to highlight in a bipartisan way the many important contributions our Members have made to our representative democracy and the lessons learned from present day politics. An example of this type of outreach is a full-day conference we organized focused on the accomplishments of the 94th Congress, the group of legislators elected following Watergate.

In September, former Members partnered with the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences at the University of Maryland to present a symposium at the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center. The event commemorated the 40th anniversary of the 94th Congress by highlighting and exploring its record and the political change it helped to initiate. Reforms adopted by both the 94th Congress and the 104th Congress under GOP control were contrasted with the current management and operation of today's 114th Congress. With the 2016 elections looming and the challenges to govern facing the Republican-controlled Congress, the symposium was of great currency and of great relevance.

While a number of former Members from that class were involved in putting this effort together, we should acknowledge again that David Skaggs and Bob Carr, two of our active Members, along with our CEO Pete Weichlein were the driving force behind this effort, which gives me an opportunity to thank Peter and all of our staff for the marvelous, marvelous work they do to prepare us for these events.

Opening remarks were given by FMC President, Barbara Kennelly (D–CT) followed by FMC Board Members and event organizers David Skaggs (D–CO) and Bob Carr (D–MI). FMC Board Member Ron Sarasin (R–CT) served as the moderator to the Congressional Reform and the Republican Resurgence panel. Former Members Dave Obey (D–WI) and Mickey Edwards (R–OK) were integral panelists during the afternoon discussions on Congressional Reform in the 1970s and Congressional Reform and Republican Resurgence. FMC was delighted to be working with UMD and the members of the Steering Committee to help make this event a huge success.

This wonderful conference was made possible by grants from three outstanding foundations, which we wish to recognize and acknowledge: The Williams and Flora Hewlett Foundation; the Rockefeller Brothers Fund; and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Links to the videos of the presentations and photographs can be found through the FMC website at www.usafmc.org.

Having thus far reported on our domestic programs, I would like to yield at this time to our Association's distinguished president, Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut, to report on our international work. She has been a tireless president. I have greatly enjoyed working with her and learning from her and laughing with her and sometimes whining with her about all of the work that this organization performs. It has been a great experience. I would like to add that I enjoyed the experience every minute. She was an outstanding president for our organization who has really put her personal stamp on the terrific work that we do.

Barbara, thank you for your leadership, and I yield the floor.

Mr. FROST. Ms. Kennelly is recognized.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Jim, for those kind words. I really enjoyed working with you also. These past 2 years have been incredibly busy. You heard Jim's report. Now get ready, I am going to take more than 1 minute, to be sure. We have done so much.

Each year when Connie was president and following, it is magnificent work how much work this staff is able to accomplish, and include the Members who want to be active. Tell your friends how much they can get out of this Association and how we have grown. We are really becoming part of the scene here.

Listening to STENY, aren't we lucky. We are totally nonpartisan. We all get along. If that can happen, it can happen to them, too.

As Jim has already demonstrated when reporting on our domestic undertakings, we are just as busy and impactful in the larger world. This is certainly true in our international work.

In addition to the domestic programs Jim has just described, our Association has a very active and far-reaching international focus.

We conduct programs focused on Europe and Asia. We bring current Members of Congress together with their peers in legislatures overseas. Just last week, a group came back from China. Some of you are sitting right here. I understand it was a marvelous trip and you were exhausted, but that is the way it should be.

We partner with former parliamentarians from other countries for democracy strengthening missions. Two of our most valued partners over the years have been the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians and the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament.

Right now, we have a former head of the European group, Enrique Baron Crespo, and he has come all of the way from Brussels. I met him in Brussels about a month ago and told him that he had to be with us because I enjoyed the visit in Brussels with him so much. It was shortly after the bombing, and it was an absolute wonderful thing to see the parliament functioning and seeing everything being absolutely calm. I thank you for being such a wonderful host.

In Brussels, I participated in the annual general meeting of the former members of the European Parliament. And just a few weeks ago, my colleague Martin Frost joined the Canadian former Members for their annual meeting in Ottawa. We are expecting representation from the group, but their plane was held up and I guess they haven't gotten here yet. We will welcome them later.

Via the Association of Former Members, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies who have come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form

of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets, and I have learned as much, if not more, from our visitors as they do from me. Just last month our Association hosted at our offices a large group of young professionals from ASEAN countries including Vietnam and Indonesia. We had a great dialogue about running for office and serving our constituency. I would also like to thank Bev Byron because when we have some of these wonderful folk coming in from other countries, she has been very generous in entertaining them in her home and it has been a delight.

Our Association has also had a longstanding partnership with a great NGO called Legacy International—bringing young professionals from the Middle East and North Africa to the United States. Our most recent group just completed their 6-week D.C. stay last month and was composed of young professionals from Morocco and Tunisia. An earlier group also included young professionals from Egypt.

Our program promotes a positive relationship between the United States and North Africa, which, in light of the Arab Spring is now more vital than ever. Our Association connects the Fellows with former Members, whom they meet with several times over the course of their stay. The former Members act as a kind of mentor to these young men and women through one-on-one meetings, roundtable discussions, and by attending Program discussions and events.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and North Africa. I am very proud that our association can be part of this very interesting and vital dialogue.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our Association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas and engage overseas audiences—students, government officials, NGOs, and corporate representatives—in a dialogue about the many challenges that are global in nature and require across-border communication.

You have already heard about our Congress to Campus program, and it has a very active international component in that we have brought the program to numerous universities and countries such as Turkey and the U.K.

Also, earlier this year we brought a bipartisan team of former Members to Germany for a number of town hall meetings in Munich and Berlin to talk about the United States election. It was no surprise that many discussions this year veered toward the upcoming Presidential election and the two presumptive candidates. Even in Europe, it is a lead topic of conversation, as you can well imagine.

Two foundations in Germany invited a bipartisan pair of former Members to provide some insight into what they thought about the elections, the candidates and how it may or may not impact the US-Germany relationship and the US-Europe relationship. Speaking to audiences in both Berlin and in Munich this spring Mary Bono of California and Carol Moseley Braun of Illinois participated in two journalist moderated town-hall style discussions, fielding questions from business leaders, student and political junkies. The former Members were asked to address a number of central issues that appeared controversial during the presidential debates. The discussions included the TTIP agreement, the role of Putin, education reforms, growing populism on both sides of the Atlantic and the status of western democracies in general. The audience was also able to take part during the course of the debate, by vote on central issues by iPods, with the resulted revealed at the end of the discussion.

We thank the BMW Foundation and the Alfred Herrhausen Foundation for their partnership and sponsorship of this excellent program.

Other overseas delegations, we called them ExDELs, have traveled to countries where dialogue is often difficult, but nonetheless incredibly important. A country on which we have focused quite extensively is China. In the past 5 years, we have sent nine delegations of former Members to China. The most recent one just returned last week, and included your colleagues Cliff Stearns, Tim Petri, Mike Ross, Jim McCrery, and Tim Roemer, as well as our Association's CEO Pete Weichlein. They traveled to Beijing, Chongqing, and Shanghai, and had meetings with the National People's Congress, the Foreign Ministry, as well as corporate and academic representatives, and engaged in dialogue focused on issues ranging from environmental policy to the South China Sea. I can see why they were somewhat tired when they got home.

The ExDELs are an excellent example of how former Members can play a pivotal role in establishing a dialogue where current Members might be a bit more curtailed in their outreach.

Since starting our China outreach, we have been able to send 9 delegations totaling almost 40 former Members of Congress. These ExDELs depend on strong partners in China, and we are extremely fortunate to work with two of the most respected and influential NGOs in China: The China Association for International Friendly Contact, and the China United States Exchange Foundation. In addition, we have partnered with the Committee of 100 to bring a more productive and impactful focus on China to Capitol Hill. Thanks to these three outstanding partners, our China program now involves current and former Members of Congress as well as senior staff in both the House and the Senate.

In addition to these former Member international programs, our Association supports Congress' international dialogue in a meaningful, productive and bipartisan way via our Congressional study groups. These are groups that I am really most proud of because sometimes—years ago—when we became members of the Association of Former Members, we really didn't know what we were getting into or what it was. Now we have these study groups, and they are incredibly successful. They are incredibly successful. We have luncheons and we have get-togethers, and that means that present Members of Congress are familiar with our organization and are ready to join us. As you can see as we read these many programs that we have, we need more active Members. We are so appreciative of you coming this morning at 7:30, but we do need more active members, and I think this is going to do it by having present Members be active in the Association before they leave Congress.

"The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey and Europe are the flagship international programs of FMC. The Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff that strive to create better understanding and cooperation between the United States and our most important strategic and economic partners abroad.

The Congressional study groups are not the only programs dedicated to this mission, but they are unique in their year-round outreach to Capitol Hill. Unlike our other formats, we provide long-lasting staff support and maintain a well-respected reputation as independent and nonadvocacy. As a result, our network attracts a large, diverse group of legislators and policymakers who are committed to international dialogue. What is most important for us is that they join the discussion.

Our model celebrates active discussion among all participants, avoiding lengthy speeches or formal presentations in order to create an atmosphere that promotes personal connections. We believe that the network of peers created via our programs have acted to renew and expand areas of mutual cooperation.

Each Study Group has a membership roster of between 75 and 125 Members of Congress and is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of co-chairs. Our co-chairs are true leaders, who not only serve in their role at official Study Group events, but are also called on by various embassies and outside organizations to speak on panels, attend roundtables, and meet with countless visiting delegations.

I would like to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs:

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is led by Senator JEFF SESSIONS, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TED DEUTCH.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is led by Senator MAZIE K. HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, and Representative BILLY LONG.

The work of The Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially focused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of four dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming. Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogue is a valued addition to The Congressional Study Groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our four core Study Groups.

In the past year, we have also formed the Congressional Staff Advisory Council. As former Members of Congress, we know the value of good staff. The Staff Advisory Council formally recognizes the mutually beneficial relationships we have in offices across Capitol Hill. We are as grateful for the staff who participate in and support our programming as we are for the Members of Congress.

Finally, I would like to thank the institutions, foundations, and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair and Ms. Junko Chano of Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA and Dr. Karen Donfried and Ms. Reta Jo Lewis of the German Marshall Fund for their support as our institutional funders of The Congressional Study Groups in 2016.

The Congressional Study Groups are also grateful for the support of the international business community here in Washington, D.C., represented by each Study Group's Business Advisory Council. Companies of the 2016 Business Advisory Council are: Allianz, All Nippon Airways, Airbus Group, American Honda Motor Co., BASF, Bank of Tokyo—Mitsubishi UFJ, B. Braun Medical, Central Japan Railway Company, Cheniere Energy, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL, Fresenius, Hitachi, Honda, Lockheed Martin, Lufthansa German Airlines, Marubeni America Corporation, Mitsubishi Corporation (Americas), Mitsubishi Heavy Industries America, Mitsui, Representative of German Industry and Trade, Sojitz, Toyota Motor North America, United Parcel Service, and Volkswagen Group of America.

Because of this support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad.

As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by The Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues still in office and are proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach.

In addition to these substantive and issue-specific international projects, our Association also offers its members the opportunity to participate in group travel where our staff puts together the logistics and participating Members assume all the costs. These trips are unique because they combine a tourist experience with more formal meetings that involve current and former government officials in the country we are visiting.

For the 2015 FMC Study Tour, over 25 former Members traveled to Cuba, on two separate trips. Both trips proved to be incredibly insightful at this interesting time in the history of U.S.-Cuban relations. After fifty years of limited travel to the country, the recent changes in our diplomatic relations make it one of the most intriguing destinations for Americans at this time.

The proud people of this culturally rich country were welcoming to the delegations. The former Members met with experts on the U.S.-Cuban relationship, Cuban government officials helping to define the new bilateral relationship, and government officials dealing with trade and the promotion of new businesses. We met with Cuban professors focused on Cuba's economy, Members of the Cuban National Assembly, internationally acclaimed Cuban artists, students and average citizens of Cuba. The group also had the privilege of meeting with Ambassador Jeffrey DeLaurentis (Charge d'Affaires at the U.S. Embassy in Cuba). The contingent heard frank opinions regarding the burden the embargo has had on the citizens of Cuba and many of their international relationships.

Many Cuban citizens welcome a more extensive relationship with America. However, concerns about the endurance of Cuban cultural identity have grown in light of increasing American presence. There is clearly apprehension and suspicion directed toward the motives of the United States.

Though Fidel Castro is still much respected and admired, there was a clear feeling that Raul Castro—or rather the current political state—as softened the hard edges of communist living and blurred the bold line defining the U.S.-Cuba bilateral relationship. The Cubans remain very proud of their government's ability to provide free healthcare, free education, and support for the arts. That being said, the study groups noted a substantial positive effect that private businesses, such as the paladores (privately owned restaurants), had on the Cuban community.

We visited artists' studios, art museums and went to iconic music and dance shows, enhancing the rich cultural experience. Though many of the buildings in Havana were shadows of their past beauty, one could see in the restored Old Havana how it was once one of the most cosmopolitan cities of the Caribbean, and very well could be again.

We all came home from the visit with a new appreciation and understanding of the country. Changes are happening which will take a lot of work and may take a long time. In fact, later today we will be hosting a panel discussion on Cuba that will include some of those who traveled there.

By traveling at this time and meeting the U.S. Ambassador, members of the Cuban government, esteemed professors and citizens of Cuba, the former Members were able to still see how Cuba has existed for the past fifty years while getting a glimpse of the dynamic and promising future of this island nation.

All the programs you have heard about clearly require funding, and we have been very successful in growing our fundraising capabilities along with our programming. The most impactful single fundraising mechanism we have created is the Annual Statesmanship Awards Dinner.

We held our 19th Annual Statesmanship Awards Dinner on April 14 of this year at the historic Mellon Auditorium on Constitution Avenue in Washington, D.C. This year's theme was Recognizing Those Who Support Our Nation's Heroes. The dinner paid tribute to individuals and programs that have made it their mission to support the nation's active duty troops, veterans, and military families.

The Statesmanship Awards Dinner has become a ''must attend'' event in Washington, and this year was no exception. There were over 400 VIP guests, including former and current Members of Congress, Ambassadors, wounded warriors, military service members from the U.S., France and Japan, and heads of industry.

FMC was honored to give the Statesmanship Award to Senator Max Cleland of Georgia, who has been a distinguished public servant for nearly 50 years. Senator Cleland served his country in uniform and returned from Vietnam a highly decorated and severely wounded veteran. His commitment to our troops continued during his time in elected offices in the state of Georgia and in the United States Senate, and while heading the Veterans Administration. Currently, he preserves the memory of American troops who have fallen overseas by leading the efforts of the American Battle Monuments Commission. Fellow Georgian, Representative JOHN LEWIS, presented the award to Senator Cleland.

In recognition of its company-wide commitment to facilitate the transition of active duty personnel and veterans into the labor force, FMC was proud to present Audi of America, Inc. with the Corporate Statesmanship Award. Audi's highly successful ''Veterans to Technicians'' program trains former military personnel to become service technicians, service consultants, shop foremen and parts specialists in dealerships across the country. Scott Keogh, president of Audi of America, accepted the award on behalf of Audi.

The Navy SEAL Foundation, whose mission is to provide immediate and ongoing support and assistance to the Naval Special Warfare (NSW) community, their families, and the families of the fallen, as well as wounded and transitioning NSW veterans, was the recipient of the Civic Statesmanship Award. Robin King, Chief Executive Officer and wife of a Navy SEAL, accepted the award for the Foundation. This is as impressive and outstanding an NGO as we have ever worked with, and I urge you to find out more about their crucial work by visiting www.navysealfoundation.org.

The tradition of holding a panel discussion with the awardees was continued this year, and our new emcee, Jennifer Griffin of Fox News, deftly moderated the discussion with Senator Cleland, Scott Keogh and Robin King, which touched upon the different ways we can support our troops, veterans, and military families. The award recipients talked about the progress and challenges this community has faced, as well as what needs to be done to take care of our heroes in the future. FMC was proud to recognize these individuals and organizations that have demonstrated a true commitment to our nation's armed forces, veterans, and military families.

All the programs we have described of course require both leadership and staff to implement. Our Association is blessed to have top people in both categories. I want to take this opportunity to thank our board of directors—30 former Members divided equally between parties—for their advice and counsel, I really appreciate it.

I also want to thank the many partners and supporters we have to make our programs possible. We are truly lucky to have assembled a group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work and make our success possible, and we very much value our partnership with them. Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank the other members of our Association's Executive Committee: our Vice President, Jim Walsh; our Treasurer, Martin Frost; our Secretary, Mary Bono; and our Past President, Connie Morella. You all have made this Association a stronger and better organization than it has ever been, and I thank you for your time and energy.

To administer all these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals.

Alexis Terai is part of our international team and runs our Congressional Study Group on Japan. She was born here in the United States, but spent many years in Japan. She's fluent in Japanese and has already been an invaluable addition to our Japan program, as well as a host of other projects.

Lorraine Harbison is our other international programs officer, focusing mostly on our Germany and Europe programming. She has studied both in the United States and in Europe, is fluent in Spanish, and has been instrumental in making our Diplomatic Advisory Council such a huge success.

Rachel Haas is our CEO's right hand person, but she is so much more. First of all, she's the most pleasant professional you could ever spend time with, and I would know because Rachel and I traveled to Brussels together earlier this year for our sister organization's annual meeting. In addition to that, Rachel runs the office, controls the books, and plays a leading role in putting together our outstanding gala fundraising dinner.

Andrew Shoenig, who is our Associate Director of International Programs, has been with the Association for five years now. He is instrumental in putting together all the international programs you heard about earlier today, and as we're speaking he's leading a delegation of District Office Directors on a Study Tour to Germany.

Sharon Witiw is our Domestic Programs Director and without her our Congress to Campus Program would not be half as active and as successful as it currently is. In addition, she oversees all of our civic education projects, makes sure the golf tournament is a success and put together the two Cuba trips you heard about earlier.

Sabine Schleidt is our Managing Director who designs and implements all the current Member international programs called the Congressional Study Groups. In addition, she's the driving force behind our fundraising efforts, has 10 brilliant ideas every day, and never seems to take a break!

Pete Weichlein is our Chief Executive Officer, who has been with the Association since 1999 and became CEO in 2003.

In addition to our wonderful staff, we benefit greatly from volunteers who lend us their talents and expertise pro bono. None deserve more appreciation than Dava Guerin, who has taken on the role of our Communications Director. She tells our story and connects us with the media. She also is an author and her most recent publication is a terrific book called ''Unbreakable Bonds'' about the mothers who become full-time caregivers again when their grown children return severely injured from the battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I should also mention that we are benefitting tremendously from the support of our Association's Auxiliary, led so ably by Betty Ann Tanner, wife of former Member John Tanner. The Auxiliary is playing a more and more prominent role in working with us on our programming, and the memorial service in Statuary Hall, which we will host for the first time later this afternoon, is a great example of the tremendously valuable contribution our Auxiliary is making. Thank you Betty Ann, and we're looking forward to getting the same outstanding leadership from her successor, Chris English, spouse of Phil English.

It is now my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former and current Members who have passed away since our last report. I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to now rise as I read the names and at the end of the list we will pay our respect to their memory with a moment of silence. We also want to use this time to include in our thoughts and prayers the victims of the horrible massacre in Orlando, and remember them as well as all victims of terrorism across the globe. Thank you.

We honor the following Members of Congress for their service.

They are: Bruce Alger of Texas, Thomas Cass Ballenger of North Carolina, Robert Bennett of Utah, Mario Biaggi of New York, Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, Dale Bumpers of Arkansas, Don H. Clausen of California, Howard Coble of North Carolina, Wes Cooley of Oregon, Frank Denholm of South Dakota, Don Edwards of California, Allen Ertel of Pennsylvania, Joe Gaydos of Pennsylvania, Robert Griffin of Michigan, John Paul Hammerschmidt of Arkansas, Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin, Delbert Latta of Ohio, Arch A. Moore, Jr. of West Virginia, John H. Murphy of New York, Morgan Murphy of Illinois, John T. Myers of Indiana, Allen Nunnelee of Mississippi, Mike Oxley of Ohio, Martin Sabo of Minnesota, James Santini of Nevada, Gus Savage of Illinois, Richard Schweiker of Pennsylvania, Louis Stokes of Ohio, Fred Thompson of Tennessee, Tim Valentine of North Carolina, George Voinovich of Ohio, Jim Wright of Texas.

Mr. FROST. Will the gentlewoman suspend for just a moment.

We have been advised that we have to vacate the floor in 5 minutes by 9:25. I would ask that the gentlewoman submit the remainder of her remarks for the RECORD. However, she must proceed directly to the election of the board and the officers for the coming year.

Ms. KENNELLY. Yes.

I really want to thank Betty Ann Tanner, wife of former Member John Tanner.

Another thing I am going to say quickly is we are working very closely with the Auxiliary. This afternoon, I am going to read the names of former Members who have died this year, and this afternoon at 6 p.m. we are going to have a memorial. It was my visit to the European community where they had the most wonderful, wonderful memorial to their members who had died that year. And another one in Canada that some of our Members went to, and I want to have something like that this afternoon so I hope you can come. Staff has put a great deal of thought into it.

Now we are going to have the election of our board of directors.

Every year at our annual meeting we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. The candidates are running unopposed. Everybody who wants to say ''yea,'' say ''yea.'' I doubt there will be any ''nays.''

For the Association's board of directors, the candidates are:

Ann Marie Buerkle of New York
Bob Clement of Tennessee
Mike Ferguson of New Jersey
Phil Gingrey of Georgia
Dan Maffei of New York
L.F. Payne of Virginia
Tom Petri of Wisconsin
Nick Rahall of West Virginia.

All in favor of electing these eight former Members to our board of directors, please say ''yea.'' Any opposed? Hearing no ''nays,'' the slate has been elected by the membership, and I congratulate them on their election and the work they are going to do.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. The candidates for our executive committee are:

Cliff Stearns of Florida for president
Martin Frost of Texas for vice president
Tim Petri of Wisconsin for treasurer
Karen Thurman of Florida for secretary.

All in favor of electing these four former Members to our executive committee please say ''yea.'' Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership. Congratulations to all four of them, and I especially look forward to working with Cliff Stearns.

Mr. FROST. We need to go directly, if we may, to Cliff Stearns.

Ms. KENNELLY. All right. But before I do that, I do want to tell you that the 6 p.m. event, the memorial that many of us have worked hard on, will take place at 6 in Statuary Hall, and we have invited the families of the Members who have passed this year, and we have had a good reception from them. If you have to leave, I do hope you will come back for the memorial. We will have the memorial, and then we will have a reception after the memorial.

Now our new president will say a few words to us.

Mr. STEARNS. Barbara, thank you very much. And thank you, Members, for your confidence.

I think in light of the hour here, we will go right directly to honoring our past president and our vice president.

Pete, if you will give me the plaques, I would like to read them. They have done an extraordinary job, and I think at this point we are going to recognize what they have done.

So, Jim, would you mind coming up here.

I want to thank Congressman Jim Walsh of New York for his stewardship and counsel as vice president of the association. His dedication to bipartisanship and his respect for the Congress, as an institution, were evident in every program he led, and he played a pivotal role in making our association even more impactful and successful.

Jim, congratulations.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you.

Mr. STEARNS. Barbara, if you will come up.

Barbara, your plaque is inscribed:

''We thank Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut for her leadership and guidance for the past 2 years as president of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. Her wisdom and sage counsel have been invaluable. The dedication and support she

has given to the board, her fellow Members, and the Former Members of Congress staff has guided and grown the Association, and we are a better organization thanks to her.''

Thank you, Barbara.

Ms. KENNELLY. As I accept this award—and we are not going to read the names of the memorial that we are going to have this afternoon—I think we all ought to just stand for a moment and just say a small prayer for what happened in Orlando.

Thank you.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Barbara. And let me just conclude before we leave here to say we have a lunch today—and I hope all of you will come—to bestow the 2016 Distinguished Service Award on the current Senators and Representatives who are retiring after the 114th Congress. Our Association has decided that every 2 years, we will take our Distinguished Service Award and dedicate it to the retiring Members as an opportunity to thank them for their public service and to let them know that, through our Association, their service can continue.

And since we cannot hand a plaque to all of these people, we have decided to award a $1,000 scholarship in their name to a graduating high school senior from a D.C. school. We invited students to compete for this scholarship by writing an essay about civic responsibility and what it means to be a citizen. Out of the many really outstanding submissions we received, we selected a very impressive individual who is graduating and is heading to Harvard. His name is Nicholas Stauffer-Mason, and he and his mother will join us for lunch later today. I hope all of you will attend.

Thank you, everybody, for this opportunity.

Mr. FROST. The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House for their presence here today and also the leadership of the House of Representatives for hosting us once again in this revered Chamber.

Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those former Members who did not respond when the roll was called to give their names to the Reading Clerk for inclusion in the roll.

The meeting stands adjourned.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Father Mina D. Essak, St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church, Troy, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, thank You for our lives, our health, and the opportunity to serve our beloved United States of America. Send Your spirit for protection of her inhabitants as she continues to exist as the most powerful nation in the world.

Send Your spirit to touch the hearts of our Nation's leaders.

Endow the spirit of wisdom on President Obama and the Members here today with familiar words: The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you peace.

Accept the great goodness they strive for: trust, justice, and peace in our great Nation. Inspire our leaders with new approaches to increase the prosperity of those whom they represent. Grant each Member talent with which to multiply their fruits.

May we please You, O God, this day. Hear us, Almighty God.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi 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 REVEREND FATHER MINA D. ESSAK

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Father Mina and the Coptic community he represents in southeast Michigan. Egypt's Coptic Christians have been a staple in my district since they held their first liturgy at St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church in Troy almost 40 years.

Father Mina is an engineer by trade, but in 1991, he accepted God's calling and became a priest to serve the then-small congregation of Coptic Christians in southeast Michigan. Under the leadership of Father Mina, the Coptic community has grown from a handful of families to over 750 today.

The Copts are my neighbors and friends. They are our nurses, schoolteachers, public servants, and business leaders. The Copts represent what America represents. Their story is America's story: the story of people who dreamed of a better life, the story of people who left everything they had ever known to come to this country for a new beginning.

I am proud to represent this vibrant and welcoming community, and, under the leadership of Father Mina and Father Maximus, the Copts will continue to serve an important role in southeast Michigan for a long time.

I want to thank, again, Father Maximus and Father Mina for leading the House in prayer today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO THE U.S. ARMY

(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, yesterday was the 241st birthday of the United States Army, a celebration for the strongest fighting force in the world. There are now more countries liberated and thriving in peace and democracy than in the history of the world because of the American military.

It is an honor to represent Fort Jackson in the Midlands of South Carolina, the largest initial entry training facility of the Army. I was grateful to meet the incoming commanding general of Fort Jackson, Brigadier General Pete Johnson. I appreciate departing Brigadier General Roger Cloutier, who served in the tradition of Major General Bradley Becker.

This is also a special day for my family, as the son of a World War II veteran of the U.S. Army Air Corps, as a grateful 31-year veteran of the Army Reserves and the South Carolina Army National Guard. I especially appreciate the Guard service of my sons, Alan in Iraq, Julian in Egypt, and Hunter in Afghanistan. My fourth son, Addison, served as a Navy doctor with the Army Rangers in Iraq.

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

Happy 241st birthday, U.S. Army.

ORLANDO

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the victims of the tragedy in Orlando. This act of terror and hate has reverberated across our Nation with a goal to divide us and instill fear against those who simply wish to express themselves and live their lives freely.

We cannot let fear lead us to single out an entire community or take our

focus away from fighting terrorism. We cannot allow politics to distract us from coming together and passing commonsense gun reform.

We must stand up against hate in all of its forms and the weapons that allow our enemies to too easily violently express it. That is something we all stand for.

We must act. The victims and their families of Orlando deserve no less.

TUPELO POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUE

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the incredible work being done by the Tupelo Police Athletic League.

The Police Athletic League is a national organization that allows members of the police force to expand community outreach and connect with young people and their parents through athletics and other school-related activities. This organization has reduced juvenile crime and teaches our youth to appreciate and trust police officers.

During the National Police Athletic League conference, Major Anthony Hill of the Tupelo Police Department was named the national 2016 Male Volunteer of the Year. Additionally, Tupelo Police Department Lieutenant Michael Russell was appointed to the Police Athletic League national executive board.

I want to thank Major Anthony Hill and Lieutenant Michael Russell, among others, not only for their dedication to this program, but for their work to leave Tupelo a better place than they found it.

I have worked with both of these officers firsthand as a city prosecutor, and I have seen the love and dedication they have for their community and the youth, and the countless hours of overtime, nights, and weekends they spent away from their families to make sure they help our youth.

Police officers across the country make countless sacrifices to both protect and improve our communities.

Thank you for all you do, Major Hill and Lieutenant Russell.

HATE CONTINUES TO FESTER

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 49 dead Americans: sons, daughters, husbands, wives, friends.

Whatever his ideology, whatever gun he used, this killer was driven by hate toward the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community.

Just as hate struck the LGBT community at the UpStairs Lounge in New Orleans or at Uncle Charlie's in New York City or the BeBar nightclub here in Washington or the hundreds and hundreds other attacks that occur each year, it is because of the inaction of bodies like this, the Congress of the United States, to address discrimination, to ignore cries for equality, that this hate continues to fester.

The LGBT community deals with this fear and hate every single day, all for wanting to live and love and be who they are. And who they are, just like every member of the LGBT community, are sons, daughters, husbands, wives, and friends.

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

(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 June as Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month.

More than 80,000 Americans die as a result of Alzheimer's each and every year, which makes it the sixth leading cause of death among our Nation's senior citizens.

With over 5 million Americans suffering from Alzheimer's, research toward finding a cure, as well as the rehabilitation of patients, is crucial to eliminating this debilitating disease. That is why I am a cosponsor of the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, which will increase access to care for those with Alzheimer's and ease the burden on their families.

Mr. Speaker, Alzheimer's and dementia have affected everyone in this country, in every congressional district across the country, in some way, shape, or form. A strong congressional response is critical to helping those struggling with this disease as well as their family and friends.

This month, I call on my colleagues to pass the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, and I ask them to join me in raising awareness for this very important issue.

WE NEED MOMENTS OF SUSTAINED ACTION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the murder of 49 innocent people at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando last Sunday once again demonstrates the urgency of addressing gun violence in this country.

While I appreciate the moment of silence we observed earlier this week, what we really need are moments of sustained action to ensure that this never happens again.

We should immediately close the terror gap so individuals on the terrorist watch list cannot legally purchase a gun. If you are too dangerous to get on an airplane, you are too dangerous to own a gun.

We should move quickly to prohibit the sale and possession of weapons of war, like the assault rifle that the Orlando gunman used.

We should also close the hate crimes loophole so that anyone convicted of a hate crime is prohibited from buying or owning a gun.

We should close the Charleston loophole so gun sales cannot go forward until a background check is completed.

These are commonsense measures that would immediately reduce the incidence of gun violence in this country.

It is on all of us, as the people's elected representatives, to take action today. Choosing to do nothing is an insult to the victims of these attacks and a danger to the safety of those we represent. There is no more solemn responsibility that we have than to protect the people we represent.

Let's get to work.

FARM CREDIT CELEBRATES 100 YEARS

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Farm Credit on its 100th anniversary.

On July 17, 1916, the Federal Farm Loan Act was signed into law, thus creating the Farm Credit System. Since then, Farm Credit has provided our Nation's rural communities with the financial tools they sorely need.

At a national level, Farm Credit has provided more than $260 billion in credit to more than 500,000 rural customers. In my district, the Farm Credit System serves over 544 borrowers and customers, providing roughly $160 million in credit.

As a large animal veterinarian, I have seen firsthand how Farm Credit has served generations of young farmers and ranchers who rely on these tools available to start successful businesses, businesses that keep American farming strong.

Without the Farm Credit System, our farmers in Florida and the Nation would not have access to the much-needed credit required to farm so that they can feed not just America, but the world.

DERELICTION OF DUTY

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, the worse mass shooting in the history of this great Republic took place in Orlando, Florida. It was an egregious act of terror, a vicious hate crime directed at the LGBT community, and an attack on our democracy.

In times like this, the American people deserve real congressional leadership. The American people deserve legislation to prevent suspected terrorists on the no-fly list from being able to purchase weapons of war that are not used to hunt deer, but are used to hunt

human beings, such as the 49 individuals who were viciously killed in Orlando, Florida.

Instead, House Republicans brought us a brief moment of silence and then got back to business as usual. It is a shameless, shameful dereliction of duty, but it is what we have come to expect from this reckless Republican majority—and the American people deserve better.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING ENDY EKPANYA

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, there is great pain and agony in Pearland, Texas, and all across America. Pearland police officer Endy Ekpanya was killed in the line of duty while on patrol in Pearland. He was killed at 3:15 a.m. on Sunday. He died 45 minutes later at a hospital.

Endy was only 30 years old. He had been with the Pearland police force for less than a year. His fellow D squad officers said he was always eager to learn, and with that huge smile. Endy was the first Pearland policeman killed since 1973. As you can see, Endy leaves behind a wife and a young son.

Mr. Speaker, I will use my remaining time to say a silent prayer to honor Endy.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO DO ITS JOB

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, the United States Congress observed a moment of silence for the victims of a mass shooting, this time in Orlando, Florida. Once again, many in this Chamber remain silent on stopping more of the same.

Nearly a third of the world's mass shootings occur right here in our country; and yet, this Congress, defying the wishes of our constituents, refused to take any reasonable steps to keep dangerous guns out of the wrong hands.

This Congress has refused to ban military grade assault rifles whose primary purpose is to kill as many people as possible at one time. This Congress refuses to close the loophole that lets criminals buy firearms online or at gun shows without a background check. And, most shockingly, this Congress is refusing to prevent those suspected of terrorism from buying weapons that could be used in the next attack.

This Congress offers lots of thoughts and sympathies when people are massacred by firearms, but no action to stop the carnage. It is time for this Congress to do its job before we have to say more prayers for innocent victims.

RECOGNIZING VIRGINIA STATE PARKS

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of our Virginia State parks. From the Blue Ridge Mountains to the Chesapeake Bay, the Commonwealth boasts some of the most beautiful natural landscapes in the United States, and for the past 80 years, the Virginia State Parks have served as an avenue for families to enjoy the outdoors together.

Outdoor recreation is such an important part of our national heritage, and our 36 Virginia State parks have fostered that tradition by helping generations of Virginians explore and understand our natural resources. With more than 600 miles of trails and convenient access to Virginia's major waterways, our Virginia State parks offer no shortage of opportunities for Virginians to go places they have never been before.

I commend the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation for their role in maintaining the Commonwealth's State parks and for preserving our lands in the public trust.

I thank Virginia State Parks for keeping our Commonwealth beautiful. I wish them a happy 80th anniversary and many, many more to come.

REMEMBERING TWO YOUNG MICHIGANDERS KILLED IN ORLANDO

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember two young Michiganders who tragically were among the 49 people who lost their lives in Orlando on Sunday.

Tevin Crosby, from Saginaw, Michigan, was just 25 years old. He was on a trip visiting family in North Carolina and went on to Florida to see some friends and some colleagues. He was a young businessowner. He was described as a rising star, according to his friends and his colleagues. An employee at his company told The Saginaw News that he was always smiling and always positive.

Michigan also lost Christopher ''Drew'' Leinonen, who was a native of Detroit. His mother, Christine, told ABC that her son established the gay-straight alliance at his high school and received a humanitarian award for his effort. Juan Ramon Guerrero, the man he planned to wed, was also killed.

My heart aches for Tevin and Drew's families and their loved ones and all those who were killed over the weekend. This was an act of terror against the LGBT community.

As our Nation heals from this tragedy, Congress must turn our country's grief into action. There is no place for weapons of war on the streets of America's cities, murdering our children. This Congress has it within its hands to act, and this Congress needs to act.

RECOGNIZING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA CHARTER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America Charter. On June 15, 1916, President Woodrow Wilson signed the law granting a national charter to the Boy Scouts of America, which had been incorporated 6 years earlier in 1910.

I spent more than four decades in scouting as a scoutmaster, Juniata Valley Boy Scouts Council executive board member and Council president. In my own scouting experience, I was honored to become one of just 2,000 people since 1969 to receive the national Distinguished Eagle Scout Award.

It was my experience in scouting that first sparked my interest in public service, in the vein of the Boy Scouts model, which urges us in part to do our duty to our country.

In 2013 there were more than 2.6 million members of the Boy Scouts of America. In a time which has in many ways been highlighted by a decline of volunteerism, I know that our Nation's future is in good hands with these young men and young ladies.

It is my hope that this wonderful organization continues to contribute to the lives of youth for generations to come.

SICK OF SILENCE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, our country continues to grieve with Orlando and the LGBT community in the wake of the deadly shooting at the Pulse nightclub.

The American people are angry; they are anxious; they are afraid; and they have good reason to be. This is the deadliest in a long list of recent attacks. Yet, after each mass shooting, many of my Republican colleagues have stood in the way of efforts to protect Americans from the next one.

Monday night we held yet another moment of silence on the House floor. I have lost track of how many moments of silence we have had since I have been in Congress. Mr. Speaker, I am sick of silence.

Forty-nine people were murdered this weekend in Orlando, and that is not just a number. Those are 49 young men and women who had parents and boyfriends and girlfriends who loved them and whose lives will never be the same. Moments of silence are not enough to

honor these victims, and they do nothing to prevent future attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on you to allow us to vote on reinstating the assault weapons ban and legislation to prevent suspected terrorists from buying firearms.

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT THE ORLANDO ATTACK

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we all know the facts from the Orlando attack, and they are absolutely heartbreaking. We know that the terrorist pledged his allegiance to ISIS before he carried out the assault and murder of 49 people.

We also know that we need to be supporting our law enforcement. What we are learning is that law enforcement, local law enforcement, is constrained by political correctness. They are constrained by lack of communication. They are constrained, and we have to understand that they are on the front lines in this fight. Congress must listen to the FBI, Homeland Security, and other law enforcement entities and give them the tools that they need to protect our communities.

This attack calls into question the assessment, threat assessment programs, the vetting, and the information sharing that is in place. The FBI twice investigated the Orlando shooter. This reveals vetting is nearly impossible. The vetting process being nearly impossible is one of the reasons that we need to halt the migration of Syrian refugees until a proper process is in place.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO BE SILENT

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, once again, our country has been shocked by a horrific act of gun violence, and, once again, the only real response from Congress has been a moment of silence.

Well, this is not the time to be silent. Congress needs to act, and Congress needs to act now.

This murderer at the Pulse nightclub of Orlando, who was once on the terror watch list, was free to walk into a store and purchase an assault weapon that could kill 49 people and wound 53 others. Today, someone inspired by ISIS, who was deemed too dangerous to even board a plane, could walk into a gun store to buy whatever weapon they want. That is outrageous. That is why we must pass the no fly, no buy legislation that would keep those on the terrorist watch list from buying lethal weapons.

Unless we act to finally keep the most dangerous weapons out of the most dangerous hands, our moments of silence will become our legacy of silence.

RESILIENCE IN THE FACE OF ADVERSITY

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, in June, a gay nightclub—what is supposed to be a safe place where the LGBT community can gather and be who they are—was targeted by violence and bigotry. That was 47 years ago in New York City. The Stonewall riots are considered the very beginning of the gay rights movement, and that is why we celebrate June as LGBT Pride Month, pride for progress made against fear, against HIV/AIDS, against violence, and against the silence that too often greets bigotry, including in this Chamber.

Here we stand today, so much progress, but still so far from true equality. And we see more hatred-fueled violence at a gay gathering place.

What do we do?

I know only because I have seen the path well worn by my LGBT brothers and sisters, whose resilience in the face of adversity inspires me. We organize, we fight for equality and against prejudice. We change the hearts and minds of those who have yet to embrace the fundamental American principle that all are created equal.

This Pride Month we stand up against bigotry and against the silence, and we do it proudly.

□ 1230

ORLANDO

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard repeatedly, this past weekend, Omar Mateen walked into a nightclub that had been a fixture of Orlando's LGBT community for over a decade and opened fire, killing 49 people and wounding dozens more.

This tragedy was many things. It was an act of terror and the deadliest mass shooting in American history. It was an attack targeting the LGBT community in what was meant to be a safe space on what was meant to be a night of celebration.

Information is still coming in about the perpetrator and his past, and we will continue to learn more in the days ahead. But we do know now that Mateen had been investigated by the FBI for possible terrorist ties and placed on the terrorist watch list. Despite this, he was able to pass a background check and legally purchase a gun.

There were other warning signs as well. He was described by coworkers and family as a violent and unstable person with a history of domestic abuse. But the loophole by which suspected terrorists can purchase guns is something that we have the power to fix right now with one simple change. The vast majority of Americans agree with us: if you are too dangerous to ride on a plane, you are too dangerous to own a gun.

Let's fix this commonsense loophole.

ORLANDO SHOOTING

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House stood to bow our heads in a moment of silence for gun violence on the House floor for the 27th time since the horrific shooting of children at Sandy Hook Elementary; this time, for the unspeakable murders that took place in Orlando.

A moment of silence for gun violence; that is what we do. We have stood, and we have prayed.

One time, I stood up and said: Now, let's do something. We are not short of solutions.

The American people cannot believe that the Republicans have voted against a bill that says that people on the suspected terrorist watch list should not be able to buy guns. That is right. They would not support that law. They won't support a ban on assault weapons that have no other purpose than to kill people.

Enough is enough. That silence is a deafening silence. We cannot stand to do that anymore without taking real action.

CLOSE THE CHARLESTON LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I often quote Martin Luther King, Jr.'s iconic letter from the Birmingham City Jail when he wrote:

> We are going to be made to repent not just for the hateful words and deeds of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people.

Mr. Speaker, some very dastardly acts have been committed, one of which we will be commemorating the first anniversary of on Friday, June 17, when the people of Charleston, South Carolina, the State, and many across the Nation, will pause to commemorate the lives of nine people who were murdered and the three who survived because our gun laws allowed a young man to purchase a gun whose background check showed he should not have have been allowed to purchase a gun. However, the loophole says if the background check is not completed in 3 days, you can still purchase the gun.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to close the Charleston loophole.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5293, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 783 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 783

Resolved, That 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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order.

SEC. 2. (a) The bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 170, line 7. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, 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.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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. 6. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 16, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member, 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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 783 provides for further consideration of H.R. 5293, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The resolution provides for a structured rule and makes in order 75 amendments. The rule also provides suspension authority for Thursday.

I want to kick off today's debate by making one thing very clear: the underlying bill is a very good bill. I know some of my colleagues may have some things to say that they would want to have added or a few things they would want to see changed. But all things considered, this is a very good bill. Let me tell you why.

This bill provides funding for the entire United States military, including critical funding to help fight the Islamic State and others who wish to do us harm. This bill ensures that our military receives the 2.1 percent pay raise they deserve, instead of the 1.6 percent pay raise requested by President Obama.

An important function of our military is research and development of new technologies and weapons systems, so this bill provides funding for those efforts. This bill makes important investments in military readiness by providing for equipment procurement for each of the service branches. We are sending far too many of our servicemembers into harm's way with outdated or damaged equipment, so this bill also includes much-needed funding for maintenance operations.

This bill also includes vital funding for the Defense Health Program, which provides care for our troops, while also spurring investment in important areas like traumatic brain injuries, cancer research, suicide prevention programs, and sexual assault prevention and response.

Now, I seriously doubt that any of my colleagues disagree with those functions. So this should be a bipartisan bill that passes with overwhelming support, especially considering all that is going on in the world today.

Just look at what happened this past weekend in Orlando. A person influenced by radical Islamic terrorists took the lives of innocent Americans.

Well, this bill includes funding to help fight the groups and organizations like the Islamic State that are spreading this radicalization. This bill is critical if we are to defeat the radical organization that is spreading terror all around the globe.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, I expect that today's debate will focus little on what is actually in this bill. I fear that today's debate will result in conversations about things that have absolutely nothing to do with the United States military. That is a real shame, because this bill is so very important.

I know some of my colleagues are going to express concerns about procedure and the fact that this is a structured rule. So I want to share some quick facts with you. More importantly, this rule makes in order 75 amendments out of 105 submitted to the Rules Committee. Forty-three of these amendments—over half—are Democrat and bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk here about regular order. Well, regular order means that the House works. Regular order doesn't mean chaos. Regular order doesn't mean that Members get to offer poison pill amendments just to kill a bill. Regular order is about ensuring we can do the business that the American people elected us to do and that they expect us to do.

Let's be real for a second. Only in Washington are people debating or worried about whether a bill to fund our troops comes to the floor under a structured rule or an open rule.

You know what people are worried about in homes from Maine to Hawaii? They are worried about the safety and security of their families.

So let's not get caught up, especially on this bill, in political games. The men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day to keep us safe deserve better than that. And the American people deserve better than that.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, despite Speakers BOEHNER and RYAN promising that the Chamber would be open, we haven't had an open rule since Speaker RYAN became Speaker. He has closed down the legislative process, shutting out Members and, thus, their constituents.

We need a full, open debate process, and though Speaker RYAN had the best of intentions when he assumed the mantle, his best laid plans have already crumbled and the Chamber has been slowed to a halt so Republicans can avoid taking difficult votes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us provides appropriations for the Department of Defense at a level $3 billion above fiscal year 2016, though it still remains $587 million below the President's request.

There are some strong, bipartisan measures in the bill, including funding for research into traumatic brain injuries, cancer, and physiological health research, as well as sexual assault prevention funds. Those are welcome investments.

Also included is a well-deserved pay raise for our men and women in uniform. Their immense sacrifice cannot be quantified, and they deserve our wholehearted support for the tireless defense of our Nation.

Additionally, the bill provides robust funding for cybersecurity and sorely needed assistance for our friends struggling for democracy in Ukraine so they can get the training and equipment they need to defend themselves against Russian aggression.

One of the most important aspects of this bill, however, is the investment made in the Department's manufacturing technology programs. That is the wave of the future, Mr. Speaker. We have no way to achieve national security if we cannot manufacture the goods that we need here at home.

The Manufacturing Technology Office administers the soon to be eight DOD-led Manufacturing Innovation Institutes that allow us to secure technological advantage and economic competitiveness around the world.

I am proud that one of these institutes, AIM Photonics, is included, and that this bill fully funds the institute's launch with $25 million of the total $110 million committed by the Federal Government. I thank the chair and the ranking member for making our Nation's industrial policy a bipartisan priority.

However, these essential pieces of funding are overshadowed by the way in which the House majority has decided to source their funds. They do so by raiding the overseas contingency operations, or OCO, which is meant to be emergency supplemental funding.

This budget gimmick makes it even more likely that the Department of Defense will run out of funding early next year as we will come to another standoff over funding.

□ 1245

This is robbing Peter to pay Paul, and it is not how any rational citizen would run a household budget. And why would the House majority endorse it?

The discussion and debate, while essential, detract from the urgency of addressing the war at home, the gun violence epidemic that is crippling our Nation. Mr. Speaker, I rise today heartbroken from the horrific loss of life due to gun violence in America, but this Chamber keeps turning and churning, and going about business as usual.

On Monday night, as so many of my colleagues said, we held yet another moment of silence. Since there have been 998 mass shootings in the United States since Newtown, that is a lot of moments of silence, but no action at all.

How many times do we have to stand on the floor and observe that silence when our colleagues who actually have the power to make the changes necessary to stop it are in the room with us?

For the victims of Orlando and every shooting before, for their families and our constituents, we need more than thoughts and prayers. We need action and laws now.

Mr. Speaker, according to the United Nations, half of the world's guns are in the United States. We have 317 million people in our Nation, but an estimated 350 million guns. If you think that the ubiquity of firearms in our Nation has not increased the likelihood of mass shootings, I encourage you to reconsider.

What happened in Orlando was a man with a military weapon shot without pause for heaven knows how long a time because he had a weapon. The fact that he had that—and we have said over and over again that those guns are only intended to kill people, and, unfortunately, that has come true, and it is our citizens that they are killing.

Now, we, the Members of this body, could vote for lifesaving, commonsense measures, yet the majority refuses to act. The majority blocks votes to prevent terrorists from buying guns. A terrorist on a watch list can go ahead and buy a gun.

They won't consider legislation to require universal background checks, which the majority of Americans support. They won't even consider, anymore, the assault weapons ban. Before it expired, it made a lot of difference in the mass killings in this country.

What is even more dangerous is that, in the healthcare bill passed—it was stunning to me that it was even in there—the Centers for Disease Control can't even track data on gun violence as a public health issue. Also, family doctors, who can ask about drugs in the home, are not allowed to ask about guns in the home; and some gun sales records are destroyed after 24 hours, by law, making it incredibly hard, if not impossible, to verify information and to track sales.

So that is the state of affairs in this Chamber today. Instead of thoughts and prayers, which we always turn to for solace, we would like to have, now, some actions and laws.

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

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

I appreciate the gentlewoman's positive words about the underlying bill. She pointed out a number of things about this bill that are very good indeed.

I hear that she disagrees with the use of the overseas contingency account for funding part of what is going on here, but we are in a war. We are in a war overseas, and we are going to have to use that account to fight that war overseas.

I also heard her say that we need to do more than just have a moment of silence, as we did the other night. Acting on this bill does something very important to stop terrorists over there from coming over here and harming us, or to stop terrorists over there from being able to inspire some of our own citizens to attack us. I have said many times, if you want to stop terrorism in the United States, it is better to defeat them over there. The underlying bill does that. It has been worked out carefully, in a bipartisan fashion, as the gentlewoman said, with the Department of Defense, so that they have what they need to protect us, because the most important way to stop violence from terrorists hitting us here at home is to make sure those terrorists are destroyed abroad.

I am glad the gentlewoman from New York brought up the issue of open rules. To have this debate, I think it is important to look at the minority's record when it comes to openness and fairness on appropriations bills.

When the gentlewoman was chair of the Rules Committee in the 111th Congress, they also had a structured rule for the Department of Defense Appropriations. So how many amendments did they make in order? Fifteen. This bill makes in order 75 amendments to the Defense Appropriations bill. That is a pretty stark difference, Mr. Speaker.

Let's not just look at the Defense Appropriations legislation. On the Energy and Water bill, which this House considered under an open rule a few weeks ago, the Democrat majority considered it under a structured rule and made just 21 amendments in order.

What about the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill in fiscal year 2010? The gentlewoman made just eight amendments in order. The House considered the same bill earlier this year under an open rule.

A few more numbers for you from fiscal year 2010. Only 5 amendments were made in order through the Labor,

Health and Human Services bill, just 23 for Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, 17 for Financial Services, and 1—only 1—amendment to the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

Then, for fiscal year 2011, under the Democrat majority, only two appropriations bills were presented to the House, both under structured rules. They were considered, and then they just stopped the appropriations process altogether.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to talk a big game about open rules and the importance of fairness; but, if you look at the record, it is clear that this House has been much more open and much fairer under Republican leadership.

Our Conference wanted to restore open rules in the appropriations process; however, the minority has abused the process, and we have no choice but to take the steps necessary to ensure we can get the business of the American people done.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me take just a minute to say that I appreciate the history lesson, but the fact is that both Speaker BOEHNER and Speaker RYAN had said that this was going to be the most open Congress in history, but we haven't had a single open rule since Speaker RYAN took over. So I think we could go on in this debate like a tennis match all day long, but the facts are the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democrat whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I tell my friend, BRADLEY BYRNE, I would love to have a discussion with him on that issue that he raised, but I don't have the time to do it now because I want to speak about the bill.

First, let me thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, who is the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and Mr. VISCLOSKY. They have worked together. They worked positively, and America can be proud of their leadership. Both of them have been extraordinary advocates for our military and men and women who serve.

This rule presents a rejection, however, of the regular order Speaker RYAN promised in the House. He promised it. That is the issue, not a question of how many. What he said was this was going to be open.

As soon as it became clear, however, that the House Republicans might have to take an up-or-down vote again on whether to ban discrimination against LGBT Americans, they shut the open appropriations process down. And, in fact, when we adopted that amendment, a majority of the Republican Members voted against their own bill. That was the abuse of the system, I tell my friend, not anything we have done over here.

No transparency, no open process, no regular order, no scruples about denying Americans' Representatives the chance to add their input in this Defense bill, simply because they want to allow discrimination against LGBT Americans. That is what this is about. That is how we got to this closed rule or structured rule. Make no mistake about it.

In rejecting the Maloney amendment last month and now closing the process as a result of losing the Energy and Water bill because it did not allow discrimination, House Republicans are feeding the same kind of anti-LGBT sentiment that makes gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Americans feel unsafe in our country and creates an environment which furthers racism, homophobia, and xenophobia. That is tough language. I get it.

Speaker RYAN had said he would allow the House to work its will. That was his pledge. He told Roll Call in November that the Republican leadership would not ''predetermine the outcome of everything around here.''

Well, in this instance, the House is being steered in a very deliberate direction by the Speaker and the leader. The Republican leadership, once again, is more concerned with keeping its Members from having to vote on LGBT discrimination than on maintaining the open process that it promised. Each and every Member of this House ought to be not only willing but eager to cast their votes to say, unequivocally, we are against discrimination.

Let me be clear. There are many provisions in this bill that I support, but there are a number about which I have serious concerns. My concerns include the dangerous act of setting up a funding cliff next year that would put our troops in danger.

In their attempt to get around the funding caps both parties agreed to last year, House Republicans pretend that they are keeping the deal we made, but, in reality, they are raiding the account that provides our troops with the resources they need to do their jobs safely.

This bill also includes restrictions on the Pentagon's ability to transfer Guantanamo Bay detainees as well as, once again, abandoning military-civilian pay parity in cost-of-living increases.

The American public, Mr. Speaker, ought to know it costs $5 million per incarceree at Guantanamo, $5 million per person. How many terrorists have escaped from American prisons? Zero. Zero.

Now there is a Republican amendment to ban DREAMers from serving in uniform, a discriminatory provision in this bill.

Because the process has been shut down, Mr. Speaker, Democrats have been severely limited in our ability to put forward amendments to improve this bill and address these concerns. We will continue, however, to push hard to ensure all our troops have the tools they need to succeed at their mission and come home safely, and we will keep asking the House to take a vote to end discrimination. We must not rest until all Americans are truly equal under the laws and Constitution our men and women in uniform put their lives at risk to defend.

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

I really appreciate my friend from Maryland who, recently, he and I had an opportunity to spend some time together. I have enjoyed his company, and I recognize that he is a man of great experience and wisdom. I do have some differences with him on some of his remarks, however.

He mentioned the Guantanamo Bay provision. It has recently come to light that the White House has now admitted that some of the Guantanamo Bay detainees that have been released are now back on the battlefield trying to kill American servicemen and -women. So, for those of us on this side of the aisle, that is not acceptable. We don't want more Guantanamo Bay detainees out there putting our men and women in harm's way. We want to keep them where they are, to keep our men and women in uniform safe.

He talked about a funding cliff. What he is referring to is that this takes us, on the OCO account, into next spring, to when we will have a new President in place and, at that time, we can put in the rest of the funding.

Now, this is exactly what was done 8 years ago when we were having a transition from the Bush administration to the Obama administration. At that time, then-Senator Obama, then-Senator Kerry, both voted for that, both supported that. So all we are doing now is the same thing we did 8 years ago. It is common sense. It was perfectly okay with them then; it is not now.

And then on the Maloney amendment, I know exactly what the gentleman is talking about. The other side asked for that amendment. It was adopted by the House. It was put in the bill, and then when the bill itself, with the amendment on it, came up for a vote, only six Democrats voted for it. I voted for the bill with the language in it. The Democrats voted and killed the bill that had the antidiscriminatory language that they feel so strongly about.

So let's understand what is really going on here. This is not an effort to do anything about discrimination. This is an effort to bring an end to the appropriations process, to throw a rock in the gears of what we have got to do to make government work for the American people. And our side of the aisle, the majority, is simply not going to allow that to happen. We are going to do the work that the American people sent us here to do; we are going to use structured rules; we are going to bring order out of chaos; and we are going to get the people's work done.

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

□ 1300

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a valued member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, our ranking member, for yielding me the time.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this restrictive rule. The gentleman from Alabama talks about a poison pill. The poison pill amendment he is talking about is an amendment that would prohibit discrimination against the LGBT community. That is the poison pill. It is pathetic that an anti-discrimination measure would be considered a poison pill, but only in this Republican-controlled House would that be the case.

I would also say to the gentleman that the last time I checked, Republicans have the majority in this place. You have 247; we have 188. You can do whatever you want to do. That is why we see these restrictive rules one after another after another coming before the House.

When I hear that we are limiting the appropriations amendment process only to get rid of poison pills, there are other amendments that I don't think would be considered poison pills that were denied. My colleague from California, JACKIE SPEIER, had an amendment dealing with littoral combat ships. That was not made in order. If we had an open rule under the appropriations process that we should have had, that we were promised, she could have offered her amendment. But that was denied as well.

In terms of how the whole bill is funded with this overseas contingency account, it is one gimmick after another. It is embarrassing to try to defend this OCO account and how my colleagues have tried to get around the budget caps by going in and taking money to lift up the overall amounts in the base bill.

But here is the deal: I will say that I am grateful that an amendment was made in order that I authored along with Congressman JONES and many of my other colleagues that would basically say that it is about time Congress has a debate and a vote on an AUMF. We are at war in Syria, and we are at war in Iraq again. Our troops are in combat situations. That is the way the Secretary of Defense describes it. Our troops are being wounded. We have lost soldiers in these recent battles, and we have not had the courage in this institution to actually debate these wars and to vote up or down on whether we should continue these wars.

My friends have all kinds of excuses why we can't do this. First they say: Well, the White House has to come up with a plan.

The White House did.

Now it is: Well, we can't debate this because it is a delicate time.

We should have debated these wars before we entered these wars, yet the leadership of this House prevented us time and time again.

Now we have 10 minutes, 5 on both sides, to debate this amendment. But my amendment is very simple. It basically says no AUMF, no money. If we don't have the courage to have this debate and to authorize these wars, then our troops ought to come home. It is that simple. It is very, very straightforward. For the life of me, I can't understand why anybody would vote against this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If some of my colleagues want to expand these wars, then this is the opportunity for you to do it. If some of my colleagues, like me, want to lessen our military footprint in the Middle East, this is the opportunity. But to do nothing is unconscionable, and voting for this would force us—would force us—to do our job and to live up to our constitutional responsibility.

We cannot hide behind all these excuses anymore. There is no more excuse. Our brave men and women are in harm's way. The least we can do is show them that we care enough about what is going on to have this debate and vote on an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both side of the aisle to vote for the McGovern-Jones amendment. Vote to force this House to have a debate and a vote on an AUMF. If not, let us bring our troops back home to safety with their families.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Rules Committee is exactly right. We made in order his amendment that would allow him to have a debate on this floor on the AUMF. I also agree with him that it is probably not enough time to have a full debate on the AUMF. We talked about this several times in the Rules Committee, and he and I have a common understanding of the need for us to have a full debate on this floor on an AUMF. I agree with the gentleman, so we made his amendment in order.

I think he would like for us to go beyond that and actually bring an AUMF itself to the floor so we could have a fuller debate. When the time is right—and I don't know when that is going to be—I am going to be supportive of that. I have written letters in that respect, so I believe in that.

I want to point out to him that we made his amendment in order. We made his amendment in order and 74 others. That is 60 more amendments that were made in order on the Defense Appropriations bill than when the Democrats were in control of this House. So I have heard enough about this closed debate, closed rules. We have a structured rule to bring order out of chaos, and we have allowed many, many, many more amendments than the Democrats ever allowed on appropriations bills.

This is a good rule. It is a fair and balanced rule that allows for a full debate on issues. Some of these amendments I don't agree with, Mr. Speaker, but I thought they should be made in order, as did everybody else in the Rules Committee who voted for the rule. I know the Democrats didn't. This is a good rule, and I hope that we will adopt this rule and move forward with the debate on these important issues.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if my colleague has further speakers.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague says that some amendments he likes, some he doesn't. That is perfectly legitimate, but that is not why we make amendments in order in the Rules Committee. We don't pick out some we like and some we don't. We talk about the germaneness of the amendments. Certainly, if you have 70, I am sure there are going to be several people do not agree with.

But there is beginning to be a very unpleasant trend—and I am very concerned about it—that members of the majority on the Rules Committee will ask people coming to ask to have their amendments made in order—which, remember, as far as I can say right now, and I could be proved wrong, I think we are the only committee where members of a committee come up and ask for something. It is a totally different process from what happens in the other committees.

They come to us with full understanding—of course, the ratio, as you know, is 9–4, so it is kind of window dressing a lot of time—to ask that an amendment be in order. Those are sometimes people from the committee whose amendments weren't made in order in the committee, or it is other Members who have a great interest in that bill and would like to express the interest of their constituents in it.

But there is no question that there is really beginning to be a trend: if they don't like the amendment themselves, it is out the window. There is no chance of debate. In fact, so few of us get a chance to do any debating that we believe—and think that it is a fact—that many of our constituents in the country are just shut out of the debate.

What is even worse than that, now members have begun to ask the witnesses, as they come with their amendments: If we make your amendment in order, will you vote for the bill?

I object most strenuously to that. We are just getting into it, and I really want to study, but there is a quid pro

quo there that I don't believe is intended for members of the Rules Committee to have.

There is a favoritism being asked: If we do this for you, not because it is good, it is germane, it should move the bill and because, as a Member of Congress, you have a right to do it; but if we grant you this wish, your obligation is to vote for the bill, even though you may hate everything else that is in it.

So we will amplify on that a little bit. We have some review to do on how that is going to work, but on the face of it, I find it totally offensive myself.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity now to make a meaningful change, as all my colleagues have said, to address the gun violence epidemic that is crippling our Nation.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

No matter how hard I might try—and I don't plan to—I don't believe I could find any kind of cogent argument that would argue against that. I think a thinking person would say: Yes, someone on the FBI's terrorist list, we would not like them to be collecting firearms and explosives.

It is unconscionable that the Republican majority has repeatedly refused to even debate closing such a glaring loophole. In fact, in our discussions about that and shouldn't that be done—as I said, the public really wants that done—they won't even consider it.

The country can't wait any longer for Congress to act. I think the whole country is absolutely paralyzed with sadness, anger, and mixed feelings about what is going on in this country. The number of people shot in a weekend in Chicago; the young singer the other night, just before the Orlando massacre, who was shot to death because somebody wanted to do it and had the ability to do it.

We have Second Amendment rights, but we also have rights to live. We have the right to think that when our children go to school in the morning, they are going to come home in the afternoon. I can assure you that all the people worshiping in Mother Emmanuel Church believed they were going to go home after that to supper and to bed and to look forward to the next day.

We are not sensibly looking at what is going on here. Our record internationally is appalling. I will tell you that the country, I believe, at this moment is really crying out for something, and I am afraid, again, it will fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so that we can do an amendment on guns and to vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened very intently to the gentlewoman, and I do want to say this to her and to all of my colleagues in the House: The American people are worried. They are fearful, and they are fearful because there are people in other places who want to come here and do us harm simply because we are different from them. We are Christians, or we are a different type of Muslim from them, or we are LGBT, or we believe in all the principles that make America great. They want to come here and destroy all of us.

The attack on Sunday was an attack on every citizen of the United States of America. People are fearful that those terrorists will come here or they will find more people who are here now and inspire them to do the horrendous act that we saw done Saturday night, early Sunday morning.

They want us to defend them. We defend them by authorizing and appropriating the money to pay for the activities of the Armed Forces of the United States of America. That is what this bill is about. That is what we should be debating. That is what the people of the United States want us to do.

So we have put together a rule that is going to get the people's work done and provide the money to defend them from people that would harm us. That is the least we could do in reaction to what happened the other night, but it is a very, very important step for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 783 and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 783 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment

or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1402

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 783;

Adopting House Resolution 783, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5293, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 783) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
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
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
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
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
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)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
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
Perry
Peterson
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
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—183

Adams
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
Costa
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
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.
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
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
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
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Brat
Fattah
Forbes
Herrera Beutler
Love
Pearce
Rice (NY)
Takai
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Young (IN)

□ 1420

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. BOUSTANY and McHENRY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, we stand before you as the congressional women's softball team. Our bipartisan team, which we are very proud of, has won the Congressional Women's Softball Game for the last 2 years in a row, and we are looking to three-peat against the Bad News Babes press team tonight.

So we encourage all of you to come out tonight. Tell your staffs and anyone that is interested in helping to raise money to beat cancer to join us

tonight at 7 at Watkins Recreation Center near Eastern Market. You are going to see a phenomenal competition.

We are raising money for the Young Survival Coalition, which is an organization that helps young women under 40 years old who are diagnosed with breast cancer.

I know many of you know that I was diagnosed with breast cancer at 41 years old, 8½ years ago, and continue to be a survivor who is very proud to be healthy, and continue to spread the message that women need to pay attention to their breast health. I stand here with my sisters in Congress, sisters in the fight against breast cancer.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my friend and cocaptain.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our side of the aisle, I would encourage all of you to come tonight. We are going to beat cancer. More importantly, we are going to beat the press. Although, they are not up there, so they must be intimidated.

Every person in this room has been affected by cancer, so I would just encourage you to come. This is a great bipartisan effort for a great cause, and we would love to have all of you out there cheering us on to beat the press and beat cancer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

YEAS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
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
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
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
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)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
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
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—185

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
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
Costa
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
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
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
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
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
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Brat
Duffy
Fattah
Forbes
Grijalva
Herrera Beutler
Takai
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)

□ 1431

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, regretfully I am absent from the floor today. My son is graduating from high school tonight. Had I been present, however, I would have voted: On the Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 783 (rollcall 304), I would have voted "yea." On the Adoption of H. Res. 783 (rollcall 305), I would have voted "yea."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

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 include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5293, 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 783 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. 5293.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1434

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. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, 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 on Tuesday, June 14, 2016, all time for general debate pursuant to House Resolution 778 had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 783, no further general debate shall be in order. The bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read through page 170, line 7.

The text of the bill through page 170, line 7, is as follows:

H.R. 5293

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, 2017, 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, $39,986,962,000.

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, $27,774,605,000.

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, $12,701,412,000.

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, $27,794,615,000.

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, $4,458,963,000.

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, $1,898,825,000.

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, $736,305,000.

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, $1,718,126,000.

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, $7,827,440,000.

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, $3,271,215,000.

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, $34,436,295,000: *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.

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, $40,213,485,000: *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, $6,246,366,000.

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, $38,209,602,000: *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, $32,263,224,000: *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 $8,023,000, 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.

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, $2,767,471,000.

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, $975,724,000.

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, $320,066,000.

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, $3,106,066,000.

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), $6,923,595,000.

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, $6,708,200,000.

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, $14,194,000, 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, $170,167,000, 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $289,262,000, 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $371,521,000, 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, $9,009,000, 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, $222,084,000, 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), $108,125,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, under programs and activities of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program authorized under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act, $325,604,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

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, $4,628,697,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $1,502,377,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $2,244,547,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $1,513,157,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $6,081,856,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $15,900,093,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $3,102,544,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $601,563,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

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:

Ohio Replacement Submarine, $773,138,000;

Carrier Replacement Program, $1,271,205,000;

Carrier Replacement Program, (AP), $1,370,784,000;

Virginia Class Submarine, $3,187,985,000;

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,742,134,000;

CVN Refueling Overhauls, $1,689,920,000;

CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP), $248,599,000;

DDG–1000 Program, $271,756,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer, $3,211,292,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,439,192,000;

LHA Replacement, $1,559,189,000;

TAO Fleet Oiler, $73,079,000;

Moored Training Ship, $624,527,000;

Ship to Shore Connector, $128,067,000;

Service Craft, $65,192,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $1,774,000;

YP Craft Maintenance/ROH/SLEP, $21,363,000;

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $645,054,000; and

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $160,274,000.

In all: $18,484,524,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2021, of which $160,274,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, to fund completion of prior year shipbuilding programs: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2021, 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, $6,099,326,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $1,213,872,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $14,325,117,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $2,288,772,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, 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, $2,538,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $1,609,719,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $17,342,313,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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, $4,649,876,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

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. 4518, 4531, 4532, and 4533), $74,065,000, 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, $7,864,517,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

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, $16,831,290,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *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, $27,106,851,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

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, $18,311,236,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *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.

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, $178,994,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,371,613,000.

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, $33,576,563,000; of which $31,696,337,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, and of which up to $15,523,832,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $413,219,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,467,007,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, 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 $644,100,000 shall be made available to the United States Army Medical Research and Materiel Command to carry out the congressionally directed medical research programs.

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, $551,023,000, of which $147,282,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $49,533,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $20,368,000 for activities on military installations and $29,165,000, to remain

available until September 30, 2018, to assist State and local governments, not more than $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for the destruction of eight United States-origin chemical munitions in the Republic of Panama, to the extent authorized by law; $15,132,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2019, of which $15,132,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $388,609,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $380,892,000 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, $908,800,000, of which $631,087,000 shall be for counter-narcotics support; $118,713,000 shall be for the drug demand reduction program; and $159,000,000 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, $322,035,000, of which $318,882,000 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 $3,153,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, 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, $483,596,000.

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, 2017: *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 2017: *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: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to transfers from the following appropriations accounts:

(1) Environmental Restoration, Army;

(2) Environmental Restoration, Navy;

(3) Environmental Restoration, Air Force;

(4) Environmental Restoration, Defense-wide;

(5) Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites; and

(6) Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense.

(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 2017, 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 2018 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2018 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 2018.

(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 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 $40,021,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $28,000,000 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) $10,337,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force''; and

(3) $1,684,000 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 the current fiscal year may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings not located on a military installation, 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: *Provided*, That up to 1 percent of funds provided in this Act for support of defense FFRDCs may be used for planning and design of scientific or engineering facilities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees 15 days in advance of exercising the authority in the previous proviso.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2017, 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 2018 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 $126,800,000.

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 2017. 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. The Secretary of Defense shall issue regulations to prohibit the sale of any tobacco or tobacco-related products in military resale outlets in the United States, its territories and possessions at a price below the most competitive price in the local community: *Provided*, That such regulations shall direct that the prices of tobacco or tobacco-related products in overseas military retail outlets shall be within the range of prices established for military retail system stores located in the United States.

SEC. 8033. (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 2018 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2018 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 2018 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. 8034. 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, 2018: *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, 2018.

SEC. 8035. 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. 8036. 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. 8037. (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. 8038. None of the funds appropriated by this Act and hereafter 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. 8039. (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. 8040. (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. 8041. 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) ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', 2015/2017, $15,000,000;

(2) ''Other Procurement, Army'', 2015/2017, $30,000,000;

(3) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2015/2017, $150,000,000;

(4) ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2015/2017, $16,698,000;

(5) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', 2015/2017, $43,600,000;

(6) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $65,800,000;

(7) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', 2016/2018, $13,000,000;

(8) ''Other Procurement, Army'', 2016/2018, $58,000,000;

(9) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2016/2018, $6,755,000;

(10) ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2016/2018, $15,413,000;

(11) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', 2016/2018, $1,000,000;

(12) ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2016/2020, $276,906,000;

(13) ''Other Procurement, Navy'', 2016/2018, $54,394,000;

(14) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2016/2018, $178,300,000;

(15) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2016/2018, $23,250,000;

(16) ''Procurement, Defense-wide'', 2016/2018, $2,600,000;

(17) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', 2016/2017, $73,000,000;

(18) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', 2016/2017, $75,000,000;

(19) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', 2016/2017, $181,700,000; and

(20) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide'', 2016/2017, $3,000,000.

SEC. 8042. 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. 8043. 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. 8044. 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. 8045. (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. 8046. 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. 8047. None of the funds made available by this Act for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle service competitive procurements may be used unless the competitive procurements are open for award to all certified providers of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle-class systems: *Provided*, That the award shall be made to the provider that offers the best value to the government.

SEC. 8048. 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. 8049. 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. 8050. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program set-asides shall be taken proportionally from all programs, projects, or activities to the extent they contribute to the extramural budget.

SEC. 8051. 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. 8052. 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. 8053. 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. 8054. (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. 8055. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of United States Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet: *Provided*, That the command and control relationships which existed on October 1, 2004, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act: *Provided further*, That this section does not apply to administrative control of Navy Air and Missile Defense Command.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8056. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide'', $25,000,000 shall be for continued implementation and expansion of the Sexual Assault Special Victims' Counsel Program: *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. 8057. 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. 8058. (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. 8059. 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. 8060. 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. 8061. The Secretary of Defense shall continue to provide a classified quarterly report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8062. 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. 8063. 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. 8064. 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.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8065. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $75,950,170 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 1633 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'', $600,735,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, $62,000,000 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; $266,511,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which $150,000,000 shall be for co-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, of which not more than $90,000,000, subject to previously established transfer procedures, may be obligated or expended until establishment of a U.S.-Israeli co-production agreement for SRBMD; $204,893,000 shall be for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture, of which $120,000,000 shall be for co-production activities of Arrow 3 Upper Tier missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures, of which not more than $70,000,000, subject to previously established transfer procedures, may be obligated or expended until establishment of a U.S.-Israeli co-production agreement for Arrow 3 Upper Tier; and $67,331,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *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'', $160,274,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, 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'', 2012/2017: LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $45,060,000;

(2) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2011/2017: DDG–51 Destroyer $15,959,000;

(3) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2017: Littoral Combat Ship $3,600,000;

(4) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2013/2017: Littoral Combat Ship $82,400,000;

(5) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2017: Expeditionary Fast Transport $6,710,000; and

(6) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2013/2017: Expeditionary Fast Transport $6,545,000.

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 2017 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

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 2018 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 $573,400,000.

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) 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. 8078. 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. 8079. 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, 2018.

SEC. 8080. 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. 8081. (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 2017: *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. 8082. 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. 8083. None of the funds made available by this Act for excess defense articles, assistance under section 2282 of title 10, United States Code, 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 et seq.) 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. 8084. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $17,000,000 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. 8085. (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. 8086. 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. 8087. 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. 8088. 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. 8089. 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. 8090. 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. 8091. (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. 8092. (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. 8093. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to $122,375,000, 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. 8094. 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. 8095. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of the provisions of section 130h of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8096. 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, 2017.

SEC. 8097. 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.

SEC. 8098. (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.

SEC. 8099. 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 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) and section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

SEC. 8100. 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. 8101. 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. 8102. (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. 8103. 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. 8104. (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.

SEC. 8105. 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. 8106. The Secretary of Defense shall post grant awards on a public Web site in a searchable format.

SEC. 8107. 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. 8108. 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.

SEC. 8109. 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. 8110. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of any agency funded by this Act who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8111. 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 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. 8112. 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. 8113. 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. 8114. 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. 8115. 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.

SEC. 8116. The amount appropriated in title II for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' is hereby reduced by $336,000,000 to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to lower than anticipated fuel costs, the total amount appropriated in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by $1,493,000,000.

SEC. 8118. 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.

SEC. 8119. 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.

SEC. 8120. 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).

SEC. 8121. 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.

SEC. 8122. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows: AH-64E Apache Helicopter and UH-60M Blackhawk Helicopter.

SEC. 8123. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $274,524,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for any purposes related to the National Defense Reserve Fleet established under section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. 4405): *Provided*, That such amounts are available for reimbursements to the Ready Reserve Force, Maritime Administration account of the United States Department of Transportation for programs, projects, activities, and expenses related to the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8124. Of the funds previously appropriated for the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund'', the Secretary of the Navy may transfer such funds to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation; and procurement, only for the purposes of sustaining, equipping, and modernizing the Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers CG-63, CG-64, CG-65, CG-66, CG-67, CG-68, CG-69, CG-70, CG-71, CG-72, CG-73, and the Whidbey Island-class dock landing ships LSD-41, LSD-42, and LSD-46: *Provided*, That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which they are transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided herein shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in the Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, not less than 30 days prior to making any transfer from the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund'', notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of such transfer: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer and obligate funds from the ''Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund'' for modernization of not more than two Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers: *Provided further*, That no more than six Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers shall be in a phased modernization at any time: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall contract for the required modernization equipment in the year prior to inducting a Ticonderoga-class cruiser for modernization: *Provided further*, That the prohibition in section 2244a(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the use of any funds transferred pursuant to this section.

SEC. 8125. The Secretary of Defense may use up to $95,000,000 appropriated in titles II and IV of this Act to develop, replace, and sustain Federal Government security and suitability background investigation information technology systems of the Office of Personnel Management: *Provided*, That such funds shall supplement, not supplant any other amounts made available to other Federal agencies for such purposes.

SEC. 8126. None of the funds made available by this Act for the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System recapitalization program may be obligated or expended for premilestone B activities after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 8127. Using funds made available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2918 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 shall include the use of energy sourced domestically within the United States 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 domestically sourced United States energy sources.

SEC. 8128. Of the amounts made available by this Act for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'' that are provided for the Defense Working Capital Fund, Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA), not less than $48,000,000 shall be used to support the transportation of fresh fruits and vegetables to commissaries in Asia and the Pacific.

SEC. 8129. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used for the acceptance of fresh fruits and vegetables at any commissary in Asia and the Pacific unless such fresh fruits and vegetables were grown within the country in which the commissary was located or were accepted for use by the Defense Commissary Agency at a location in the continental United States.

SEC. 8130. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense may be used to close, in part or in whole, or transfer, in part or in whole, from the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense of the United States, Naval Station Guantanamo Bay.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8131. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for military personnel pay, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, $340,000,000 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. 8132. 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).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8133. Additional readiness funds made available in title II of this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', and ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be transferred to and merged with any appropriation of the Department of Defense for activities related to the Zika virus in order to provide health support for the full range of military operations and sustain the health of the members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and their families, to include: research and development, disease surveillance, vaccine development, rapid detection, vector controls and surveillance, training, and outbreak response: *Provided*, That the authority provided in this section is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in Sec. 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 8134. (a) The Secretary of Defense may provide from funds appropriated in title II of this Act up to $5,000,000 for financial support for military service memorials and museums in the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of exhibits, facilities, and programs that highlight the role of women in the military.

(b)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may carry out subsection (a) by entering into contracts with nonprofit organizations under which such an organization shall carry out the activities described in such subsection.

(2) The Secretary may not enter into a contract under paragraph (1) until the congressional defense committees have received a report from the Secretary that describes how the use of such a contract will help educate and inform the public on the history and mission of the military, or support training and leadership development of military personnel, and is in the best interests of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8135. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities, or for any activity necessary for the national defense, including intelligence activities.

SEC. 8136. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the changes to the Joint Travel Regulations of the Department of Defense described in the memorandum of the Per Diem Travel and Transportation Allowance Committee titled ''UTD/CTD for MAP 118–13/CAP 118–13—Flat Rate Per Diem for Long Term TDY'' and dated October 1, 2014.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/ GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $2,426,130,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $1,154,828,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $257,501,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $63,500,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $453,542,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $349,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $591,792,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $145,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $203,174,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $172,362,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $7,905,000: *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'', $3,087,000: *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'', $15,979,000: *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'', $436,968,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $316,454,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $4,125,000: *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'', $12,582,680,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $2,186,672,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $5,029,252,000, of which up to $162,692,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'' account: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $1,082,170,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $916,496,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $166,900,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $6,870,406,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $960,626,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $3,895,434,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, 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 enhance the ability of the armed forces of Jordan to increase or sustain security along its borders, upon 15 days prior written notification to the congressional defense committees outlining the amounts intended to be provided and the nature of the expenses incurred: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $351,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $272,047,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $186,381,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $138,019,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $112,350,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $29,628,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $24,550,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $72,723,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $27,550,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $380,221,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $237,880,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $279,036,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $247,950,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund'', $750,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *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: *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 upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes herein, such amounts may be transferred back to the appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated: *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'', $3,448,715,000, 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 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 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 more than $25,000,000 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.

COUNTER-ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the ''Counter-Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant Train and Equip Fund'', $880,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *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; logistics support, supplies, and services; funding, including payments and 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 foreign security forces, irregular forces, or groups with a security mission, to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and their affiliated or associated groups: *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, or under the heading ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' in prior Acts, that was transferred to security forces, irregular forces, or groups participating, or preparing to participate in activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and returned by such forces or groups 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 equipment procured using funds provided under this heading, or under the heading, ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' in prior Acts, and not yet transferred to security forces, irregular forces, or groups participating or preparing to participate in activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense when determined by the Secretary to no longer be required for transfer to such forces or groups and upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available to provide assistance only for activities in a country designated by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as having a security mission to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and following written notification to the congressional defense committees within 15 days of such designation: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign security forces, irregular forces, or

groups: *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, by 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 fewer 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 35 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 Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided under this heading. The reports shall include claimed numbers of members in each organization, as previously defined; numbers of actual fighters trained; ideology; status of relationship for each group; the areas of operation for each group and the scope of support provided for each group, and a listing of the countries, groups, and individuals providing assistance: *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.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $795,071,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $481,900,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $828,917,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $196,100,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $610,544,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $212,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $541,723,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $240,200,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,381,410,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $8,400,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $971,037,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $626,714,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $183,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $175,100,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $120,540,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $58,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $3,086,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, to be provided to the following programs: Carrier Replacement Program, (AP), $263,000,000; DDG–51 Destroyer, $433,000,000; Amphibious Ship Replacement LXR, $1,550,000,000; Ship to Shore Connector, $160,000,000; LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $80,300,000; and Classified Programs, $600,000,000: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $3,086,300,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $214,081,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $102,530,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $213,667,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $107,463,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $2,005,549,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $1,295,716,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $335,795,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $194,420,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $478,158,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $323,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $3,479,781,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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'', $389,134,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $170,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT ACCOUNT

For procurement of rotary-wing aircraft; combat, tactical and support vehicles; other weapons; and other procurement items for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,000,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019: *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 further*, That none of the funds made available by this paragraph may be used to procure manned fixed wing aircraft, or procure or modify missiles, munitions, or ammunition: *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'', $167,522,000, 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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $67,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $106,323,000, 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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $65,990,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $42,905,000, 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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $179,919,000, 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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $20,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $140,633,000: *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'', $781,764,000, 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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $450,000,000 shall be made available to support base budget requirements as detailed in the appropriate account table included under the heading ''Title IX – Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism'' in the report accompanying this Act.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $215,333,000: *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-THREAT DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund'', $408,272,000, to remain available until

September 30, 2019: *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'', $22,062,000: *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. 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 2017.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9002. 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 $4,500,000,000 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. 9003. 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. 9004. 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 United States Central Command area of responsibility: (1) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle; and (2) 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. 9005. Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the amounts appropriated by this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commanders' 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 6 months of the fiscal year, 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 6-month period 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 fiscal year quarter, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees quarterly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the CERP 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. 9006. 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. 9007. 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. 9008. 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. 9009. 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. 9010. 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. 9011. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', up to $60,000,000 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 2017, 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 2017, 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 2017: *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. 9012. Up to $500,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund may be used to provide assistance to the Government of Jordan to support the armed forces of Jordan and to enhance security along its borders.

SEC. 9013. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Counter-Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant Train and Equip Fund'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

SEC. 9014. For the ''Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative'', $150,000,000 is hereby appropriated, 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; lethal weapons of a defensive nature; logistics support, supplies and services; sustainment; and intelligence support to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, and for replacement of any weapons or defensive articles provided to the Government of Ukraine from the inventory of the United States: *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.

SEC. 9015. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for replacement of funds for items provided to the Government of Ukraine from the inventory of the United States to the extent specifically provided for in section 9014 of this Act.

SEC. 9016. 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.

SEC. 9017. (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.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9018. 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 operation 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 funding under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2017.

SEC. 9019. 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).

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9020. 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 such amounts 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, as amended:

(1) ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, DSCA Coalition Support Fund'', 2016/2017, $300,000,000;

(2) ''Counterterrorism Partnership Fund'', 2016/2017, $200,000,000; and

(3) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2016/2018, $169,000,000.

SEC. 9021. 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.

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 20 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.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–623, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 783, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of that resolution.

Each amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 783, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 783, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–623.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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:

Page 3, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000) (increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee for coming forward on what I know is a very hard task. I thank them so very much.

I thank the Rules Committee, in this structured rule, for allowing this amendment to come forward, and I would like to share with my colleagues my intense commitment to the language of this amendment and the purpose.

Over the last year, I have been working with IFES and NDI, and I have been working with women around the world who have come here to the United States Congress to discuss peace and security.

The purpose of this amendment is to encourage the Secretary of Defense to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance to U.S. military women, to military women in other countries, so military women to military women, in combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking, and their impact on women and girls.

I recall the aftermath of the Afghan war, when we went over to Afghanistan, when they were writing the constitution. Members of the United States Congress, women, insisted on women's rights being in that constitution.

I, myself, went to Afghanistan and met with women parliamentarians, and we thought that we had secured their place in the infrastructure of that country. But, ultimately, when the Taliban rose up again, girls' schools were burned, and women were not protected.

I believe that now that more women are in the military—not only in the United States, but they are in the military around the world—this women-to-women conversation is a very important dialogue to help protect women and girls. Again, it is to give them the technical assistance and to help provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed for that technical assistance.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking has a great impact on women and girls. To find your school burned has an impact.

It will help curb terrorism, this communication between women in the military of the United States and around the world, by making available American technical military expertise to militaries in other countries like, for example, Nigeria, which is combating violent jihadists such as Boko Haram.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, healthcare providers, relief workers, school children, and members of the diplomatic corps, and the armed services.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

I ask for support for the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the gentlewoman's amendment, and thank her for her advocacy.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, again, let me thank the ranking member for his support and assistance, and let me also thank the chairman.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment for the protection and safety and security of women and girls around the world. Peace and security can be emphasized by the Jackson Lee amendment.

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 allied 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 highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this enables us to combat terrorism which now can plague 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. Chair, 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, helping our neighbors and their military build capacity to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics

trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe serves our national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 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 NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. SHUSTER. 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:

Page 7, line 14, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $170,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 14, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 15, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $135,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, to protect America's depots, arsenals, and ammunition plants, commonly known as the organic industrial base.

For over 200 years, the U.S. military has relied on a set of unique, highly technical facilities to equip its warfighters. They take equipment worn down in the field over months of hard use and remanufacture it, bringing it back to fighting condition and returning it to the hands of our Armed Forces.

In my district, Letterkenny Army Depot works tirelessly to get equipment turned around and to supply the Patriot missile battalions, the most deployed units in the Army. Everything from helicopters to small arms and tanks are brought into the depot system to be reset.

During the course of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, the organic industrial base reset more than 3.9 million items, and over $30 billion worth of equipment for the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps have been reset. In 2015 alone, over 66,000 pieces of equipment were reset in our depots.

Even better, the organic industrial base makes good business sense. For every dollar invested in depots and arsenals, $1.78 is returned to the taxpayers. Taken together, these installations are America's national security readiness insurance policy.

My amendment seeks to restore a damaging cut that will directly impact our depots and arsenals, and would do concrete damage to the ability to support the warfighter.

According to the Army, these reductions will affect the Army's ability to repair equipment needed to sustain readiness, increase unit production cost, and could result in the loss of critical skill sets.

Further, these cuts threaten Army readiness and the ability to support future operations.

ISIS is on the move. Russia is flying their jets within a few feet of our ships. And China is building a small island empire. Now is not the time to make cuts to the depots and arsenals repairing equipment so we can reuse it to defend our Nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me compare this to something that we all can relate to, and that is, if we were building a house and we had $1,000 to build the external structure of that house and, at the end of the year, we had spent $250 to build the foundation, well, that $750 that is not going to be spent this year has to be spent next year building the walls, building the roof, and building the siding. And that is what this is tantamount to doing.

□ 1445

Those equipment have long lead times. It takes them time. They can't get it all done at the end of the year, so those dollars are already obligated. They are dollars that are going to be spent to rebuild these pieces of important equipment.

With a range of dangerous enemies and a U.S. military that is stretched thin, it is not in our best national interest to strip these funds for such a critical purpose.

So I ask all Members to fully support this amendment. It is fully offset with bipartisan support, Mr. Chairman, and, again, I urge Members to accept it.

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, let me thank Chairman SHUSTER for his strong advocacy on behalf of our military, our Army, our depot, and our arsenals.

Let me explain why I am opposed to his amendment. This amendment is in response to the committee's decision to make targeted reductions to the Army Working Capital Fund due to the historically large carryover balances above the allowable ceiling. Our bill does not cut funds for Army depots. Please understand that our bill strongly supports the depots and the organic industrial base. In fact, our bill provides an additional $750 million in the fiscal year 2017 budget for additional depot maintenance work across all of our services.

I know the gentleman is aware that given the fiscal constraints under the current budgetary caps, targeted reductions aimed at money unspent helps alleviate the need for actual programmatic reductions in the Army and the department's O&M activities. I can't support an amendment that would cut operations and maintenance accounts, which this does.

These accounts provide critical funding for training, operations, maintenance, and readiness programs, things our committee bill has emphasized.

After a decade of war, restoring readiness is the top priority for both the Army and our committee. Therefore, while I appreciate my colleague's concern and pledge to work with him closely on this issue, I urge rejection of his amendment.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Again, I certainly thank the chairman and my good friend from New Jersey for being a champion for our national defense, but I disagree. I think this does hurt our readiness because these are dollars that are obligated. These are projects that aren't completed at the end of the fiscal year but have to go on to the next year. The Army, in fact, has been reducing carryover for the last 5 years, and, again, these budgets that are tight, you still have to complete the reset for this equipment to be able to go back into the field.

Again, it is already obligated, and it will impact readiness. So, again, our bill offsets it. I think we have bipartisan support, so I would, again, urge all my colleagues to support this to protect our depot system which is critical to the Nation's readiness.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman yielding, and I simply want to associate myself with his remarks.

I also have a deep respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I appreciate what he is trying to do, but as the chairman did mention, this does make cuts as far as operation, readiness, and training. So I do associate myself with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's remark.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Again, I have great respect for both the gentlemen from Indiana and New Jersey, but this, I do believe, does affect readiness. As I keep saying, these dollars are obligated. By cutting them, we will stop the flow of work once the fiscal year ends and they continue to rebuild this vital, vital equipment that needs to get back into the field and needs to be back and deployed so that our warfighters have the equipment necessary.

With that, 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. SHUSTER).

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

Mr. SHUSTER. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114–623.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. 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:

Page 7, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the United States is a leader in the research and development of directed energy technologies, including high energy lasers. Now, this technology plays a significant role for our military on and off the battlefield, offering substantial advantages to our troops.

Directed energy technology uses highly focused energy to minimize collateral damage, reduce civilian casualties, and then give our troops the advantage they need on the battlefield.

Now, I have seen these systems being developed and tested when I visited the Air Force Research Laboratory in New Mexico. I am very proud of the groundbreaking work being done there and New Mexico's contribution to developing and advancing this important technology.

Now, I hope that as this technology develops, it could spur the development, then, of non-defense and civilian-related applications.

My amendment increases the funding for the HEL–JTO by $7 million. The HEL–JTO is the High Energy Laser Joint Technology Office which oversees the high energy laser research for the Air Force, Navy, and Army.

Now, this funding will support the development of beam directors, adaptive optics, deformable mirrors, and high energy diodes. These components, in fact, will help high energy laser technology to become smaller, more portable, and more efficient, which expands the possibilities for the military.

Given that the Army's current work is focused on large ground systems that lack mobility, I was pleased that the House Appropriations Committee recognized the need for smaller and more portable directed energy technology and urged the Army to invest in directed energy capabilities for both combat vehicles and dismounted soldiers.

The committee further encouraged the Secretary of the Army to reduce the size, weight, power, and cost for these directed energy systems and to focus on integrating them into our existing or future combat and tactical vehicles as well as individual soldier weapon systems.

It is clear that the committee understands the importance of further development of this important technology through HEL–JTO, and I hope to continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that they have the funding that they need to fulfill their important mission.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that you will continue to work with me as this process moves forward in order to ensure that we are, in fact, fully investing in these and other technologies that really can make the difference, frankly, on and off the battlefield.

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.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 20, line 14, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, as our military has been severely shortchanged over the past few years from budget cuts, it has been stretched thin—too thin—and we must make some very significant decisions to ensure our military readiness remains at a level capable of addressing the expanding threats of today.

We have seen stories of airplane parts being cannibalized from museum aircraft and units making do with old or degraded resources, and our military operations and troops are suffering as a result. We have also seen evidence of buildings in disrepair, falling apart, or unusable due to their poor conditions.

This is true of the Army's old and aging ammunition plants like pictured here. These plants produce the small caliber ammunition and armaments required by our troops for training and combat operations. These critical facilities operate 24/7, 365 days a year, and they have little or no counterpart in the private sector, meaning any shutdown or production stoppage would have significant impacts and consequences for our men and women in uniform. At 75 years old, all four of these plants are in various states of disrepair and in dire need of modernization and upkeep. Failing to make this investment could result in the loss of 90 percent of all small caliber ammunition used by troops in every branch of our Armed Forces. Almost 90 percent of all small caliber ammo used by troops in every branch of our Armed Forces are produced in plants, and we must continue to provide the necessary resources to modernize these aging facilities.

The plants' conditions are the result of devastating budget cuts which have forced valuable dollars into other programs and projects. They have been neglected too long, and we must act before it is too late.

We are charged with making sure our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to address the threats of today and prepare for those of tomorrow. This amendment makes this critical investment for our troops, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARTZLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are very pleased to support the gentlewoman's amendment, and we thank her for her advocacy on behalf of much-needed modernization of these ammunition plants.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your support. It is critical that we modernize these plants, and I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. MEEHAN. 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:

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,000,000) (increased by $7,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will facilitate health screenings in communities coping with groundwater contamination from nearby defense installations. My amendment dedicates $7 million in the operations and maintenance defense-wide account to screenings for residents who, unbeknownst to them, have fallen victim to exposure to firefighting chemicals which have bled into the drinking water.

One of those sites where this has happened for over a couple of decades is in my district, a district I share with the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE, the Navy Air Station in Montgomery County, and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Bucks County in Warminster.

The Navy has been working very closely with the EPA and the public water authorities to take wells off line to address contamination and to provide public drinking water. But one of the things that they have not done is levels of screening to determine whether there has been any impact associated with the presence of what we call PFOAs, something the EPA has determined levels at which it may create a potential risk.

Make no mistake about it, the Federal Government is responsible for this. That will not be an issue which will be contested. So the question is whether there is precedent for the ability to work on something like this, allowing the Navy. And the answer is, yes, this has happened. Private entities in both Hoosick, New York, and West Virginia have worked through State authorities to enable there to be testing of thousands of local residents in situations like this to determine whether or not there could have been any local impact due to that.

So we are not asking the Defense Department to put any kind of man hours into this. We are asking them to work with what we believe are appropriate authorities that already exist, and for them to work in public-private partnerships with State entities to enable and facilitate some of this testing to take place.

I think the Navy deserves credit for being proactive in the way they have looked at this issue. But we see this as a continuing obligation and would like to see the Navy fulfill the support to enable this important, important testing to take place.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for putting important language in the appropriations bill that includes report language requiring the Pentagon to report on what sites pose a potential health risk and its plan to address them. I am very thankful to my friend, Representative BRENDAN F. BOYLE from Philadelphia, who has worked closely with me on this issue. But I also understand, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the committee has some observations on this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman's concerns and share those concerns very deeply, as do all members of our committee.

Concerns about PFCs have been proliferating nationwide as more evidence becomes available about the toxicity of these compounds.

□ 1500

Our bill does provide $33 billion for the Defense Health Program and another $289 million for the Navy Environmental Restoration Program, nearly $8 million more than requested.

However, it has come to our attention that the Department may lack the authority presently to administer blood screening tests or spend funds requested by my colleague for this specific activity. Our committee is certainly committed to working with him and thanks him for his leadership. We will be working very closely with him and closely with the State of Pennsylvania to see what sort of partnerships we could put together to address this problem and what would be a success in Pennsylvania. We could look across the Nation for implementation as well.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague who also represents Montgomery County and parts near Philadelphia, Mr. MEEHAN. It has been an absolute pleasure to work with him on this issue on a bipartisan basis, as well as our colleague, Mr. FITZPATRICK, from Bucks County.

Mr. Chair, PFOA and PFOS are chemical compounds, PFCs, that are found in the firefighting foams that have been used on military bases throughout the country. The EPA and other agencies are testing these chemicals for suspected links to cancer and other serious health impacts and recently lowered advisory levels for drinking water.

This past March, the DOD released a list of 664 sites nationwide where these firefighting foams might have been used and similarly infiltrated local groundwater. Every State in the Union has at least one of these sites. The DOD is currently investigating.

To date, 16 public wells and 140 private wells in our area have been taken offline because of the Navy's contamination at and around the former Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove in my district. This list will likely grow.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment to give the gentleman a further opportunity to make his case, and I also recognize his leadership on this important issue.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey showing that those from Philadelphia and those from across the Delaware River, in New Jersey, can get along, and I appreciate his support on this issue.

Just to continue and conclude with what I was saying, the Navy and National Guard have taken responsibility for contamination and have agreed to pay approximately $19 million to provide replacement water, install filtration systems on affected public wells, and hook homes with affected public wells into public water systems, but the community is seeking information regarding their years—possibly decades—of past exposure due to our military's contamination.

I think the amendment that Mr. MEEHAN and I are offering for $7 million in the context of a $32 billion operations, maintenance, and defense-wide account for screenings is reasonable. I understand, though, the recent Defense Department concerns.

I look forward to working with the chairman, as well as the ranking member, to ensure that we continue to fight for and advocate for our constituents in Montgomery County and Bucks County and all those potentially across the country who may be affected by this same issue. It is an issue that this body must pay closer attention to. Let's inform communities as the Defense Department investigates the potential scope of this issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I, again, thank both of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would add my voice to the chair's. I look forward to working with both gentlemen on this very important issue. I do appreciate him raising it and do look forward to working with the chairman and with the both of them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman and the chairman and the ranking member for their recognition of the issue and their willingness to work with Mr. BOYLE and Mr. FITZPATRICK in Bucks County, who is similarly situated, and myself. I look forward to working with both of those

gentlemen and the committee on this issue.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I rise to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Representatives MEEHAN and BOYLE, in supporting an amendment that would provide health screenings for our constituents.

The DOD has begun the process of checking whether chemical compounds like PFOS and PFOA may have contaminated groundwater surrounding more than 660 military sites across the nation, including confirmed contamination around the former Naval Air Warfare Center in Warminster and former Willow Grove Naval Station in Horsham. In each of these instances, both public and private wells in my district have been impacted by contaminated groundwater—rightly concerning residents and local leaders.

Because of this immediate and widespread concern, it is only right the Department increase efforts to offer health screenings in communities surrounding these formerly used defense sites. This simple amendment clears that path by increasing funding for these screenings.

I urge this body to support this bipartisan amendment and, in doing so, reaffirm this government's commitment to protecting the health and safety of its citizens.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 783, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 7, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73 printed in House Report 114–623, offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey:

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $40,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $32,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $32,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $32,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY OF ARIZONA

Page 146, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000) (increased by $100,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 7, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,600,000)''.

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

Page 7, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,086,000) (increased by $6,086,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY OF WISCONSIN

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER OF NEW YORK

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 85, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 85, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. ADERHOLT OF ALABAMA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $17,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $17,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following:''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,500,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER OF MISSOURI

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $8,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $8,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''. 4

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY OF MARYLAND

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,800,000)''.

Page 84, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR OF NEW JERSEY

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $12,500,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $12,500,000) (reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 85, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

Page 30, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000) (increased by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD OF HAWAII

Page 31, line 8, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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 enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a 3-year period preceding the 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;

(2) is presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a 3-year period preceding the offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction account), insert 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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the majority and minority have agreed to this en bloc amendment package. These are noncontroversial amendments that cover topics such as lung cancer, personnel security, and gulf war illness. The sponsors of the amendments have agreed to the amendments being considered en bloc.

I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply would indicate that I, too, support the en bloc amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank, again, both gentlemen, the ranking member and the chairman.

I have come to the floor to emphasize these two amendments that are very important, I believe, to the work of the Defense Department and the many persons that they serve. I want to speak to the Jackson Lee amendment that addresses the question of post-traumatic stress disorder by emphasizing the numbers of individuals who are now coming back from service that have PTSD. PTSD has been discovered post the time of leaving the battlefield. Post-traumatic stress disorder is where one repeatedly relives the trauma of war in their thoughts—the day in and day out nightmares.

Texas, in particular, is a State that has a large number of returning veterans.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In the name of a young boy who was killed by a former marine who indicated that he had post-traumatic stress disorder, this increase of $1 million is important.

Finally, let me say, triple negative breast cancer kills more women. It is important that there be an emphasis of up to $10 million for added research to ensure that this deadly aspect of breast cancer does not continue to kill women not only in the United States military, but elsewhere. As a survivor, let me be very clear that this research has not yet been completed. Lives have not yet been saved.

I hope these amendments will be passed because it provides $10 million for triple negative breast cancer and $1 million for post-traumatic stress disorder.

I ask support for the Jackson Lee amendments.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I would like to begin by thanking the staff and respective chairman and ranking member and my colleagues as well, FRANK LOBIONDO and LOIS CAPPS, who co-chair with me the Lung Cancer Caucus. I have come to be so impressed with the hard work that the staff and the chairman and the ranking member do to bring this legislation forward.

My amendment would simply increase the amount of money available for lung cancer research by $2 million, from $12 million to $14 million, in the hope that we can do better.

Mr. Chairman, $2 million, I know, is but a dent in the Defense operations budget, but it is a source of great hope and great promise for people struggling with lung cancer, the most deadly of all cancers. 159,000 people, including many veterans, are victims of that each year.

I think so many of you know that my daughter Katherine was diagnosed some time ago with an advanced stage form of lung cancer. I would be remiss if I didn't thank my colleagues for their prayers, for their condolences, for their support, and for their support for this medical research to give hope to the victims of lung cancer for the future because, but for the money that this Congress has appropriated, my daughter wouldn't be experiencing the hope that she has for her recovery. With this additional amendment—it is a small one—I am appreciative of your support for it because it provides not only great hope for Katherine and her family, but it offers hope for so many more people all across the country affected with this dreadful disease.

I thank the committee, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for adding this amendment to the en bloc package, and to staff for their coordination and effort.

My amendment would increase funding for the Information Assurance Scholarship Program by $5 million and decrease the operation and maintenance defense-wide Office of the Secretary of Defense administrative account by the same amount.

The IASP is a DOD program designed to address our cyber personnel demands through the recruitment and retention of top IT and cybersecurity talent. It allows the Secretary of Defense to provide financial assistance to individuals pursuing studies in computer and network security in exchange for their obligation to either serve in the Armed Forces or fulfill a DOD civilian service commitment postgraduation.

Using 2014 numbers, the DOD has employed over 500 IASP/CAE—Centers for Academic Excellence—graduates, and has seen a 97 percent completion rate since the program was started in 2001.

It is imperative that we give the Department of Defense the tools necessary to recruit those personnel charged with protecting our critical infrastructure, fortifying DOD networks, and conducting computer network operations.

We must make sure that we have the right people with the proper training in the right positions, and this amendment would aid in that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I once again thank the chairman and the ranking member.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise today to encourage all members to support the Rooney amendment (Number 7) to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2017, H.R. 5293, to reverse DOD's reimbursement rate cuts for Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA) therapy for children of service members with autism.

Military life presents unique challenges for children with autism and their families, given the frequent changes of residence and schools, and the prolonged absences of a parent. In this context, coverage of ABA therapy is even more necessary to help military children adjust day-to-day, while also improving outcomes over the long term.

The Administration's reduction in the reimbursement rates for ABA for military children with autism could jeopardize access to this critical therapy. ABA is proven to bring about positive behavior change and assist in a child's long term development, especially for children with autism, and the program must be protected.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I'd like to offer a statement in support of my amendment to H.R. 5293, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee. I commend my colleague, Rep. RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, for his work on the bill before us and I thank him and all the members of the subcommittee and staff for their hard work in crafting this important piece of legislation.

My amendment seeks to transfer $6.086 million from within the Navy's fiscal year 2017 Operations & Maintenance (O&M) account, to increase funding for the Weapons Support, Fleet Ballistic Missiles, Project 934, Engineering and Technical Services sub-account managed by the Navy's Strategic Systems Program office. My objective in offering this amendment is to strengthen nuclear deterrence by improving the operational readiness and reliability of the Navy's Strategic Weapons Systems aboard Fleet Ballistic Missile submarines.

At a time when Russia is flexing its nuclear muscles, both China and Russia are aggressively modernizing every aspect of their nuclear arsenals, and North Korea is conducting long-range missile tests and underground nuclear weapon tests, it is incumbent on Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient funds to ensure the operational readiness and reliability of our nuclear forces, including the most survivable leg of the U.S. nuclear triad, the sea-launched ballistic missiles aboard fleet ballistic missile submarines.

A strategic weapon system consists of the launches, fire control, navigation, test instrumentation, missile, missile checkout, guidance and re-entry subsystems. Funding in this particular account provides support for all subsystem equipment aboard Trident II (D–5) submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and at shore facilities. Critical readiness-related efforts include: maintenance for subsystem equipment aboard SLBMs; equipment renewal and updating during overhauls; testing and repair of various electronic and other components and subcomponents; logistics control procedures; operational flight testing; support of crew training; technical engineering services required to test, analyze and maintain reliability of the weapon system; missile maintenance operations; and targeting support.

According to the Navy's Congressional Budget Justification Book, in Fiscal Year 2017 the Strategic Systems Program office was forced to absorb a program decrease in Operational Engineering Support of over $6 million. This reduction will negatively impact Navy readiness in areas such as missile anomaly evaluations, re-entry body accuracy, launcher reliability maintenance, navigation accuracy, and guidance system performance evaluations.

I remind my colleagues of the fact that the Trident II (D–5) strategic weapon system will likely be in service through at least 2040, and possibly through 2080. This places a premium on engineering and technical services such as qualification and accelerated life testing, and other readiness-support efforts aimed not only at sustaining the missile system but also on ensuring its reliability.

Furthermore, I would add that my amendment is entirely consistent with one of the main themes and thrusts of this bill—and the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) as well—namely, identifying serious shortfalls in readiness across the armed forces and taking steps to address those readiness challenges by adding funding, where necessary and appropriate. A nearly identical increase to this account was also authorized in the House's NDAA.

In sum, given the increasingly dangerous global security environment, we must take proactive steps to bolster nuclear deterrence—and the readiness and reliability of systems such as the sea-launched ballistic missiles aboard SSBNs on which deterrence rests. My amendment is intended to move a modest amount of funds ($6.086 million) within the Navy Operations & Maintenance (O&M) account of over $40 billion to help sustain the readiness of a key leg of the U.S. Nuclear Triad, our Trident II (D–5) submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak on amendment number 63 which has been included in the first en bloc package. My amendment seeks to increase funding for the Department of Defense Peer-Reviewed Cancer Research Program by $8 million in order to fight bladder cancer, brain cancer, colorectal cancer, liver cancer, lymphoma, melanoma and other skin cancers, mesothelioma, pancreatic cancer, stomach cancer, and cancer in children, adolescents, and young adults.

I'd like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their support of this measure, and for accepting it into this package. It is my hope that this additional funding will be used to contribute to the creation of a cure for these horrific cancers. Every year, millions of Americans die far too early from these diseases. Perhaps, however, our actions here today will lead to a world where future generations will not have to know the pain of such losses. Thank you to each of my colleagues who supported this measure, and to the many groups who lent their support as well—including: Action to Cure Kidney Cancer, American Brain Tumor Association, American Urological Association, Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, Bladder Cancer Action Network, Fight Colorectal Cancer, Melanoma Research Foundation, and Pancreatic Cancer Action Network.

We may not know the end of cancer in our lifetimes, but I pray we can find it during my children's. I submit the following letter:

JUNE 15, 2016.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, The undersigned organizations strongly support the recent approval by the Senate Committee on Appropriations of $60 million for the Peer Reviewed Cancer Research Program (PRCRP) in their version of the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations Act.

We are therefore encouraged to learn of an amendment that will be offered by Representative Grace Meng (D–NY) to the House version of the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2017 (H.R. 5293) to move funding for the PRCRP closer to the Senate level. Specifically, the Meng amendment increases by $8 million the $30 million appropriation for the Peer Reviewed Cancer Research Program (PRCRP) included in the bill.

Funded at $50 million in fiscal year 2016, the PRCRP funds innovative, cutting-edge research on a variety of cancers. Since Fiscal Year 2009, the PRCRP has funded innovative basic, applied, and translational cancer research to support our nation's military service personnel, their families, and the American public. Members of the military are exposed to hazardous environments due to the nature of their service and deployments and are therefore at risk for the development of many types of cancers. Funding innovative and translational research, the PRCRP focuses on the gaps in cancer research with respect to unique situations and military environments.

As approved by the House Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 5293 provides $30 million for the PRCRP and includes as eligible areas of study: bladder cancer, brain cancer, colorectal cancer, listeria vaccine for cancer, liver cancer, lymphoma, melanoma and other skin cancers, mesothelioma, pancreatic cancer, stomach cancer, and cancer in children, adolescents, and young adults.

House approval of the Meng amendment would bring the PRCRP funding level closer to the $60 million approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in their version of the Defense Appropriations. We hope that you will support this amendment to ensure the strongest possible funding level is included in the House-Senate conference for the final enacted version of the Defense Appropriations Act.

Thank you for your consideration of this important request.

Sincerely,

Action to Cure Kidney Cancer, American Brain Tumor Association, American Urological Association, Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, Bladder Cancer Action Network, Fight Colorectal Cancer, Lymphoma Research Foundation, Melanoma Research Foundation, Pancreatic Cancer Action Network.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. PAULSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. PAULSEN. 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:

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their hard work in bringing this important legislation to the floor today. It is vital that we do provide our men and women in uniform with the support and resources they need to keep our country safe. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to provide funding for Defense Production Act purchases for strategic radiation-hardened microelectronics.

Through research, development, and testing we have been able to create the

most sophisticated weapons systems in the world. These systems are created using thousands of different parts, many of which utilize some of the most advanced technology that is available anywhere.

□ 1515

One of those products that many of our systems rely on is radiation-hardened microelectronics. These microelectronics are specially designed to withstand extremely harsh natural and manmade radiation environments. Although they can be small, they play a large role in ensuring our systems work in the toughest conditions.

The Department of Defense requires accesses to these unique products from sources that it knows and that it trusts to be responsible for handling those components with the utmost security. That is why, in 2004, the DOD created the Trusted Foundry Program for microelectronics.

This program would ensure that the DOD had access to cutting-edge microelectronics that were produced right here in America by American companies. The Trusted Foundry Program has given the DOD the peace of mind of knowing that the microelectronics they receive are not counterfeit, are not tampered with, and have not been compromised in any way as to jeopardize our national security.

Unfortunately, through challenges both inside and outside of the DOD's control, we now find ourselves in the unenviable position of having no clear vision for the future of this vital program. One issue that we currently face is that there is a shrinking number of American-owned and -operated companies that are capable of producing strategic radiation-hardened microelectronics. We now face the stark decision of trusting foreign-owned entities or of scrapping these products altogether.

I think we all share the same belief that the DOD needs to reevaluate its long-term strategic plan on how it plans to acquire microelectronics going forward. However, in the meantime, we should make sure that we have continued access to these products from sources that the Department already knows and trusts.

Mr. Chair, that is simply what this amendment aims to do by providing the funding for purchases through the Defense Production Act. The Defense Production Act was created to make sure we always have access to the industrial resources that are necessary for national defense. This year's report that accompanies the National Defense Authorization Act highlights the exact same concerns that I have raised. In fact, the NDAA encourages the Secretary of Defense to do exactly what this amendment would do, which is to use his authority under the Defense Production Act to ensure that continued access to a domestic supply for strategic radiation-hardened microelectronics is there.

Mr. Chair, we should make sure that the DOD has access to as many trusted domestic suppliers as it possibly can instead of relying on just a single supplier for these products. The challenges that a single supplier presents have been well highlighted by the GAO in the past.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAULSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ZINKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $80,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $80,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chair, 2 weeks ago, when I held events across Montana to finally welcome our Vietnam veterans home and present them with the 50th Anniversary Vietnam Veteran Lapel Pin, many of these veterans were surprised to find out that the same UH–1 Novembers that they flew in in Vietnam are still in service today. Even more astonishing is that these 50-year helicopters are still used to protect our national nuclear missile sites.

Mr. Chair, I commend our men and women in uniform who are still able to maintain these aircraft in a constant state of readiness, but, in reality, the Huey is incapable of meeting the mission requirements they face today. In fact, they have failed multiple exercises, not from personnel issues but from equipment issues.

This amendment will provide the funding that is necessary for the Air Force to expedite a full and open competition to replace these aging aircraft. It is critical we provide our men and women who protect our Nation's nuclear missiles and arsenals with the equipment that is capable of meeting the requirements of this important mission.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZINKE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I commend the gentleman for bringing this important issue to our attention. We support his amendment and commend him for his work.

This is something that needs to be done. It is hard to believe that we are still flying Hueys out there, and the fact that we are moving into competition I think is a very positive development.

I thank the gentleman for his special service to our Nation.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and his staff for the hard work they have done in helping me to bring this to the floor. It was a learning experience for all of us. I thank the gentleman for his efforts and work.

I also thank the Vietnam veterans. They don't have to look at the UH–1s flying to protect our missiles again.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, we can raise living standards for families who have members who are working for Federal contractors right now. I propose in this amendment that we can raise that living standard for working families across the country if we use the Federal dollars to create good jobs.

My amendment would reprogram funds to create an Office of Good Jobs in the Department of Defense that would help ensure that the Department's procurement, grant-making, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices.

Right now, the U.S. Government is America's leading low-wage job funder, funding over 2 million poverty jobs through contracts, loans, and grants with corporate America. That is more than the total number of low-wage workers who are employed by Walmart and McDonald's combined. Many U.S. contract workers who work for Federal contractors earn so little that nearly 40 percent use public assistance programs, like food stamps and Section 8, to feed and shelter their families. To add insult to injury, many of these low-wage U.S. contract workers are driven deeper into poverty because their employers take away their wages through wage theft—breaking other Federal laws.

Now, some people might think, well, the debarment system covers this. Why is this necessary? The fact is you can get away with a lot of labor violations before you are debarred, yet there are some Federal contractors who have excellent employee relations, who pay decent wages, who allow collective bargaining, and who never engage in wage theft. These good contractors are competing with the bad ones.

Not only is this Office of Good Jobs going to prioritize the best public contractors, but it will also make sure that workers are treated fairly and that good, high road contractors are treated fairly.

Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his effort to look at the largest Federal employer and look at ensuring that we do everything possible to make sure employees have living wage jobs and that there are responsible employment practices.

I tell people repeatedly what my greatest regret of public service is. When I came to the United States Congress on staff in 1977, the real hourly wage for 1-hour's worth of human labor, whether it was pushing papers, waiting on tables in a diner, or working for the military, or in a mill, was more in 1977 in the United States of America than it is today. I do think that we ought to look at Federal resources and do everything possible to make sure that people do have a living wage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, 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. Chair, this amendment would create a new office that would require the Department of Defense to make subjective determinations concerning a contractor's or a grant provider's workplace policies. The amendment would delay and disrupt an already complicated Federal procurement system and would harm a potentially large civilian contracting workforce that is essential to the missions and the operations of the Department of Defense. Furthermore, this amendment is unnecessary and duplicative of the many efforts that are already underway by the Department. The best way to ensure that government contracts or provides grants to the best employers is to enforce the existing suspension and debarment system.

Finally, the amendment reprograms funds away from the Department's operations and maintenance accounts—accounts which are critical to supporting our warfighters—and restores readiness to the services and to, may I say, our committee's top priority.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, first of all, I have a particular story I would like to tell.

There is a young woman named Mayra who works at the Pentagon food court. She was fired after challenging her managers to comply with labor laws and for going on strike multiple times in response to those violations.

Mayra is a first-generation immigrant who is struggling to pay her tuition at George Mason University. She now works odd jobs to make ends meet. Her experience at the Pentagon has inspired her to seek further education so she can help workers who get treated unfairly.

Research shows that Mayra is not alone. Federal contractors break Federal laws sometimes—not all. Many are good, but not all are, and the bad ones are not good for the United States. A U.S. Senate report, for example, found that over 30 percent of the biggest penalties for law-breaking were filed against the biggest U.S. contractors. This is an issue. We need an office to make sure that the best public contractors—Federal contractors—are the ones who get the best contracts and who get preferential treatment over the ones who have multiple violations.

Workers aren't the only ones who benefit from this new office, as I already mentioned. Let me emphasize that this is about benefiting law-abiding contractors, high road employers. They are competing with people who cut every corner and do the least to avoid debarment. We need to make sure that our system works well and that the largest spender of money in the world—the U.S. Government—spends it wisely, not with the ones who can barely skate by through the debarment process but with the best contractors, the ones who really prioritize good employment practices.

I ask Members to vote in favor of this amendment. It is a step toward bringing forth good jobs and closing this awful wage gap and wage stagnation we have seen in our country for 30 years. Please give us a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. Chair, it is intended that funds in the appropriation for Defense Wide Operations and Maintenance be used to establish an Office of Good Jobs in the Department aimed at ensuring that the Department's procurement, grantmaking, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices. The office's structure shall be substantially similar to the Centers for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships located within the Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce, Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Small Business Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and U.S. Agency for International Development.

Mr. Chair, I 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 NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1530

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment pluses up the account for extended-range cannon artillery, and it is paid for.

I want to begin by thanking the leadership of this esteemed committee, both the chairman and the ranking member, for their teamwork and also for their great work. I have been here 6 years, and I think this is the strongest bill that I have seen with regard to Defense Appropriations. I am deeply grateful.

Let me say that a principle for our country dating back to the founding is one of peace through strength, which relies on this concept of deterrence. It certainly brings forward a strong military with the intent that we would deter potential adversaries so, indeed, that we can empower our diplomats.

On our best day, other countries want to be like us, and this bill here is critically important toward that end. Look, after this past weekend, as we continue to mourn for those killed in the terrorist attack in Florida, I think it is on everyone's mind how important it is that we get this bill passed.

With regard to peace through strength and deterrence, I do have some concerns. Inasmuch as I am a very strong advocate of this bill, I am concerned about where we are today

with regard to our indirect fires capability. In some regard, it is understandable that we are beginning to fall behind some of our potential adversaries, certainly our competitors.

We have spent the last 15 years consumed in efforts to protect our people, protect our homeland, existential threats from terrorists, and that has led to largely counterinsurgency operations. And that has been somewhat at the detriment to our full spectrum capability, including indirect fires.

Part of our concept is we do rely heavily on close air support as part of this, understanding that, but saying that there is some risk to that. And I do appreciate the fact that the committee has actually taken note of this. There is a plus-up in this bill, and I want to commend both the chairman and ranking member for doing that. I think that we need more.

I would encourage my colleagues, if they haven't already, to take a look at the writings of Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster. I think he is a visionary. He is a great battlefield commander. I served under his command in Iraq in 2005, and he continues to do great work for this Nation. He has written about Russian activities, for example, in Ukraine and Syria. And it is clear that Russia and China are continuing to march forward with their capabilities, including in Ukraine, where Russia has shown a very extensive capability to mass fires. Candidly, they outrange our artillery, and I think this is something we need to address.

So I brought forward this amendment. It does plus-up this account by a million dollars. I mean, candidly, we could do more. But I do want to commend the committee for what they have done so far, and I think our amendment would help reinforce that.

I want to also say, as proud as I am of all of this work, I want to say, too, that I am very proud of the work of those men and women who serve us in the industrial base.

The work that is done on cannons is done in Watervliet, New York, at the Watervliet Arsenal. I am very proud of their work, but no one is more proud than their own Representative. Their own Representative is here with us today. He sponsors this bill. He is a Democrat from New York, and his name is PAUL TONKO.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON), my colleague and friend for yielding and for leading us on this very important amendment.

Improving our artillery weapons system has been identified as a need by the Army Modernization Strategy. This amendment would make a modest increase to the Army's weapons and munitions advanced technology funding for extended-range cannon artillery.

We know that with additional research, development, and testing, we can make meaningful advances to these systems. Unfortunately, these systems have been overlooked in recent years as we have chosen to modernize other parts of our forces.

During this time, other countries have begun to produce artillery with new capabilities such as improved range, mobility, and accuracy. Not only does this increase the risk to our warfighters in the field, it has encouraged our allies to consider purchasing these systems from elsewhere.

I know we are capable of designing and building the best artillery in the world. I have seen it firsthand at the Watervliet Arsenal and Benet Laboratories in my district where hundreds of women and men support our warfighters by developing and manufacturing cutting-edge cannons and mortars.

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, we know that. It is a great inspiration just by their tradition alone.

We have an incredibly skilled workforce, the best in the world. Now we just need to make the investments necessary to ensure the products they manufacture will continue to be the best as well.

Once again, I thank our colleague, Congressman GIBSON, for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the esteemed chairman of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for his advocacy on behalf of some remarkable installations in the State of New York. May I say we have a very close working relationship through Picatinny Arsenal. Firepower is important, considering what our adversaries are utilizing today and may be using in the future.

I am pleased to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I appreciate the support.

I just want to express my gratitude to both the chairman, the ranking member, and the committee staff. I know that this bill takes a lot of work, and I deeply appreciate all of those who are involved. I thank my friend and colleague, PAUL TONKO, for his great support and great work on this issue.

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. GIBSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $29,800,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $33,900,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

I am pleased to offer this bipartisan amendment today with my friends, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. NUGENT. The Navy's electromagnetic rail gun is a technology described as revolutionary and a potential multimission game changer for long-range, land-attack, ballistic, and cruise missile defense, and antisurface warfare.

Mr. Chairman, the best mix of air and missile defenses will consist of complementary kinetic and nonkinetic weapons systems, enhancing our capability to defeat larger salvos of air and missile threats.

Rail guns have the capability to fire at higher velocities, which means longer ranges. Under certain conditions, a 32-megajoule gun will be able to launch projectiles more than 100 nautical miles. And it is more cost-effective. Whereas low-cost kinetic defenses run around $400,000 each, surface-to-air interceptors and guided hypervelocity projectiles can be as low as $25,000 to $40,000 each.

My amendment also provides for the mount for the rail gun, a necessity that was promised to the Navy, appropriated but ultimately never delivered.

So this bipartisan amendment tracks the funds authorized in the FY17 NDAA and continues to provide imperative assistance to our Navy as they pursue high-tech, game-changing weapons systems across the fleet.

We must also not leave our sailors high and dry on a technology that we promised, one that is critical to the future of our military and promises to change the landscape of our missile defense capabilities at sea.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that would restore the funding for the directed energy weapons and rail gun.

If this funding reduction is left in place, then contracts will have to be renegotiated. Generally, those result in higher funding later on. We will lose a workforce that has been built and crafted generally over a long period of time, and that would require additional years getting back to this.

As my colleague from Connecticut said, this is about defending, in many instances, surface combatants. The

current opportunities are very expensive with a laser or rail gun. The cost per shot is dramatically less than it will be under the way we currently try to defend these multibillion-dollar assets as they move forward.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, these cuts are ill-timed and the program is mature to the point that it is ready to go that way. I understand we have a legitimate difference of opinion with my colleagues on our side of the aisle and the staff. This clearly may be one of those glass-half-full/glass-half-empty kind of scenarios. But many of us who look at this program—I am on the Seapower Subcommittee—believe that this program does, in fact, need to move forward.

I would request a positive end result and an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments. I support what he had to say and concur.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the distinguished co-chair of the Directed Energy Caucus.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his strong support of our national defense and especially for his leadership as ranking member of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee where we serve together. I also thank the gentleman for his engaged and well-informed chairmanship with me of the Directed Energy Caucus.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment because a rail gun is a game-changing, third-offset technology that has many applications across warfare domains and very high potential for a significant leap in capability.

It should also save money in the long term as guided hypervelocity projectiles, as has been mentioned, only cost around $30,000 apiece. Without this critical funding, this program will be hard-pressed to make progress and keep moving forward. This next-generation technology will be delayed, and warfighters will lack long-range precision fires against multiple threats.

Finally, funding is offset from an account that was originally intended for the exact same purpose.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but do so reluctantly because the three previous speakers I have a very high regard for.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, the gentleman's amendment would restore a funding reduction and increase funding above the President's budget request for the Navy power projection advanced technology line.

While the Navy's high-energy laser program has its merits, it is one of the many examples of defense programs that has had, quite honestly, significant increases in funding for fiscal year 2017, in fact, 250 percent greater than the enacted level. So it hasn't been impoverished.

Our funding reduction still allows for a level that is more than 160 percent of the enacted level, a significant growth that allows for additional testing but puts the program on a path to actually be able to obligate funding in a manageable timeframe.

Our committee has a responsibility to conduct appropriate budget oversight, reducing funding to programs that aren't justified and adding funding to programs that aren't fully funded.

Appropriate budget oversight, reducing a program that is funded above its needs is an example of what I think we see, to some extent, here with this amendment.

We see no justifiable reason to add funding to this line, but it may be a matter of disagreement, but I think we have taken a close look at it.

This technology has great potential, but it also has significant development challenges that may be difficult to overcome. The weapons require very substantial power sources, cooling platforms, and corrosion protection.

The program should be continued in a fiscally responsible manner, which includes slowing funding to an appropriate level. I think we have reached that level.

While we may have some disagreement here, we are certainly supportive of the program, but I do reluctantly oppose the amendment put forward by these three great gentlemen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. And although we respectfully disagree, I hope my colleagues will see the wisdom of following what the House Armed Services Committee did and add additional funding for this great capability, which is a game-changing technology which will better protect both our fleet, also ultimately all of our military assets, and our men and women in uniform who serve.

I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $108,515,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $108,515,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

□ 1545

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to urge the House to support my bipartisan amendment to restore critical missile defense funding for next-generation investments. I want to be clear: the mark by the gentleman from New Jersey is a good mark. I support it. I just want to improve it a little.

Mr. Chairman, Deputy Secretary of Defense Bob Work has recently stated: ''Competitors have caught up on this regime and they're going to fire mass guided missile salvos at us . . . it doesn't have to be a kinetic solution. Hell, I don't really want a kinetic solution . . . it's got to be something else.''

Last week my subcommittee received a classified briefing by the Joint Staff on the results of the Joint Capabilities Mix Study IV. It is clear that we have to change the way we do missile defense if we expect to win in future years.

Our adversaries have not been standing still, and we can't stand still either. This amendment I offer, along with 13 colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FRANKS, and Mr. LAMBORN, would simply restore the funding to the level of the President's budget for directed energy efforts in the weapons technology and technology maturation initiatives lines as well as the special programs—MDA technology line.

My amendment offsets this increase by cutting RDT&E for the KC–46 tanker program's budget request, which is not executable this year according to the GAO's recent budget fact sheet, and the Air Force does not dispute this fact. My office can share this document with any Member who has questions about the cut, which both the House and Senate NDAAs have also recommended.

Again, I strongly support the mark of the gentleman from New Jersey. I urge the House to support my bipartisan amendment to improve it and allow us the room to continue to work on this bill in the conference committee.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, again, reluctantly.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly knowing that

the gentleman is extremely knowledgeable and is a strong advocate for some very important things that relate to our missile defense. However, I do believe in responsible budgeting, which is a prerogative of our subcommittee. As stewards of taxpayer dollars, we prioritize funding programs at appropriate levels, levels that the Department can obligate responsibly in a timely manner. As such, when projects such as the weapons technology directed energy line are continually slow to develop and lag significantly behind other similar technology developments, reductions are warranted.

The funding provided in this bill provides $9 million for each of three projects to continue. This is an opportunity for these laboratories—and they are remarkable laboratories—to prove that their demonstrations will be effective and deserve to continue to be funded in the future. A more advanced directed energy line, technology maturation initiatives, was supported in our bill at an increase of 275 percent over the enacted level.

The minor reduction in this program is due to the fact that funding will not be obligated in fiscal year 2017 to purchase long lead items, making the request early to need. Let me reiterate, we are highly supportive of the program. However, funding should be appropriately timed to the schedule.

As for the request to restore $72 million in funding to a special program line, which, due to its classification we cannot discuss in an open forum, the funding is not tied to any requirement. We are concerned, and it is reflected in our bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would associate myself with the chairman's remarks. I appreciate what the gentleman from Alabama wants to do, but I do oppose his amendment for two reasons primarily.

One, obviously, under the circumstances we find ourselves in, he had to find the money for the increase, and it was taken from research and development for the United States Air Force, also vitally needed research and development dollars.

And, secondly, dollars do matter, but dollars have to be effectively spent.

It is not my personal belief that any additional dollars to this particular account—given the analysis that the committee has done on the budget this year—can be effectively spent.

So, again, I join with the chairman in respectful opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding. I do thank the gentlemen from both New Jersey and Indiana for their good work. Most of the time I am going to agree with their recommendations, but I reluctantly have to disagree in this case.

I rise in strong support of this amendment because we must do everything we can to protect our country from nuclear attack, especially in light of the rapidly growing threat from Iran, North Korea, and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, increasingly sophisticated ballistic missile technology is being widely produced and proliferated, and there is a long list of bad actors that currently have or desire this technology. According to the intelligence community, ballistic missile systems are becoming more mobile, survivable, reliable, accurate, and capable of striking targets over longer distances.

Today we can trust our current system and those who operate it to keep us safe and our allies safe from ballistic missiles, including warfighters like NORTHCOM/NORAD and the 100th Missile Defense Brigade in my district, and those doing the research and development, capably led by Admiral Syring of the Missile Defense Agency. However, we must not rest on our laurels. We must invest now in future technologies to be prepared to face future threats.

Most important, as my colleagues pointed out, there is consensus among senior DOD leaders as well as outside experts that nonkinetic, third-offset technologies such as directed energy are vital both to maintain superiority and to enable us to transition to a more cost-effective approach to missile defense over the long term. The current cost equation is against us. Our interceptor missiles we use to shoot down threats cost much more than hostile missiles we may have to destroy, and buying enough interceptors to counter a proliferating threat is ultimately a huge challenge.

Finally, I would simply point out that this amendment restores funding that is so highly classified, we can't debate it publicly, but suffice it to say that it has great promise to help us protect our homeland and keep Americans safe.

I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama on the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces. It is an honor to serve with him as vice chairman.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would just close by saying I have enormous respect for the gentleman from New Jersey. I just disagree on this particular issue.

I would like to point out the GAO language in particular for this offset that I have offered.

GAO says:

> The Air Force fiscal year 2017 RDT&E budget request for the KC–46 program could be reduced by up to $140 million because fiscal year 2016 RDT&E funds are potentially in excess to program need.

So we have the money to pay for this. It is a critical national security need. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, again, I will say that I understand the gentleman's concerns. We respect them. We certainly respect his position and knowledge and commitment of the members of his subcommittee. They are experts.

We also take a look at the bottom line as well. We understand the gentleman's concerns that we properly fund homeland defense initiatives of the Missile Defense Agency. That is why our bill includes $130 million above the request for important Homeland Security defense priorities, including the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System and the Aegis Weapons System, two systems that have demonstrated their capacity to perform, that should be, quite honestly, robustly funded.

I have no further comments and would ask that the amendment be opposed.

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

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. 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 Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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:

> Page 31, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,802,000)''.
>
> Page 170, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,802,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Air Force plans to acquire 1,000 next-generation air-launched cruise missiles, otherwise known as the long-range standoff weapon. This is double the size of the existing nuclear-armed cruise missile arsenal. However, many experts have already told us there is no need for nuclear-armed cruise missiles.

We already have the most advanced bomber ever created in our arsenal, the

B–2 Stealth bomber, and the Air Force will be acquiring new B–21 Stealth bombers. These bombers are capable of penetrating enemy airspace and dropping a nuclear bomb directly above a target, making nuclear-armed cruise missiles redundant.

If we decide we want to shoot nuclear missiles from thousands of miles away, we still have very expensive submarines and very expensive ICBMs capable of doing just that. Instead of investing more dollars into our outdated and oversized nuclear arsenal, we must make smart investments on other priorities that actually keep us safe, or on reducing our unsustainable debt and deficits. Yet, last year's budget doubled down and accelerated production of the missile by 2 years to 2025. The accelerated procurement schedule will cost taxpayers an additional $75.8 million more in 2017 than originally planned in the fiscal year 2015 acquisition schedule, but that makes little sense when there is so much uncertainty about whether this missile is affordable or even necessary.

That is why my amendment will put $75.8 million towards deficit reduction by placing funding for the long-range standoff weapon back on its 2015 acquisition schedule. There is no need to rush development when as little as 2 years ago the Air Force had requested a delay in procurement to pay for higher priorities before changing its mind a year later.

On top of that, the existing air-launched cruise missile and warhead isn't being phased out until the 2030s.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, I am deeply familiar with our nuclear forces. I want to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Two successive Secretaries of Defense have said that nuclear deterrence is the most important mission the Department has.

Secretary Hagel said: ''Our nuclear deterrent plays a critical role in assuring U.S. national security, and it is DOD's highest priority mission. No other capability we have is more important.''

Secretary Carter said: ''The nuclear mission is the bedrock of our security. It is what stands in the background and looms over every action this country takes on the world stage. It is the foundation for everything we do.''

The LRSO program is critical to the mission, and it must remain on schedule. The fleet of existing air-launched cruise missiles that the LRSO will replace is over 30 years old, and their reliability is rapidly declining. Projected improvements in adversary air defense will impact its effectiveness even more. Simply put, our nuclear deterrent will not be credible unless it is modernized. The funding this amendment seeks to eliminate is necessary to modernize and keep this aspect of our nuclear deterrent on schedule.

There is a clear military requirement for the LRSO, and it is a national security imperative. This requirement has been identified and documented by the military and the Obama administration.

We should not be supporting the unilateral nuclear disarmament, and we should not be supporting this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment today is being offered by my colleague, Mr. QUIGLEY, along with Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ranking Member SMITH, and myself. It would take the first step toward rightsizing a project in the U.S. military.

The U.S. military is in the midst of a major modernization program to sustain the strategic nuclear triad. The program will generate a massive wave of spending requirements into the 2020s, but the Pentagon does not know how to pay for it. Well, look, we have at least a partial idea for how to pay for the security needs of our country.

The United States, in the next decade, will build a new ballistic missile submarine, a new strategic bomber, a replacement for the Minuteman III, and the cruise missile discussed today. Now, one might ask why a Stealth bomber needs a nuclear long-range standoff weapon, and that is exactly what many military experts are already asking.

Slowing the spending on the LRSO would slow spending on a redundant weapon, one that many military commanders agree is simply not needed. It would save $75 million and help start us on a road towards making smart decisions about our Nation's security, and save dollars down the road as well.

□ 1600

I am very pleased to be supporting this amendment. The Pentagon comptroller recently called the strategic force modernization ''the biggest acquisition problem that we don't know how to solve yet.'' The cruise missile alone is estimated to cost $20 billion to $30 billion over its life cycle.

Let's make some commonsense decisions to make our country economically stronger, economically more secure, as well as our military stronger.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, it is a pleasure to stand with the chairman of the committee that has oversight of this important, critical program.

The bottom line is that this amendment would unilaterally disarm our country by undermining the development of this new cruise missile, which would, in turn, weaken the airborne leg of our nuclear triad, which we depend on for a deterrent. You can be darn sure that the Russians and Chinese are not sitting back.

For the record, our committee has taken fiscally prudent minor reductions in the Standoff Weapon program when justified. This cut, which is nearly 80 percent of the funds requested, would be crippling, which, of course, is the apparent intention of this amendment. We don't support that.

The Air Force remains on track to issue a request for a proposal to industry for the technology maturation and risk reduction phase of the program before the end of the fiscal year, with a contract award to be made in fiscal year 2017. This amendment, if adopted, would radically slash funding and bring this effort to a halt. Therefore, I join with the chairman in urging strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

The chairman mentioned that the reduction that is called for in this amendment would certainly impact the cruise missile program; however, I would point out that there is funding in the legislation, and we are developing a B–21, a new penetrating bomber. Also, moneys are being set aside by the United States Congress to extend the life of the B–61 nuclear weapon.

Congress will likely continue to provide robust funding for both of these very costly systems. I do not think we need a third redundancy, and we ought to pull back and support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by saying that it is essential that we keep this modernization pace that we have got in place. Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time I have, this doesn't gut the program. It brings it back to its 2015 acquisition schedule.

Folks, we have to prioritize. We can't have three redundancies when we have cut homeland security money by 50 percent in the last 5 years. After Orlando, we should learn to reprioritize

what really keeps Americans safe. I encourage a ''yes'' vote.

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

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8055.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Representative FORBES and myself that would strike section 8055, a provision that prohibits modifying the command and control relationships between U.S. Fleet Forces Command and the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Importantly, this amendment directly aligns with guidance provided by the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral John Richardson, in his ''A Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority,'' released just 5 months ago. In that guidance, Admiral Richardson advocated for examining the organization of U.S. Fleet Forces Command, U.S. Pacific Fleet, and their subordinate commands, with the end goal of clearly defining operational and wartime demands and generating ready forces to meet these demands.

Further, this amendment would allow our Navy to conduct an internal review and amend its organization and direction as needed to create organizational effectiveness. The Navy has advocated for this opportunity, and granting their request would streamline processes and support the Navy's efforts to become a greater fighting force than ever before.

Finally, this amendment eliminates redundant expenditures on Naval organizational structure and provides opportunities to redirect funds toward bolstering fleet readiness.

This amendment is consistent with the FY 2017 NDAA that passed the House by a vote of 277–147. Specifically, section 910 of the House-passed FY 2017 NDAA reduces component commanders to the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral. This amendment grants our Navy the latitude it needs to effectively organize its own commands in order to meet our Nation's maritime defense demands.

Mr. Chairman, 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 world's largest fleet command, the United States Pacific Fleet, encompasses 100 million square miles, nearly half the Earth's surface. As our Nation conducts a rebalance in the Asia Pacific arena, it is critical that the Pacific Fleet preserve and increase its force structure, when necessary.

Under the current organization and command structure, the Fleet reports directly to the administrative offices of the Chief of Naval Operations and, operationally, to the U.S. Pacific Command.

It is my belief that the current command structure ensures more oversight and more accountability, particularly for budgeting and resources, which we as appropriators certainly appreciate. Changing this relationship, I believe, would make that oversight of this committee and the Congress more difficult, and, therefore, I am opposed to it. We have enough problems with oversight at the Department of Defense. We don't need to pile on.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that, when the Navy asks for the ability to reduce its organizational structure to make itself more efficient to do the things that it needs to do to indeed fulfill the role in the Asia Pacific, maybe we ought to do what the Navy asks for us to do.

I am certainly an advocate for streamlined organizational structure and not more organizational structure. I think that this actually gets at that. It allows the Navy to perform its mission there in the Asia Pacific, allows that realignment to happen, but allows it to do so in a modernized organizational structure that the CNO is asking for. To me, that just makes sense. That is why I am strongly in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, it is my understanding that, because I am defending the position of the committee, I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I would say that, based on the direction from the CNO and his directives of how the Navy is looking to reorganize itself to make sure that it has the ability to maintain maritime superiority—this came out just 5 months ago—to me, it makes perfect sense for us to be able to do that. It is to enable the Navy do the things that it needs to do.

We have a modern Navy that needs the flexibility to make sure that it brings all of its assets forward, especially in the Asia Pacific, with new challenges there for our surface fleets, for our submarines, and for our aircraft carrier strike groups there. This, to me, is a needed change to make sure that the Navy can become more efficient organizationally to be able to get the job done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, let me say I support the gentleman's amendment. I think it makes good sense. I understand his rationale and strong feelings as to why it needs to take effect.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would again point out, as I did in my opening remarks, that the current organization and command structure of the U.S. Pacific Fleet works well. It provides us with the necessary ability to oversight.

Despite the gentleman's representations, and I would not suggest he is misrepresenting the facts, I am not aware that our committee was approached by the Chief of Naval Operations for a reorganization of the Pacific Fleet command structure. I am not suggesting they are the fount of all wisdom, but they have not brought that to this committee's attention. I would, therefore, respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 15 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. O'ROURKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. O'ROURKE. 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:

Page 112, beginning line 23, strike section 8121.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no more important, awesome responsibility for us, as Representatives of our various districts across the country, than to ensure that the servicemembers whom we place in harm's way in over 140 countries around the world in the longest conflicts we have ever fought in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere are resourced, that they are trained, that they have everything that they need to complete the missions to which we have assigned them and to return home from the battlefield safely. And yet, despite authorizing a record amount this year in defense authorizations—over $600 billion—we have stretched our military thin.

We are approaching a crisis in readiness, and what that means is that we are approaching a point where we are going to send men and women into harm's way without the resources and training and support they need to ensure they come back safely. This is at a time, Mr. Chairman, when we learn that the Army has 33 percent over capacity in terms of resources that it has that it does not need to perform its functions. The Air Force is 32 percent over capacity, and the Department of Defense, as a whole, is 22 percent over capacity.

Just one example, in the Department of the Army, if we were to reduce that overcapacity and move those resources where they can be more effectively placed, we would save $500 million a year.

If we want to better serve our servicemembers, I ask my colleagues to join me in this amendment, which strikes language from the underlying bill that prohibits the Department of Defense from planning, proposing, or implementing a base realignment and closure round.

Now, to be clear, by striking that language, this would not authorize a BRAC. It would simply allow the Department of Defense to begin discussions around this, to begin planning it, and if it thinks it is the best way to serve our servicemembers and pursue our missions overseas, the Department of Defense could then propose a base realignment and closure round.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is the best way that we can serve both our servicemembers and the taxpayer and place resources where they can be most efficiently and effectively used.

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

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. Chair, respectfully, again, while the administration has argued that additional base realignment and closure rounds may be necessary to reduce infrastructure costs and overall costs, the 2000 BRAC one-time implementation costs were billions more than were assumed by the BRAC Commission.

□ 1615

Let's be honest. Even today, many States and regions are suffering from the effects of the last BRAC. I have seen little evidence that it saved us money, and we have taken a close look at it.

Furthermore, the authorization bill which we passed several weeks ago rejects BRAC for fiscal year 2017, and our bill provides none of the requested funding for a BRAC analysis and planning. I think the majority in Congress have made their views clear, and I rise in opposition to the amendment and urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I do rise in support of his amendment. The fact is, the Congress of the United States today excels at one thing. We excel better than anybody else at one thing: doing nothing. We do nothing better than anybody else. We should do something, and I do believe we ought to look ahead.

The Department is asking us to take a longer view, and let's take a look at this. The Department has indicated that they believe they have 22 percent excess capacity. Maybe they are wrong. Maybe it is much less than that. But I think we ought to have a serious examination of it and find moneys in a constrained environment for readiness, for training, for necessary procurement.

So I appreciate the gentleman offering his amendment, and I do support it.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments, and I also thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his and for mentioning the cost of these BRAC rounds.

Yes, there is a significant, one-time cost, but if we look at the combined return that we see from all BRACs in all previous years, we realize $13.6 billion annually to the positive. Just from the 2005 BRAC alone, it is $3.8 billion that we can place in support of our servicemembers, in reducing waste, and ensuring that those precious tax dollars go to where they will be most effective.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas, and I thank the chairman for a very good bill that I intend to support. This is a strong bill. The chairman has done great work.

But I do want to rise in support of the effort of my colleague from Texas. We do continue to hear about the excess capacity that each of the services have. And I ask the question: Should we really be paying for cement we don't need when we face end-strength needs, recapitalization needs, and other more important priorities than facilities?

This is a hard issue, and the answer doesn't lie simply in today's amendment. But I think we should continue the conversation. That is why I rise to support my colleague; I rise to support the bill and my chairman as well, and to thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I will just ask my colleagues to support a commonsense, bipartisan amendment that moves beyond parochialism, that moves beyond partisanship, that ensures that we have fiscal responsibility and effective and efficient support of our servicemember and our warfighter.

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

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

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8127.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I stand, once again, today to offer an amendment with my fellow Californian, TOM MCCLINTOCK, and I have to say this is a deja vu moment. Just last year, Mr. MCCLINTOCK and I worked together, on a bipartisan basis, to finally strike a wasteful provision that was in the 2016 Defense Appropriations Act and had been in many previous Defense Appropriations Acts.

Our amendment, which passed overwhelmingly in this House, would save taxpayers millions of dollars by ending an outdated earmark mandating that the Defense Department ship coal from a certain part of Pennsylvania, 4,000 miles across the planet, to American bases in Germany.

Somehow, this zombie provision from the deepest days of the cold war and the golden era of congressional earmarks, when you could go into a bill

like this and arrange a sweetheart deal for a certain district and a certain coal company, somehow that provision was snuck back into this year's bill. It just won't die.

Now, for years, the Department of Defense and the President's annual budget has urged Congress to get rid of this provision, to allow the use of cheaper fuels to power its military bases in Germany. But because of certain special interests, the provision has persisted. It is a terrible deal for the American taxpayers, for the environment, but it has persisted.

Now that finally changed last year, and our amendment not only passed this House but it passed by a vote of 252–179. In this House, that is what we call a home run.

Like a bad sequel, this earmark is back once again, sneaking into the 2017 bill under a new name. Now don't let the new wording trick you. The practical implications and the intent are exactly the same as the old zombie earmark language.

Congress worked on a bipartisan basis last year to kill this bad idea, and it should do so again because the bottom line is that taxpayers should not be paying to ship coal, or any other energy source, 4,000 miles across the planet to a certain facility in Germany. We should give the Air Force the same flexibility to meet its energy needs that every other U.S. military installation around the world has.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Huffman/McClintock amendment.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, last year, the House voted to remove longstanding language from the fiscal year '16 Department of Defense Appropriations bill that sourced Pennsylvania Anthracite to a public utility in Germany, which provides energy and heat for our troops stationed in the Rhine area and, in particular, in Kaiserslautern.

While seemingly well-intentioned, my colleagues misrepresented the overall costs associated with this provision, and they painted this as the poster child for government waste.

Taking their concern into account, the Appropriations Committee drafted language for fiscal year 2017 that does not prescribe the energy type or where it is to be sourced from, with the exception that the energy be domestically produced here in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 56,000 American defense personnel and family members reside in the Kaiserslautern military community. There are more overseas U.S. defense installations and personnel in Germany than in any other nation. Their well-being is of the utmost importance.

Unfortunately, the amendment to strike section 8127 will place the energy needs of our military installations and, by the way, all the dependents, those family members, clearly in the hands of Russia.

And I am not the only one sounding this alarm. In February, Commander of the U.S. Forces in Europe, General Philip Breedlove, testified before the House Armed Services Committee that, and I quote: ''European continued dependence on Russian energy, specifically former Soviet and Eastern Bloc states, only serves to bolster Russia's ability to coerce those nations to achieve political gains.''

Former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO provided testimony before the Armed Services Committee that: ''Mr. Putin's strategy does not rely on military power alone. He seeks to maintain European dependence on Russian gas and continues to use that dependence as a weapon; he deftly applies a 'divide and conquer' strategy to undermine Europe's cohesion.''

Mr. Chairman, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia, Dr. Evelyn Farkas testified that ''the Defense Department should no longer do any business with Russia.'' She concluded that ''we must work with Germany and other allies to meet Europe's natural gas demand in a way that gives them leverage against Moscow, not the other way around, and benefits U.S. companies and alternative suppliers.''

Those who have environmental concerns need to recognize that even Greenpeace evaluated the facilities at Kaiserslautern in 2013. They set a goal for the reduction of CO_2 emissions by 2020 greater than 40 percent, with a 35.4 percent reduction that was achieved by 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I do agree with my colleagues that we should do everything in our power to increase efficiency, but the cold reality is that if we do not domestically source energy for our troops, it is going to be left in the hands of Russia.

I encourage my colleagues to take into consideration what is at stake and reject the Huffman amendment. Failure to address these concerns could leave our servicemen and -women serving overseas in a new and very literal cold war.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the balance of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the other gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I do not support the war on coal that is waged by this administration and my friends on the left, but I do support the war on waste, and I support this amendment based upon that fiscal imperative.

Now we are told our defense budget is so stretched that we now have to scavenge museums for aircraft parts. Yet there appears to be plenty of money to squander in a corrupt earmark that dates back to 1961.

As has been pointed out, that earmark requires that one American Air Force base in Kaiserslautern, Germany, has to purchase 9,000 tons of coal a year at a grossly inflated price, plus the cost of transporting this overpriced coal across the Atlantic Ocean and halfway across the European Continent.

The latest excuse we just heard is, well, otherwise we have to buy coal from Russia. Well, why in the world would we want to do that?

One company in Poland produces 48 million tons of coal from 23 mines. It produces more coal in an hour than this base uses in a year. And the objection seems particularly ludicrous, considering that the NDAA authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for rocket engines purchased from Russia.

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 that 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 that, in 6 years, interest on the national debt will exceed what we spent this year for our defense. That makes rooting out waste like this a national defense imperative.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. A vote for this amendment is a vote to force American servicemembers serving abroad to rely on Russia as their source of energy, energy they need for warmth and comfort.

The language that this amendment strikes simply requires our military base in Kaiserslautern, Germany, to use at least one American energy source for heat and power. If we remove this, our military base will have to turn to Russia for energy.

Now Vladimir Putin has used Russian energy as a weapon in international politics before. We should not give him that power over our military assets.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and stand against Russian influence over the energy used by our military personnel.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to another gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur with the comments of my colleagues Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. BARLETTA in opposition to this amendment. I work closely with our friends in Germany. I am chair of the Congressional Study Group on Germany. I also

have been very close and meet with many leaders from Kaiserslautern. They are very pleased with the arrangement that we have had with their community for a very long time. In fact, I met with their leaders, their municipal utility, and we have had these conversations.

But what they have said is true. We might as well call this the ''Buy Russian'' amendment. Buy from Russia because if you are going to replace anthracite from the United States, there is really only one place you are going to get that. It is in Russia or perhaps in maybe some Russian-dominated areas of Ukraine right now.

□ 1630

That is it. If this energy is not sourced in the U.S., it will be sourced in Russia. As has been stated, Russia uses energy as a weapon against the West, particularly against our European allies. Why we would be unwitting allies with Vladimir Putin on this little dustup on Kaiserslautern is beyond me.

For all these reasons, I say oppose this amendment, buy American-sourced energy, and reject this buy Russian amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the boogeyman of Russian coal and Vladimir Putin really do strain credulity. In addition to the option of buying coal in Germany itself, which would obviously be one way to do this, as my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, points out, there is abundant coal alternatives if they want to buy coal in Poland, our NATO ally, or in Ukraine, an ally that we would like to help in lots of ways as they strive for independence and economic development under the boot of Vladimir Putin's Russia.

The last thing that was raised, the fact that somehow the language in the base bill would not require coal from Pennsylvania, is also a red herring. The language in this bill that says domestically sourced energy is required and other provisions effectively mean that the status quo—the sweetheart arrangement with one specific coal company in Pennsylvania—would be the only way that the Air Force could comply with this requirement.

So let's reiterate our bipartisan opposition to this wasteful, zombie earmark. I ask for an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. Chairman, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8132.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes language in the underlying bill that undermines and underfunds the Department of Defense's ability to develop and acquire alternative fuels that improve mission capabilities under section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Section 526 established important baselines that guide private sector innovators in the development of alternative fuels for our military.

It is a low-cost, commonsense provision that helps the military fulfill its existing goals to diversify its fuel supply to reduce costs and save lives.

It does not, as some incorrectly claim, ban any fuels. It has not hindered the Department of Defense from purchasing the fuels that we need right now to counter the new and dynamic threats we face throughout the globe. It simply requires fuel producers seeking to do business with our military to meet certain requirements. We cannot expect to fight and to win the wars of tomorrow with only the fuels of yesterday.

A $1 increase in the price of a barrel of oil translates to approximately a $130 million increase in DOD expenditures over the course of a year. A blip in the world oil market forces the Department to redirect resources away from mission priorities—grounding planes and turning ships around.

Since September 11, 2001, more than 3,000 servicemembers have been killed or wounded in attacks on fuel convoys in Afghanistan. Delivering technologies to our troops that improve efficiency and cost certainty over traditional sources of fuel is both a lifesaving strategy and has tactical benefits on the battlefield.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of this issue will say that section 526 is putting President Obama's green climate initiative into national security policy, but that is not true. But this provision was signed into law 9 years ago by a Republican President, George Bush. It is still supported by our military leaders today, and Congress should support it.

My colleagues will say that they are simply broadening the market for alternative fuels for the military, but they are not. They are ripping the bottom out from under it.

By inserting an anti-environmental agenda into the process of funding our national defense, the funding prohibition cripples existing efforts at the DOD to purchase cost-competitive biofuels and abolishes any certainty in the commercial marketplace.

This would take us backwards at a time when we need a smart, forward-looking approach to increase fuel diversity, particularly in ways that improve efficiency, enhance our range and agility, and better prepare our forces for future security environments where logistics may be constrained.

Energy security is national security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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, fuel for our troops' mobility and strike capability is one of our military's most critical resources. The provision it would strike ensures that our military has all the options it needs for fuel.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I rise in support of his amendment.

As he has, I think, very ably mentioned, the Department of Defense is the largest purchaser on the planet of fuel. We do need to increase the menu of our energy sources. The Department has clearly stated that section 526 has not hindered it from purchasing the fuel it needs today worldwide to support military operations, but we ought to think about tomorrow's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who will need a greater range of energy sources. We ought to keep those options open.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's offering the amendment, and I do support it.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, again, the politics on this amendment is really on the other side. We have seen the military support this. This is an effort started by President George Bush to improve our security and cost containment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support removing this restriction by voting 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 California (Mr. PETERS).

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

Mr. PETERS. 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.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, on the basis of the voice vote, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an desk amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 126, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) 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 my consume.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill gives $900 million of American money to Pakistan. That is $200 million more than last year.

My amendment cuts the money given to Pakistan to the same amount as last year, $700 million. Of course, if I had my way, I would cut all the money to Pakistan.

Here is the reason, Mr. Chairman: the Pakistanis hid Osama bin Laden, and we had to go into Pakistan and take him out. They hid him, and the world knows about it. After they hid Osama bin Laden, amazingly, the CIA section chief in Pakistan is poisoned. He comes back to the United States. He believes, and the CIA believes, that it was the Pakistani ISI that poisoned him. I agree with them.

People say that we need to help Pakistan fight the war in Afghanistan, but Pakistan is on the wrong side of the war, Mr. Chairman.

In an editorial by The New York Times entitled ''Time to Put the Squeeze on Pakistan,'' the paper calls Pakistan a dangerous and duplicitous partner, and said that Pakistan was fueling the war in Afghanistan.

Now, I don't agree with The New York Times on a lot of things, but I agree here. We can't trust the Pakistanis, yet every year, we give them more money.

In February 2012, a NATO report confirmed that ISI was supporting the Taliban and other terrorist groups with resources, sanctuary, and training. On May 21 of this year, the United States killed the leader of the Taliban in a drone strike.

And guess where he was hiding out?

In Pakistan.

Once again, the Pakistanis cannot be trusted. We are supposed to be fighting the Taliban in Afghanistan. The military in Pakistan, in my opinion, is taking the money we give them and helping to support the Taliban in Afghanistan. They want to have it both ways. U.S. officials later revealed that the Taliban leader that we took out was plotting new attacks on American targets in Afghanistan.

We have given Pakistan $33 billion of aid since 9/11, and each year we say that Pakistan is at the crossroads and needs to decide whether it is going to fight terrorists or fight on our side. Let me tell you, we are being played by the Pakistanis. They are taking money from whomever they can get it. They support the Taliban, and they claim they support us.

Let's just make them get a little less money every year. Cut it down from $900 million—which is in this year's budget—to what it was last year, $700 million.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need to pay Pakistan to betray us. They are going to do it for free. That is what this amendment does. It cuts money, $200 million.

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

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, I appreciate the gentleman's passion on the issue and his consistent passion.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, the Coalition Support Fund allows the Secretary of Defense, as was true of his predecessor, 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 a United States military operation, and Pakistan is one of those.

Receipts for reimbursements are submitted by cooperating nations and are fully vetted by the Pentagon and follow strict—and I say strict—criteria to meet standards for reimbursement. It is all about reimbursement. All payments are made in arrears and following notification to Members of Congress on appropriate committees.

Regarding Pakistan, the Coalition Support Fund remains a critical tool to enable Pakistan to effectively deal with future challenges from the emerging U.S. drawdown—and we are drawing down.

It also remains a cost-effective tool for the U.S. to remain engaged in the region and with Pakistan. We shouldn't be abandoning Pakistan, because we might actually have something even worse than what the gentleman describes if we turn our back on Pakistan.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly this amendment ought to be opposed.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's yielding. I associate myself with his remarks and I am in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

There is no question that the relationship with Pakistan has been very difficult, but we ought to also remember that not only are we talking about the issues of terrorism in this country, but that Pakistan is possessed of nuclear weapons and has capabilities.

The committee is not ignorant of these facts, and the fact is that under the chairman's leadership, we do have section 9017 that requires the Secretary of Defense, prior to obligating the funds, to certify certain actions. One of those is that Pakistan is cooperating on counterterrorist efforts. They are preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related materials and expertise, and they are not intervening extra judiciously in political or judicial processes.

No one is completely naive here in this Chamber, but it is important that we continue that relationship with great care and oversight.

And, again, I do join with the chairman in opposition to the amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

□ 1645

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, Mr. POE, is a good friend and a great leader on these issues dealing with terrorism, but let me, sadly, join in opposition to this amendment.

Over the years, I have worked with a number of persons in the Pakistani Government. But, in particular, I want to emphasize that the Pakistan military, over a period of years, has fought against terrorism and suffered a great treasure in the loss of their soldiers. I believe it is important that we continue to collaborate and, as my two colleagues have said, that we work extensively with oversight.

We must be mindful that they do have nuclear capacity. I believe it is important that we are engaging and that we use these resources for them to maintain the security of these resources but, more importantly, to keep

a collaboration with, in particular, their military operations which, overall, have been helpful in the war on terror.

I oppose that reduction, and I thank the gentleman for offering his amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of En Bloc Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 5293, the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

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, I am pleased that the En Bloc Amendment includes two of my amendments that were made in order under the Rule.

The first Jackson Lee Amendment (No. 49) 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.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 49 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.

The second Jackson Lee Amendment No. 67 included in the En Bloc 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.

The American Cancer Society calls several strains of breast cancer as a particularly aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates; in this instance, it's a triple negative. But I raise an article that says: "Fighting a Different Battle; Breast Cancer and the Military."

We all know, by the way, that breast cancer can affect both men and women. The bad news is breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

Let me say that sentence again. Breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat. 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 2011. And according to that same study, more are suspected. It grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it, and I want to add my appreciation to the military.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 67, however, will allow for the additional research.

That research is particularly needed since women are joining the Armed Services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership. Within increased age comes increased risk and incidence of breast cancer.

Not only is breast cancer striking relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male service members, veterans and their dependents are at risk as well.

With a younger and generally healthier population, those in the military tend to have a lower risk for most cancers than civilians—including significantly lower colorectal, lung and cervical—but breast cancer is a different story.

Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, according to Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues.

Dr. Clapp notes that life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

We are on the right track, we're on the right road.

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member for including the Jackson Lee Amendments Nos. 49 and 67 in the En Bloc Amendment and urge my colleagues to support the En Bloc Amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I would like to point out that these reimbursements are made to maintain some 186,000 Pakistani forces along 1,600 miles of border between Afghanistan and Pakistan to deter border conflict, movement, counterterrorism-counterinsurgency operations.

The Pakistanis have paid quite a price in their military for deaths related to their work to protect Afghanistan, and, may I say, the bad guys have paid a price. Nearly 28,000 militants were killed, injured, and arrested due to these operations. It is better that the Pakistanis are doing it than the United States military.

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 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his comments.

Pakistan is playing everybody. They take our money, it goes through ISI, and it ends up in the hands of the Taliban and Afghanistan that is killing Americans.

And, yes, they file reimbursements about us giving them money. They file reimbursements about the money that is being used. They file it with the Pentagon, and the Pentagon says that 50 percent of the reimbursement requests that they make are fraudulent. They lie and they cheat to get that American money. So Pakistan is playing everybody.

Nuclear weapons? Yes, they have got them. Now we hear reports that they may be working with the North Koreans and supplying them nuclear capability. I don't know if that is true or not.

The Pakistanis cannot be trusted. They are getting money from whomever they can. They do what is in the best interests of the current government. The military may not even be working with the government. We don't need to pay them any more money. Give them the same amount that they got last year and save the American taxpayers $200 million.

Once again, we don't need to pay Pakistan to betray us, Mr. Chairman; they will do it for free.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. 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:

Page 132, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $448,715,000)''.

Page 170, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $448,715,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY. I know that they have had a very difficult job in trying to resolve all the competing interests in this bill. They are two of our finest Members.

My amendment is being offered primarily because of my very great concern for our astounding national debt, now over $19 trillion, and a debt that is going up much higher in the years ahead. Also, I just do not believe in forever, permanent wars, and we have now been involved militarily in Afghanistan for over 15 years, with no end in sight.

The words we see most often about the American public's view of the war in Afghanistan are ''war weary.'' The American people want us to stop spending so much money in Afghanistan and start making things more secure here at home.

Afghanistan is classified as one of the least developed countries in the world. With a population of 30 million, their GDP is approximately $20 billion in American dollars. Even with my amendment, which would be a 13 percent cut, we would still be spending $3 billion there in the next fiscal year. My amendment would save $448 million and place it in the deficit reduction account.

The OCO account has been referred to as a slush fund for the Defense Department and as a budgetary gimmick. Just yesterday on this floor, the ranking members of the full committee and the subcommittee both criticized this way of funding some of our overseas operations.

The NDAA bill funded the OCO only to the level of $35.7 billion instead of the $58.6 billion in this bill, and there has already been acknowledgement that there probably will be a supplemental appropriations bill to be passed before May 1.

Afghanistan was referred to by the disgraced General Petraeus, who is still respected by many, and many others as the ''graveyard of empires.'' It is ruled by tribes and village warlords, and the threats from radical Islamic terrorists to the U.S. are much greater for almost every other country, and even here at home.

The average income there is about $667 a year. With the $3.5 billion in this bill for Afghanistan, we could put almost every leader there on the U.S. payroll and give them big raises.

My amendment has been endorsed by the fiscally conservative Taxpayers for Common Sense.

I commend the subcommittee leadership for already having a small cut in this bill for Afghan funding from $3.65 billion to $3.45 billion. This seems to me to be at least a partial admission that most on the committee agree with me. I believe that they have not gone far enough. In fact, I would have liked to have gone much further with my amendment. I simply believe that we should stop throwing money down this very wasteful black hole and start putting our own people and our own country and our own needs first once again.

In recognition that the subcommittee is at least headed in the right direction with this small cut and in hopes that additional cuts could be made at conference, or at least in next year's bill, I appreciate being given the opportunity to at least express my very strongly held views on this situation in Afghanistan.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. SANFORD. 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 in contravention of section 418 of title 37, United States Code, as such section was in effect on June 9, 2016, with respect to athletic shoes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in simplest form, would block section 808, the so-called New Balance provision, by defunding it.

I want to say before I get into the content, I want to compliment BRUCE POLIQUIN, BILL HUIZENGA, and MARTHA MCSALLY. We just had a fascinating conversation in the Cloakroom just a few moments ago. I think that, if their constituents and the American public at large could see the degree of thoughtfulness, their forthright approach, and the intellectual weight behind the things we just discussed in trying to find some kind of a solution here, they would be most impressed.

It is with reservation that I offer this amendment, based on respect for each one of them, but I do so based on some concerns that I have in looking at the base language's approach and what it would mean for the average recruit out there.

I offer this amendment based on, one, a concern for the troops. Right now, if you look at ballpark, the average new recruit, not all, but many of them have about 13 different choices in terms of shoe size. Fundamentally, this would bring it down to one, hopefully two, as Saucony came on line, and maybe two or three models of those different shoes in time, but it would begin to limit choices.

I think that, for the average recruit out there, when there are very, very few choices, there is a wisdom to having more choices based on the notion of one size never fitting all. There have been any number of different Army and other military studies that have shown a correlation between injury and fewer choices.

Secondly, I would say that this amendment is in the interest of the taxpayer. We now spend about $100 million a year in the recruit cycles on musculoskeletal injuries, 80 percent of which are tied to the lower extremities; disproportionately, those are tied to training injuries in, again, the new recruit cycle. Again, there is a degree of correlation between injury and fewer choices. I think that this amendment gets at that.

Finally, I think this is about process. The military has allowed cash allowances for some time because they have recognized, again, the need for personal choices and personal matters. For instance, for women's undergarments, people are allowed a personal choice in picking the woman undergarments that work for them.

Yet there is nothing more personal, at the end of the day, for a new recruit than their shoes. I think that, from a standpoint of process, preserving this notion of military cash allowances is important. I think it is for that reason that this amendment is supported by the Association of the United States Army, the White House, the DOD, a variety of different conservative groups, and more.

But before we get into that, so that we might have a little bit further debate on this issue, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would undermine a provision included in both the House- and Senate-passed NDAAs that is aimed at ensuring that the Department of Defense adheres to the law, a law that DOD indicated that it would follow once a 100 percent American-made shoe was available that met its cost and durability standards.

Well, today the domestic shoe industry has rebounded—employing thousands of workers throughout the country—and several versions of a completely American-made shoe are now available to the Defense Department, but they have yet to provide those shoes to new recruits.

After testing and approving two 100 percent American-made athletic shoes last year, Defense Department officials underscored their quality, writing that one of those shoes ''scored higher overall than any other neutral/cushioned running shoe we have tested thus far.''

This is quite an endorsement, since the Defense Department has been testing sneakers for more than 20 years. Even so, should recruits require something more specific, they can receive a waiver.

And Stars and Stripes reported last week that, when the Navy switched to Made in America shoes in 2004, ''stress fractures had been reduced by 69.7 percent.''

We should ensure that all recruits have the best quality shoes to choose from always—and the best is American made.

As for cost, industry has committed to providing new recruits with running shoes that cost $15 per pair less than the cash allowance currently provided to new recruits. And to be clear, any U.S. footwear manufacturer that makes 100 percent American-made shoes is eligible for this contract.

The provision in the House- and Senate-passed NDAA supports American workers, provides a better value for American taxpayers, and supports American servicemembers by supplying them with the highest quality athletic shoes available.

I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), with whom I have worked so closely.

□ 1700

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, the Berry amendment has been the law of the land in the United States for 75 years. Very simply, it requires the Pentagon to issue American-made gear and equipment to men and women in uniform for basic training. This is very important because it promotes good-paying, U.S. manufacturing jobs and national security by assuring an American supply chain for that equipment. Today, the Berry amendment supports 600,000 U.S. manufacturing jobs—from T-shirts to combat boots to parachutes.

I represent 900 of the most skilled, hardworking athletic shoemakers in the world. They are proud and they are honored to manufacture the highest quality athletic shoes for our troops.

Mr. Chair, a vote for the Sanford amendment is a vote for manufacturing jobs in Asia. I ask everyone to please vote ''no'' on the Sanford amendment. Vote ''no'' on the Sanford amendment in order to support U.S. manufacturing jobs, to save taxpayer dollars, and to reduce injuries by providing the highest quality, 100 percent American-made athletic shoes made for U.S. recruits.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Sanford amendment.

This proposed amendment runs counter to a 2014 DOD policy change that allows our military recruits to have athletic shoes that are manufactured right here in the United States.

My friend from South Carolina is misguided in his understanding of this policy, I believe. There are multiple American companies that are competing to supply our men and women in uniform. As this Member has fought against earmarks, this is not an earmark. In fact, in Michigan, Bates currently produces Berry-compliant combat boots and dress shoes for our warfighters, and it is ready to do the same for military recruits with its all-American name Saucony athletic shoe right here. It wants to compete.

In reality, the Sanford amendment, ironically, works against our men and women in uniform to have access to the best equipment available. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Sanford amendment and to make sure that our recruits have the gear that they need and deserve, both with Saucony and New Balance, and the choices that those would offer.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would just make two points in this conversation.

One, this debate before us is, really, about this notion of individual choice. I think that liberty is the hallmark of the American experiment, and I think, wherever possible, we need to preserve it. So this is not about taking away American jobs. It is about saying that I believe that American companies, based on the products that they produce, can compete on the world stage, and we don't need a mandate to ensure that they do. It is not about taking away New Balance as a choice. It is just saying: Can it be among a range of different competitive choices out there for the new recruit?

Secondly, I would make this point that, actually, if you look at the New Balance shoes, two of the three options were offered. Stability and cushioning, they approved, but the DOD has still not signed off on motion control. So, actually, only two of the three choices are available. I would add that.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

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

As a runner for 36 years and as someone who served in the military for 26 years in leading and in supervising recruits and individuals and in coaching a lot of people to run marathons and multiple running events, I know a lot about this issue. I couldn't agree with the gentleman from South Carolina more. They need to have choice in order to make sure that they are set up for success as the types of runners that they are.

Right now, our recruits are getting injured because they are handed cash, and they are told to go over to the BX and buy some shoes. Most of them have no idea: Am I a pronator? Am I a supinator? Do I have a high arch or a medium arch? Do I need a motion-control or a stability or a cushion shoe? They buy shoes based on price and put the rest in their pockets, or it is based on which ones they like, on which ones they think look good. Also, individuals at the BX are not trained to be able to put them in the right shoes to set them up for success. Right now, they are being injured; their dreams are being broken; and they are unable to contribute, due to shinsplints, stress fractures, and other things, because they are not set up for success.

If we comply with this amendment, which we vigorously discussed in HASC and passed unanimously by a voice vote, they would have the opportunity for the Pentagon to measure them, their gait, and then provide them with shoes that are appropriate for them. There are multiple choices in motion control, stability, or cushioning, whichever applies to them. This is about readiness and avoiding injury. We need our troops to start off on the right foot and with the right footwear.

I strongly oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would say a couple of different things.

One, if you look at section 418 within the NDAA, cash allowances are absolutely Berry-compliant. It is something that we have done for a long number of years. That notion of preserving a choice has been something that has been consistently offered through all armed services.

Two, people care about things that they can control, and I would argue that the average new recruit out there is going to be that much more vested in a decision that they have control over versus one that they don't.

Finally, I think there are whole hosts of people who care deeply about our

Armed Forces and our readiness—people like JOHN MCCAIN and JONI ERNST, who spent I think 20 or 30 years of her time in the military and who is now in the U.S. Senate—and who are against, again, this particular provision and who have been working on language over on the Senate side. I think it is why the White House opposes and the DOD opposes, and why a range of different conservative taxpayer groups opposes. It is not because they don't care about the DOD. It is because they believe, from the standpoint of the recruit and training, it is better for the recruit, and from the standpoint of taxpayer compliance and in watching out for the taxpayer, it is better.

Again, I have heard very loudly and clearly what my colleagues have said on this. I admire the way in which they have advocated, but I, respectfully, take a different viewpoint on this one.

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

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. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, first of all, I would just like to set the record straight. Cash allowances are a circumvention of the Berry amendment. They are not Berry-compliant.

Then just to address a couple of the issues that have been raised, first of all, as we have heard, requiring the Defense Department to abide by the Berry amendment would not advantage only one company, and it would not limit the varieties of shoes that are offered to new recruits. As we have heard, multiple companies that employ thousands of Americans have expressed their interest in manufacturing athletic shoes and would provide new recruits with the highest quality of brands to choose from.

Beyond the fact that there are multiple companies, they also would provide multiple models, as we have heard—the stability, the cushioning, the motion control. All of these would have to pass rigorous testing. As we have heard, one of those shoes has already scored higher than any other shoe that has been tested over the course of 20 years. As Stars and Stripes reported again—just to reiterate from last year—when the Navy switched to Made in America shoes in 2004, stress fractures had been reduced by 69.7 percent.

I believe we should close this loophole to make sure that all recruits have the best quality shoes to choose from, and the best is American-made.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SANFORD. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of 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 implement Department of Defense Directive 4715.21 on Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, this amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act prohibits funds from being used to implement the President's climate change agenda at the cost of our national defense.

Directive 4715.21 on Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience would force our military to incorporate climate change in everything they do—from combat operations to preparedness to training. Climate change would become one of our Nation's greatest enemies. When our Nation is under attack, generals in the war room and officers in the field need to be focused on winning the battle, not on limiting their carbon footprint.

Our national security has already been impacted by the thinking behind this directive. Former Acting Director of the CIA, Michael Morell, admitted recently that the U.S. declined attacking ISIS' oil wells in part for fear of the environmental impact, yet these oil wells provide funding for ISIS and allow the terrorist organization to recruit individuals in the United States for its evil mission.

With ISIS and its ideology attacking our homeland, now is the time to focus on our imminent defense requirements because climate change is not an enemy of the United States. ISIS, with its anti-American ideology, is our enemy. China and Russia are our enemies. North Korea and Iran are our enemies.

The lives of American citizens, the lives of our soldiers, and the lives of innocent people around the world depend on the strength and resolve of the U.S. military. When we distract our military with a climate change agenda, we detract from its ultimate purpose.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, 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. Chair, I don't know how much more scientific evidence we are going to need before we understand the reality that there is a change in our climate and that we are going to have to accommodate that change. Today, I am not talking about coal or carbon. I am talking about accommodating the change that is taking place today on the planet Earth.

We have one individual who is running for President of the United States who claims that this is hogwash and let's bury our heads in the sand. Nevertheless, one of the properties he owns has asked for money to build barriers that are justified because of climate change.

In setting aside the raw politics of this position, I would also point out that we have had the Chief of the Pacific Command, Admiral Locklear, come in. I wouldn't suggest his being an ideologue in any way shape or form but someone who was charged with the command of the Pacific Fleet, which we had a conversation about earlier today, and greatly concerned about the adverse consequences these changes have on the United States Navy.

We have had a hearing with the Director of National Intelligence, who is charged with the supervision of the 17 intelligence agencies of the United States of America. He testified that extreme weather, climate change, and environmental degradation exacerbate and spark political instability and humanitarian crises.

It is imperative that we do not hamstring our military, which is defending our interests in a changing global environment, by adopting this gentleman's amendment. I strongly oppose it.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to designate or expand a heritage asset under division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''National Historic Preservation Act''), in any of Baca, Bent, Crowley, Huerfano, Kiowa, Las Animas, Otero, Prowers, and Pueblo counties, Colorado.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, this amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act prohibits funds from being used to limit private property rights in southeast Colorado.

The Department of Defense can designate land, buildings, and archaeological sites as heritage assets to extend Federal control over private property, claiming that they need to protect areas of heritage in our country. But part of the heritage of the land in southeast Colorado is the farming and ranching that has gone on for generations.

□ 1715

The people who work on the land there take good care of it. They are true stewards who know that overuse and mistreatment will hurt next year's harvest or the next generation of livestock. After all, that land is their heritage.

These property owners now face an attempt by the Federal Government to impose a forced conservation agreement on their property without compensating them. This scheme is simply a backdoor method for the government to impose Federal control over private property.

Our democracy depends on private property rights because these rights are a key part of a free and prosperous society. We must protect the freedom, prosperity, and heritage of southeast Colorado from overreaching government.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, 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 do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's concern for his constituency and his State. We had a markup of another bill earlier today in the Appropriations Committee, and I was very vocal on behalf of the constituents I serve, so I certainly do appreciate that, but I respectfully oppose his amendment.

The previous amendment offered literally dealt with our entire globe. Now we have shrunk our concern to several counties in the State of Colorado. I appreciate—because his amendment is covered under the rules—his impulse to attach it to an appropriation bill, because, for better or for worse, the work product of this great committee is about the only one that is going to see the light of day between now and December.

Having said that, I do think it is premature. It is a matter of authorization and does not belong in the bill. And, therefore, I am opposed to it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. BYRNE. 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), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to modify a military installation in the United States, including construction or modification of a facility on a military installation, to provide temporary housing for unaccompanied alien children.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for the fine work they have done in this underlying bill. I have been with them on a couple of occasions, and we owe them a great debt of gratitude. The bipartisanship showed in this is a great reflection on our institution.

I regret that I have to offer this amendment, but something has come up since the committee had its meeting that I could not foresee.

My amendment will address a serious issue relating to unaccompanied alien children being housed at the Department of Defense facilities across the United States.

The Department of Health and Human Services has recently made agreements with various defense facilities across the U.S. about housing unaccompanied minors who are caught crossing the southern border. The large number of migrants from Central and South America crossing our southern border is a serious humanitarian crisis, and I understand the need to responsibly handle this situation with compassion.

That said, it simply makes no sense for these individuals to be held at military installations. These facilities often pose serious safety issues for children. Some of the children could be placed near live artillery ranges around active military airfields.

I represent a district in coastal Alabama, and my office recently learned that the Department of Health and Human Services was evaluating housing illegal immigrants at Navy outlying airfields right near the Gulf of Mexico. Mr. Chairman, these are airfields where they do touch-and-goes, where you have pilots that are being trained trying to learn how to do it right. Last time I checked, we try to keep children away from airfields, not put them close to them.

Even worse, these facilities lack basic infrastructure needs. There is no sewage, and as far as I know, there is no potable water. And there are no shelters there or buildings that could be turned into shelters. This means temporary housing would be set up at a Navy airfield on the Gulf Coast in the middle of hurricane season in a low-lying wet area that is prone to many mosquitos in a place we know is a major threat for Zika. The idea just defies logic.

There are other horror stories of housing these migrants and how it has impacted our military. For example, at Fort Hood in Texas, units have been unable to train on ranges. This has a direct and negative impact on military readiness. At a time when we face so many challenges around the globe, it just makes no sense to alter the intended use of our military facilities to serve a completely different purpose.

My amendment would simply prohibit the Department of Defense from using any funds to alter existing facilities or construct new ones for the purpose of providing temporary housing for unaccompanied alien children. There are other nondefense facilities near the border that are available. They do not have to use military facilities.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment as we work to ensure that defense funds are not spent on issues outside the mission of the Department of Defense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, there is no question, I think, from anyone in this Chamber that the Members of the United States military and the Department of Defense are the finest human beings on planet Earth. Their primary charge is to keep our country safe and secure.

But I also think that we take great pride when they go above and beyond

that particular charge that we have given them under the Constitution. And when there is a disaster in the country of Haiti, who do people call on for help but members of the Department of Defense and the United States military.

When there is flooding in Bangladesh, who is called upon? Members of the United States Armed Forces to help in a humanitarian crisis. When you have problems and earthquakes in Japan, who do they reach out to? Members of the United States military for humanitarian assistance. We have concerns in Pakistan and tragedies; who reaches out to members in the Armed Forces of the United States for humanitarian assistance but the Government of Pakistan. You have a typhoon in the Philippines, and who is called into action, not militarily, but from a humanitarian and relief standpoint? Members of the United States military repeatedly because we are a humane Nation.

What we are talking about with this gentleman's amendment that I strongly oppose is temporarily housing unaccompanied minor children who find themselves in a tragic circumstance in the United States of America. The Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement is required by law to provide shelter, care, and placement. Because the number of unaccompanied children has spiked in recent years, it is difficult for HHS to find temporary housing for all of them.

As long as there is no impact on DOD military activities, the Department should be allowed to identify facilities in the United States to provide the same type of humanitarian assistance to minor children that we do in the Philippines, Pakistan, Japan, Bangladesh, and Haiti.

I live in a humane country that reaches out to help people who can't help themselves, and I think we should allow the United States military to do that in the United States of America when it does not impact their military operations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I completely agree with the ranking member that we take great pride in opportunities for our military around the world to do things of a humanitarian nature. That is one of the hallmarks of the United States.

I am thinking more in this circumstance, however, about the needs of these children. I would not put my children out where they are talking about putting these children in my district. I daresay none of us would want our children to be in these places. It is simply not safe for them. With this Zika threat that is out there, we can't say that they are not going to be exposed to mosquitos that we know are vectors for this disease.

Unfortunately, where I live, this time of year, we have tropical storms, and we have hurricanes. Those children can't stay there in temporary housing. This is simply not the right place to put them.

There are other facilities that the Federal Government owns that are military facilities that are appropriate, that are closer to the border. And HHS is simply refusing to do its job by putting them in those places and burdening the Department of Defense facilities by putting them in those places, and they are not the right places for these children.

I understand the gentleman's remarks. I agree with virtually everything that he said, but I think, in this particular circumstance, this amendment is in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I reiterate my opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the House for listening to me. I ask for a positive vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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 Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out or in response to the memorandum of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Integration and Defense Support of Civil Authorities titled ''Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments Director, Joint Staff'' and dated November 25, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a bit different than the gentleman from Alabama's previous amendment in that I drafted this amendment to block the use of any funds within this appropriations bill from being used by our military to house illegal aliens or unaccompanied alien children.

So my amendment is a bit more specific, and I think it is on target in that it says that:

''None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out or in response to the memorandum of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense. . . . titled 'Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments Director, Joint Staff' and dated November 25, 2015.''

The summary of that is that this memorandum, which I have in my hand, dated November 25, is from the Department of Homeland Security to the military that says identify the inventory that you could allow to be used to house unaccompanied alien children, and then they want to enter into private agreements for each facility.

So this amendment that I have, as drafted, really says this: No military bases or buildings will be used to house the unaccompanied alien children, period. So that covers, I think, the topic that is in Mr. BYRNE's amendment, and it covers the broader topic, which is our military should not be used to inappropriately house and be part of the welcome party that the President has set up that is encouraging people to come into the United States illegally.

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, the gentleman indicated that his amendment differs from the previous one just offered and debated. I would suggest it is a difference without a distinction.

I would suggest that the solution to the concern that the gentleman has is, if we did not starve and cut and slash and pillage and burn the budget of Health and Human Services every year, maybe they would have the financial resources to house these minor children. We are in a position where the bill that is being debated on the floor has about one-half of all discretionary domestic spending in this country. Obviously, that is where the gentleman has gone.

But the fact is if he, in fact, believes that it is Health and Human Services that ought to be addressing a greater amount of the shelter needs, if they had the adequate resources, perhaps they could reach out and do it.

In the meantime, again, I continue to live in a humane nation that provides humanitarian relief worldwide. I think we can do the same in the United States for minor unaccompanied children.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would point out the distinction that the ranking member defines as without a difference, without a distinction.

There is a difference, and the distinction is that the previous amendment said no new construction and no renovation on existing bases. My amendment says no funds can be used to even negotiate any provisions nor do new

construction or renovation. None of the resources can be used.

□ 1730

Mine actually blocks the President's policy as opposed to catching up on the other end of it. But the important point of it is this. We have a President, an administrative policy that has defied the rule of law. He has even refused to enforce the laws that he has signed, and then put the welcome mat down in, especially, Central America.

We have reports of planes lifting off from places like Guatemala City flying unaccompanied alien children into the United States, and then they claim the Department of Homeland Security has a legal obligation to care for them and house them—well, not for everybody on the planet that the President has sympathy for, Mr. Chairman.

So what we are trying to bring forth here is a greater respect for the rule of law—the President, I believe, has gone outside the law with this memorandum—a greater respect for the rule of law and moving towards a fiscal responsibility that may require a sense of austerity. We don't have either one with this administration.

This amendment does also preserve the Article I authority of the United States Congress, which has been eroded significantly over the last 7½ years.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would simply reiterate my opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say again, addressing you, and with the attention of the body, that this is one of the pieces that the President has used to go outside the bounds of his authority and inside the bounds of our constitutional authority.

I have made it a point to come to this floor time after time and protect our Article I authority that is vested in us and to be able to make sure that we keep all of this in front of us. The House has never failed to send a message to the President of the United States that we will defend our constitutional authority, at least with regard to immigration. This amendment does that. I urge its adoption.

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

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. GOSAR. 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), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to extend the expiration date of, or to reissue with a new date of expiration, the memorandum titled ''Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest Program Changes'' and dated September 25, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, in September of 2014, on the same day Attorney General Eric Holder resigned, the Obama administration took executive action and issued a memo that allowed DACA aliens to begin enlisting in the military. Specifically, President Obama's administration unilaterally expanded eligibility in the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest, or MAVNI, program to include DACA aliens through a September 25, 2014 memo. Prior to this memo, the executive branch never attempted to enlist DACA aliens through MAVNI.

Further, military enlistment rules explicitly prohibit illegal aliens from enlisting in the Armed Forces. MAVNI is a military program intended for lawful immigrants and lawful nonimmigrants. The Department of Homeland Security's Web site states that DACA aliens lack lawful status and are subject to all legal restrictions and prohibitions on individuals in unlawful status.

The Gosar amendment would not end the MAVNI program, as open border advocates have falsely claimed. I support the intent of MAVNI. As NumbersUSA accurately states, the Gosar amendment would return the MAVNI program to its original intent by defunding any extension of the memorandum responsible for expanding MAVNI to include DACA beneficiaries.

When I offered a similar amendment less than a month ago, DOD reported that only five DACA aliens had enlisted in the Armed Forces. Yesterday, DOD confirmed to my office that 141 total DACA aliens had enlisted in the military through April 30, 2016, as a result of Obama's backdoor amnesty program.

As noted by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, CRS, the MAVNI program allows citizenship to be granted to any enlistee who serves at least 1 day of wartime service. MAVNI was never intended to be utilized for the benefit of illegal aliens. Testimony from DOD states that MAVNI was created to recruit legal noncitizens with critical foreign language and cultural skills.

Retired Lieutenant Colonel Margaret Stock, who created and implemented the MAVNI program, previously stated, as quoted in a Politico story: ''It's a major bureaucratic screw-up by the Obama administration . . . The MAVNI program is not designed for DACA at all . . . It was rather alarming to see DACAs being put into MAVNI. Someone didn't know what they were doing.''

An Army Times story also quoted Stock as stating: ''It was set up for people who are legally in the country, and had been legal their whole history . . . They have to go back and redo all the security screenings, train recruiters all over again . . . it's one of these things where people want magic to happen, and bureaucracy doesn't work that way.''

These comments are even more noteworthy, as Stock is a huge amnesty supporter and testified in support of provisions in an earlier version of the DREAM Act.

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters. Congress has consistently rejected and failed to act on policies that aim to allow illegal aliens to serve in the military. In fact, the House has rejected DACA three times. Furthermore, MAVNI, a pilot program, created by executive order, has never been authorized by Congress.

The amendment is supported by Americans for Limited Government; Eagle Forum; the Federation for American Immigration Reform, FAIR; Heritage Action; and NumbersUSA. In fact, it is being key scored by NumbersUSA and Heritage Action.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GOSAR not only for his work, but also for working with the Committee on Rules diligently to have this made in order.

I am very supportive of this amendment to ensure the administration cannot implement what I consider to be an unconstitutional memo expanding the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest program, I think in clear violation of congressional intent—as a matter of fact, working around Congress.

We must ensure that congressional intent is always protected and executed in accordance with the will of the people and rule of law. The purpose of this program is too important to be exploited for those who I believe have used it for a political agenda. Immigration policy must and should be debated in the Halls of Congress, not written in an agency behind closed doors.

I am very pleased with the gentleman from Arizona, and I thank him for his amendment and for working with the Committee on Rules to have this made in order today.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I also strongly oppose the amendment offered by my friend, Mr. GOSAR. Mr. GOSAR is an outstanding Member of this body and a great advocate for the great State of Arizona, but unfortunately we don't see eye to eye on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, immigrant service in uniform shouldn't be a controversial issue. The Secretary of Defense has the statutory authority to allow any immigrant to enlist if it is in our national interest, including DACA recipients who want to fight for our country.

Simply put, we shouldn't let political posturing stand in the way of our military's recruitment goals. Our Armed Forces need the best and the brightest soldiers, marines, and airmen they can get. Countless DREAMers and other immigrants want nothing more than to serve the country they love and call home. I fought in Iraq, and I know that on the battlefield what matters is your character and your commitment, not your immigration status.

Mr. Chairman, when we vote on this amendment later this evening, I hope we all consider the long sweep of history and not just the anti-immigrant politics of this present time. Immigrants, including those who came here without the right papers, have served with distinction in both world wars. Our military was made stronger in the 1940s because these men were allowed to enlist, and our military will be made stronger in 2016 if we vote to give another generation of immigrants the chance to serve.

Mr. Chairman, the willingness to fight and die in uniform is the purest expression of our love for our country. Let's oppose this amendment and give immigrants who love America the opportunity to try to enlist in America's Armed Forces.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I didn't serve in the military, but I understand my constitutional obligation, Article I, section 8 power as well as the application of the rule of law. That is exactly what made America great was equal application of the law.

If you don't like the law, don't go around it and bypass it with an executive order. Understand that the full jurisdiction of this House is to uphold Article I, section 8 powers. We never gave jurisdiction to this, and it shouldn't go forward. I ask all of those voting on behalf of this amendment to go forward, as well as the King amendment as well.

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. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GALLEGO. 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 NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to extend the expiration date of the memorandum titled ''Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest Program Changes'' and dated September 25, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very similar to Mr. GOSAR's. I think it is important that we continue the debate on this particular issue.

What it says is that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to extend the expiration date of the memorandum titled Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest program changes. Again, it is the President reaching outside the bounds of the law. It is the President deciding he is a legislator instead of the executor. His job is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, not make them up and go around the United States Congress.

I think there is something missing from this debate. It is an assumption that if we have someone in the military and they happen to be covered under DACA, that somehow they are legal. The President can't legalize people that are unlawfully present in America by law. He just asserts that executively, and we have to go to court then to reverse it and get the courts to change that. But the President has relentlessly amended immigration law by executive fiat and executive edict, and this is another time.

Under my amendment, he has the authority to put specialized people in place in the military if they have a special skill set. Now, one of those skill sets is not being an interpreter from English into Spanish. We have plenty of people who can do that. But it is for perhaps interpreters who speak Arabic; it is people who have special skills. It is not for the President to use this as a blanket amnesty.

By the way, people who come into this country under DACA have violated the law. Now, whether they were old enough to be aware or not, it is a matter of law. It doesn't matter to the law. They wave their DACA card at me and say, ''I am now here legally.'' They are not here legally. They just presume they are because we haven't been able to yet block the President on this issue; but we have litigated it, and I have been one who helped initiate the lawsuits to do that.

Now, when someone gets into the military who is Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, chances are they were in the military before they ended up with that card. But if they did, if they came into the country illegally and the President said, ''I am not going to enforce the law against them until such time as DACA expires,'' and then he would like to extend it, they broke the law to come into America, then they lied to get into the military, and then they took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. So I would say which of those three times were they really honorable, the last time or one or two of the first two times? That is really what is at stake here, Mr. Chairman. We can't be allowing the President to go outside the law.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, immigrants have been fighting in America's Armed Forces since the founding of the Republic. Many of them did not come here legally, but in countless cases we still allow them to enlist because, for most of our history, your patriotism was more important than your papers.

The amendment offered by Congressman KING is inconsistent with this rich tradition of immigrant service.

DOD is currently allowing a small number of immigrants who possess critical foreign language and technical skills to join the military through a program called Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest. The amendment before us would end this important program, preventing immigrants from serving in uniform who have medical expertise, linguistic skills, and cultural knowledge that could make a difference in the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. It is important to note that the MAVNI program is fully consistent with current law.

As the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, Congressman THORNBERRY, stated in a recent debate on this issue:

The Secretary has the authority to fill critical needs, whatever they may be, with individuals, however they may have gotten here.

It is also worth noting that, though the MAVNI program allows certain DREAMers to serve, it also makes eligible 22 other categories of immigrants, including a variety of visa holders who entered the country legally.

Finally, this amendment is contrary to our national security interests. As a proud veteran of the Iraq war, I know that the strength of our military is defined not just by the potency of our weapons, but the quality of our people. Our Armed Forces need the best soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen they can get.

□ 1745

Mr. Chairman, we should leave the doors of our military open to our young immigrants who love America and are willing to lay down their lives for our country.

Please join me in voting ''no'' on this misguided, mean-spirited amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that I disagree with the gentleman from Arizona. There is a provision that allows the MAVNI program to be used by the Secretary of Defense, and it has notwithstanding language:

> Notwithstanding paragraph, the Secretary concerned may authorize the enlistment of a person if that Secretary determines that such enlistment is vital to the national interest.

That has long been used in the MAVNI program. It has just never been used under another President to circumvent our immigration laws and fast track people not just into the military, but into citizenship.

If a DACA person is able to get into the military under this MAVNI program or any other program, they don't have to go the green card route with a lawful permanent residence card. They can go directly on a fast track to citizenship. It is a way of circumventing our immigration laws. The President has been using it. And this amendment would block at least that provision of it, so I urge its adoption.

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

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

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

Mr. GALLEGO. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. HUDSON. 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. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to any other location.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment that prohibits funds from this appropriations bill from being used to transfer prisoners from Guantanamo Bay.

Over the weekend, we were tragically reminded of the very real threat of radical Islam when 49 Americans were murdered in the worst terrorist attack on our soil since 9/11. As we continue to mourn and pray for the victims and their families, we must recommit our efforts to defeat those who want to harm us.

We are at war with the radical Islamic extremists, yet our Commander in Chief is so focused on closing Guantanamo Bay that he ignores the danger posed by the terrorists detained there. The American people are counting on us to protect them.

This is a prison that houses some of the world's most dangerous war criminals and hardened terrorists, including some responsible for 9/11.

How can this administration guarantee that these prisoners won't return to the battlefield?

The fact is they can't. In a gut-wrenching admission, a senior Pentagon official told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that former Guantanamo inmates are responsible for the deaths of our fellow Americans overseas. According to The Washington Post, the Obama administration admitted at least 12 detainees released from the prison have launched attacks, killing about a half dozen Americans. This confirms, Mr. Chairman, our worst fears.

The American people get it, and are strongly opposed to closing Guantanamo. Our constituents continue to agree these prisoners do not belong in our backyards and shouldn't be transferred to other countries where there is a great risk they will be released and returned to the battlefield.

In the last several months alone, our world has been rocked by terrorist attacks from San Bernardino to Paris, and, most recently, in Orlando. Many of our biggest national security threats no longer come from traditional nations but from determined groups of extremists like these very detainees, whose sole desire is to kill Americans. The war on terror is an ongoing battle against evil, and we must remain vigilant.

We must take every action necessary to block the President's plan to close Guantanamo Bay. My amendment is another hurdle that will make sure it never happens. I urge my colleagues to put the safety and security of the American people first, and support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 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 regret that a bill and other relevant appropriations acts continue to see attempts to close Guantanamo by prohibiting viable alternatives.

We are debating an appropriations bill, and the committee and this Congress has to pay for things. I think maybe the appropriate discussion ought to be: Who is going to pay for this?

It is estimated that we are spending $5 million annually per inmate or 60 times the cost per inmate in a supermaximum Federal prison in the United States of America. But in the end, having talked about cost, this is not a cost issue. This is one question of law.

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 a human being—any human being—without a trial, in some instances, after more than 10 years, is violative of those laws and our constitutional standards. It is a fundamental principle of this Nation, and we ought to conduct ourselves accordingly.

It is also interesting, from my perspective, that there have been a total of over 780 detainees at Guantanamo. The previous administration released more than 500, as far as transfers. We are all tied up in knots because the current administration has, over a period of 7½ years, transferred 157. Certainly, I also suggest there is a double standard.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

How much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would just, again, urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I understand the point raised by my colleague, and I think there are some valid points that ought to be discussed; but I think the bottom line here is the folks who are left at Guantanamo are the worst of the worst. These are some of the most violent, dangerous criminals in the world, and this President has shown that he is willing to transfer them to other places where the risk of them escaping back to the battlefield is very

high. So I believe we can't risk that. I think the American people are counting on us to put their interests first.

So I will close by urging my colleagues to please support this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on this floor many, many times against amendments—so far, futilely—against amendments to bar the transfer of prisoners from Guantanamo or to prohibit the expenditure of funds to move them here or anywhere else.

This amendment is particularly pernicious. It says you may not spend any funds to move anyone from Guantanamo, period. That has to be unconstitutional, because what it says is, even if you find that an individual is innocent, even if you factually find out he is guilty of no terrorism, he didn't fight against us, he is not a prisoner of war, he is guilty of nothing, he must stay in jail forever.

How can an American legislative body pass a provision that says we will hold someone in jail forever, not only without trial, but even if we know he is innocent of everything?

I will make no further argument—I only have 1 minute—but the fact of the matter is it is clearly unconstitutional, clearly immoral, and against everything we should stand for. No one should vote for this amendment.

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 North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to survey, assess, or review potential locations in the United States to detain any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) 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.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has consistently made it very clear that it is against the law for the terrorists held at Guantanamo to be brought to the United States. Though this debate is often partisan, this commonsense policy has often had bipartisan support. In fact, Democrats were actually the first to include restrictions in the Defense Appropriations bill in 2009 when they controlled both Chambers of Congress. Since then, a bipartisan majority has renewed these restrictions every year.

My amendment is simple and logical and is slightly different than the current law that we do have on the books and the language that is in the NDAA right now. This amendment prohibits the use of any funds to study or prepare U.S. detention facilities to house these terrorists.

If it is against the law to bring dangerous terrorists to the United States, why would we allow the Obama administration to study, using taxpayer dollars, how it would try to do this? Why would we want any administration to study how it can break the law?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my colleague, Mr. LAMBORN's amendment.

I am strongly opposed to the President using funds to survey potential sites within the United States at which to hold terrorists that are currently held at Guantanamo Bay.

Congress has passed numerous times, and the President has signed into law, legislation which explicitly prohibits the President from using taxpayer funds to bring terrorists to our soil and close the detention facility. Despite the law, the President has made his intent clear to close Guantanamo Bay and bring these terrorists to our States and local communities.

In the face of opposition from the American people and Congress and State Governors, the President continues to move forward with bringing these terrorists to our soil.

Last month, Governor Haley from my State of South Carolina testified before the Homeland Security Committee. She sent a letter to President Obama opposing terrorists coming to South Carolina, and never got a response from the administration and was never included in the initial talks. The President refuses to work with State Governors and with this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, no State should be a terrorist dumping ground. No State, whether South Carolina, Colorado, or any other, should be a terrorist dumping ground. Doing so would only make our communities the most high-profile terrorist targets in the world.

As Members of Congress, we must use every tool at our disposal to prevent the President from disregarding the law and the will of the people, including our power of the purse, by not allowing taxpayer dollars going towards bringing terrorists into this country.

I fully support this, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from even reviewing locations in the U.S. to hold Guantanamo detainees. It would obviously make it much more difficult to close the prison, which is obviously its purpose, which experts agree that it is the prison that harms U.S. national security.

Major General Michael Lehnert, the first commander charged with constructing and operating the Guantanamo detention facility after 9/11, recently submitted a statement for the record to the House Subcommittee on Homeland Security, calling Guantanamo ''inconsistent with our values as Americans,'' and recommending the prison be closed.

As General Lehnert stated: ''Guantanamo's continued existence hurts us in our prosecution of the fight against terrorists. It feeds into the narrative that the United States is not a Nation of laws nor one that respect human rights.''

Former Secretary of State Colin Powell recently said that closing Guantanamo is in the United States ''best interest.'' Powell also stressed the effectiveness of U.S. Federal courts to prosecute terrorism offenses, which have convicted over 67 individuals of such charges since 9/11, including Osama bin Laden's son-in-law, Sulaiman Abu Ghaith.

Federal courts have been vastly more successful than the Guantanamo military commissions, where four of the eight detainees convicted have had their convictions completely overturned.

Prohibiting the Department of Defense from assessing U.S. locations to hold Guantanamo detainees is fiscally irresponsible. It costs us $34,000 a year to hold a detainee in a Federal supermax prison. It costs us $5 million a year to hold a detainee in Guantanamo. That is $5 million versus $34,000.

Even if it costs money to build a new supermax—although, I don't know why we would need a new supermax. There is plenty of room in our supermax prisons for the maximum number, which is 91 people now in Guantanamo, even assuming none of them were released.

□ 1800

Ninety-one times $5 million, minus 91 times $34,000 is a gross waste of money. Even if you had to spend money to build a new supermax prison, you are still saving a lot of money in the long run.

The last thing I want to say is, why would we subject our States as dumping grounds for terrorists?

Well, we have 67 terrorists convicted since 9/11 in American prisons and supermaxes in the United States. No one has ever escaped from a supermax prison. It is pure fear-mongering to say that a State or any place in the United States would be endangered by having a terrorist or anyone else in a supermax prison.

If the terrorist from Orlando had not been shot dead, he would presumably be either sentenced to death or sentenced to life in prison. He would be in a prison in the United States, and no one would say that is unsafe. No one would say: You have got to export him from the country. That is just pure, aberrant nonsense.

So we ought to shut the prison because it is fiscally sound. It would remove a terrorist propaganda point from al Qaeda and ISIS and everybody else. And not all those 91—some of them may be the worst of the worst. Some of them may not be. Some of them we know were simply handed over to bounty hunters because some other tribe in Afghanistan thought this is a good way—the Americans are handing out $5,000, $10,000—this is a good way to get rid of our rivals.

They ought to be tried. If guilty, they ought to be kept in prison for life, perhaps, depending on what they are guilty of. But if innocent, they ought to be released. And to say they ought to stay in Guantanamo without trial—and we know the military tribunals don't work; they haven't managed to convict anybody and make it stick—forever is un-American.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, President Obama's policy of releasing people willy-nilly from Guantanamo is a bad policy. The risk is real. In recent months, the administration has finally admitted that there have been Americans who have died because of Guantanamo detainees who have been released. The Director of National Intelligence has said one of every three released detainees has rejoined the fight.

Even if detainees are brought to the U.S. and never escape, to address what my colleague from New York said, there is a very real danger of proselytization within the prison system, radicalizing the inmate population, and allowing terrorists to have increased legal rights, the risk of contraband, and access to communications. If there ever were a trial on U.S. soil, they would have the right to access methods and sources used by our intelligence agencies, and those would be given away to the bad guys. The people of Colorado and other States certainly don't feel safe having these terrorists in their backyards for those reasons.

Transferring Guantanamo prisoners to American soil is illegal, period. We need to do everything we can to ensure the President doesn't break the law or overturn the will of the American people and increase the risk to the American people, all because of a foolish and misguided campaign promise.

I would like to inform the President that 9/11 happened way before there ever was a Guantanamo prison. That is not why the Islamic radicals attacked us. They oppose our very way of life. They oppose us for who we are, not for what we do.

Let's keep GTMO open.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, following up on part of the discussion, we have had 443 people convicted of terrorist-related charges held in U.S. prisons, and as has already been indicated, they are very secure because no one has escaped.

I don't think it is necessarily wrong, even if a person is evil, that they have some modicum of legal rights under the United States of America. And you have 63 people being held in Guantanamo today for over 10 years with no trial. I just don't think that is according to the constitutional principles of this country.

But what I find upsetting is the prohibition on surveys, assessment, and reviews, the search for knowledge. There may be no better way to deal with the detention issue than keeping Guantanamo open. I would acknowledge that to the gentleman. There may not be a better way.

But if we don't search for knowledge and information and the truth, we will never know. What is the harm in asking?

I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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 Colorado will be postponed.

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. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 5485, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. CRENSHAW, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–624) on the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 783 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. 5293.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1807

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. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARTER 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 amendment No. 29, printed in House Report 114–623, offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of 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 for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities in Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, today my friend, Congressman JONES, and I are offering an amendment to end the DOD's involvement in and funding of the futile war on drugs in Afghanistan.

In his most recent quarterly report from April 2016, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan, Mr. John Sopko, said that the United States has provided a total of $8.5 billion in funding for counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan since 2002. But these efforts have failed. They have been a colossal failure.

Afghanistan remains the world's leading opium supplier. It provides over 90 percent of the world's opium today, and since our efforts in Afghanistan to counter poppy production and opium production, would you believe that their production has doubled?

That is right. We have spent over $8 billion in counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan, and they have doubled their production in that period of time. If this isn't a measure of failure, I don't know what it is.

Congress annually appropriates counternarcotics funds through the DOD drug interdiction and counterdrug accounts. It also appropriates drug interdiction funds via the State Department's International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement account and through the Drug Enforcement Administration.

My amendment would specifically end DOD funding for the Afghanistan drug war, which would substantially cut the United States overall spending on antidrug efforts there. Since 2002, Congress has appropriated a total of $3 billion, that is billion with a B, for the DOD drug interdiction and counterdrug activities fund.

That is $3 billion that could have been spent here at our border on border control efforts or on antidrug efforts or counternarcotics efforts here in the United States.

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

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, for years, the production and trafficking of heroin in Afghanistan has provided an important source of revenue to the Taliban and other antigovernment forces in the region. It is estimated the Taliban receives between $70 million and $100 million per year from the illicit drug trade.

Regional heroin trafficking is also fueling corruption and impeding legitimate economic activity critical for Afghans' continued development and stability.

$140.8 million was requested to provide direct counternarcotic support for Afghanistan. It is badly needed. These activities directly support the activities of the Department of Defense Operation Freedom's Sentinel by building their capacity and neighboring countries' capacities, their counternarcotics force, to disrupt illicit trafficking and deny proceeds from being used to fund terrorists' insurgent activities.

Funds support the training and equipping of special Afghan units, including their counternarcotics police as well as their national interdiction unit. It is important.

Allowing more illicit narcotics cultivation and trade to continue, without any methods or action to counter or interdict it, would be a total disaster, a total mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member, for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time and join with the chairman in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I would agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that it is hard at times to measure progress in Afghanistan. However, with the continued presence of 10,000 troops, with the sacrifice, both in terms of life and our treasury, that have been expended over the last decade and a half, I do not believe that it is now time to completely desist, particularly, as the chairman rightfully points out, that this is a profit center for one of our enemies. So I would ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, you know, in Congress, we often make the mistake of confusing activity with progress. And no doubt there has been a lot of activity—and the goals are noble—to cut off the funding for the Taliban. This is a source of income, opium production. And the activity has been there. We have spent $8 billion.

The problem is they have doubled their production. Ironically, we have helped them with irrigation and better roads, their infrastructure. Something we are doing over there isn't working, unless our goal is to increase their profits, because they have tripled the acreage that they are growing of poppy fields over there.

So we need to do something differently. What we are doing is not working. And throwing money at the problem will not solve it.

What I am proposing today is to stop the war on drugs there. It has been ineffective.

I would also remind folks—I probably don't need to remind any of my colleagues, there is a heroin epidemic here in the United States, and it is terrible in my district. My constituents are asking me, why are we throwing the money away in Afghanistan when we have the problems here? In Afghanistan, when we see no positive results—we see negative results—why don't we, instead, use that money to secure our border and prevent the influx of opium and heroin? Why don't we first focus our efforts on cleaning up our own streets, keeping our young people away from deadly drugs, versus throwing billions of dollars more away in Afghanistan on a program that has proven, by any objective measure, to be ineffective?

We had a hearing on this in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and there was no evidence there that any of these efforts have curtailed the opium production in Afghanistan. That is why I am offering this amendment today with Congressman JONES. I encourage my colleagues to support me in this.

□ 1815

Stop throwing money away. Stop wasting it in foreign countries. Bring that money back home and spend it here domestically instead for our constituents.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, in closing, there has been progress in Afghanistan. As long as we have nearly 10,000 troops over there, this is one of the things we need to focus on because it has a lot to do with protecting those that are there fighting on our behalf doing the work of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, 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 NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. MASSIE. 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 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.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, our Founding Fathers included the Fourth Amendment in our Constitution for a reason: to require probable cause and a warrant before the government and government agents can spy on any of its citizens. Our Founding Fathers were fed up, and, frankly, I think our citizens are fed up with being spied on by the government.

I am here to offer an amendment today that would prevent warrantless surveillance of Americans. I am offering it with many of my colleagues. I want to mention that this amendment has passed this House, this body, twice previously: once by 293–123, and another time by 255–174. It enjoys broad bipartisan support.

My cosponsors are Mr. JORDAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. AMASH, Representative POCAN, Representatives NADLER, GABBARD, FARENTHOLD, TED LIEU of California, ISSA, BUTTERFIELD, LABRADOR, GOSAR, DELBENE, POE of Texas, CONYERS, SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN from California.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, warrantless bulk collection of U.S. person communications and information was not ended with the USA FREEDOM Act. Twice in the last 2 years the House voted overwhelmingly to close two loopholes, but House leadership blocked us. The first back door will be shut by prohibiting search of government databases for information pertaining to U.S. citizens without a warrant. You can get the information, but you have to get a warrant.

In October of 2011, in a declassified FISA court decision, we learned that tens of thousands of wholly domestic communications—which are not even allowed to be collected under 702—have been collected. We need to make sure that, when you look for an American in that database, you get a warrant as the Fourth Amendment requires.

The second door to be shut prohibits the government from coercing companies into weakening security protections by creating back doors in products to make surveillance easier.

What is encryption? It is sophisticated computer code that is the most powerful tool we have for preventing outsiders from gaining entry into digital systems. Encryption protects the power grid, the air traffic control system, and your smartphone. Even if a weakness in encryption is promoted and created with good intentions, it is only a matter of time until a hacker finds and exploits it.

Such flaws put data security of every person and business—and really, the security of the United States—at risk. Our government should strengthen the technology that protects our privacy, our businesses, and our country—not take advantage of it.

The Massie-Lofgren amendment will make America safer, and it will defend the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California.

May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, 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, this amendment would impose greater restrictions on the intelligence community's ability to protect our national security and create an impediment to the government's ability to locate threat information already in its possession. Such an impediment, therefore, would put a lot more American lives at risk both at home and abroad.

Colleagues, as recent events have tragically reminded us, this issue is critical to our national security. Lawful queries can enable analysts to identify potential terror plots, to identify foreign nations trying to hack into our networks, to locate foreign intelligence officers spying within our borders, and, yes, to locate hostage victims.

These authorities were fully considered, as they should be, and we will hear in a moment from Chairman GOODLATTE during the development and the consideration of the USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time and simply associate myself with the chairman's remarks. I am opposed to the amendment. I do appreciate the seriousness of people's opinion on both sides of this issue.

I am an appropriator. I don't have a complete allergic reaction to authorizing in an appropriation bill, but given the seriousness of this issue and the complexity of it, I don't think this is the right venue to make that decision. It should be done in the authorizing process.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate that all this amendment basically does is reassert the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. All of the tools currently available to our intelligence agencies and those that keep us safe in the United States would still be available.

The only thing that changes after this amendment passes is that the warrant is required to search for information on Americans. It has been this way constitutionally since the beginning of our country. We are just trying to reassert that. Let them have all the tools they have today; just require a warrant if you want to search for information on Americans.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose the Massie amendment and the inaccurate accusations that underlie it. Let me restate that. The supposition of this amendment is based off a fundamental misunderstanding of intelligence operations.

Contrary to rumor, it is illegal to use 702 surveillance authorities to spy on Americans. It is subject to multiple layers of oversight, and section 702 is an extremely powerful tool that has proven effective in disrupting terror plots, including, for one example, the 2009 plot to bomb the New York City subway. If this amendment were in effect today, the intelligence community would be unable to query the 702 database for the names of the Orlando nightclub attacker, for his wife, or even the nightclub itself.

We should be focusing on thwarting terror attacks, not on thwarting the ability of intelligence professionals to investigate and to stop them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to prioritize the safety of U.S. citizens and to reject false allegations. Let me say that one more time: false and irresponsible allegations of government spying on Americans. We can scarcely afford to hamstring our intelligence community as it investigates these horrific shootings and tries to prevent similar plots from reaching fruition.

All of us want to protect our privacy and our constitutional rights. I want to protect our privacy and our constitutional rights. But objections to intelligence operations must be based on facts and not rumors or misunderstandings. Limiting access to critical law enforcement tools to stop these plots would directly put Americans in danger.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Director of National Intelligence that shows that Americans are being spied on without a warrant using the 702 program.

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 communications 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, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, who has the right the close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has the right to close.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our government spies on Americans. Section 702 was designed to go after the bad guys overseas, but it is being used to collect communications of Americans in America without a search warrant under the Fourth Amendment.

The amendment that the gentleman from Kentucky has introduced does something very basic. It says the Fourth Amendment will apply to a 702(a). If you have got a search warrant, go see a judge like I used to be; and if you have probable cause, then let a judge sign it. If you don't have probable cause, then you don't get a warrant. That is all it does.

It says the Constitution must apply to Americans, and fear tactics—I am sorry—on the other side don't change the facts. Get a warrant if you have probable cause. That is all the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment does.

Mr. MASSIE. To the judge's point, I would say that this doesn't take any tools away from those who want to investigate what happened in Orlando, none whatsoever. That is a mischaracterization, a complete mischaracterization of this amendment. You obviously can get a warrant on the perpetrator of this crime. So it would be wrong to characterize it in the way it is being characterized. It is unfortunate that my colleagues would take advantage of that situation to try and motivate people to vote ''no'' against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. It doesn't take away any of the tools. Read the amendment; you will find out. Just get the warrant; do the search.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, before I yield my time, how much time remains on my side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, the tragic mass shooting in Florida Sunday morning is but the latest in a string of terror attacks here in America. Sadly, these plots have not been carried out by foreign terrorists but by Americans against Americans, on American soil.

We are all searching for the same answer: What motivated Omar Mateen to kill?

Investigators are still combing through evidence to determine whether Mateen was in contact with known or suspected terrorists. This amendment prohibits the government from searching data already in its possession, collected lawfully under section 702 of FISA, to determine whether Omar Mateen was in contact with foreign terrorists overseas.

Despite the characterization by proponents of the amendment that a search could occur if the government has obtained a FISA or criminal probable cause-based order, the exception does not, in fact, authorize such a query. Section 702 and the other provisions of the FISA Amendments Act are not set to expire until December 31 of next year.

The House Judiciary Committee shares the concerns of all here that we protect all Americans' rights under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The committee has engaged and will continue to be engaged in robust oversight of the programs operated under the act.

A floor amendment to a spending bill debated for 10 minutes is not the appropriate venue for Congress to alter our intelligence gathering capabilities. This complicated issue must be closely examined and appropriately vetted by the committees of jurisdiction.

Sunday's deadly attack proves once again that the terror threat has not dissipated. The FBI has roughly 1,000 active ISIS probes in the United States, and these are probes into those we know about. Now is not the time to block the use of a critical investigative tool.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b)(iii), or 6(c) of Executive Order 13653 (78 Fed. Reg. 66817).

(2) Section 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15(b) of Executive Order 13693 (80 Fed. Reg. 15869).

(3) Paragraph (4), (9), (10), or (12) of subsection (c) or subsection (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Section 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(5) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(6) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) 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 spent to fund two executive orders and several other provisions of law that require the military to squander billions of dollars on so-called green energy.

The House adopted this amendment by voice vote last year and the year before, and I hope it will do so again.

We have been told this year that the defense budget is so tight that the Air Force has to scavenge museums for spare aircraft parts. Yet, it seems we have plenty of defense money to indulge the green energy mandates that are imposed upon our Armed Forces.

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 costs just $2.50 per gallon.

These mandates forced the Air Force to pay $59 per gallon for 11,000 gallons of biofuel in 2012—10 times more than regular jet fuel cost. And it is not just biofuels.

Two years ago, 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 in various facilities. At Naval Station Norfolk, the Navy spent $21 million to install a 10-acre solar array, which will supply a grand total of 2 percent of the base's electricity. According to the Inspector General's Office, this project will save enough money to pay for itself in only 447 years. Too bad solar panels only last 25 years.

We don't know how much all of 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.'' But outside estimates are as much as $10 billion for the Department of Defense last year, a figure that continues to grow.

We are told this program is necessary to maintain flexibility. Well, shouldn't flexibility free us to get cheaper and more plentiful fuels rather than 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.

I feel the real reason for this wasteful spending is part of an ideological agenda imposed on our military that will pointlessly consume billions of defense dollars, namely, to keep money flowing to politically well-connected green energy companies that can't get anybody else to buy their products.

As long as this product continues to consume our defense dollars, we cannot say that we are stretching our defense budget to the utmost.

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 would point out to my House colleagues that the gentleman's amendment is very extensive and, for all practical purposes, will prohibit the Department of Defense in pursuing green energy initiatives. We have had previous debates today about the issue of climate change and the defense issues it presents to our Nation.

The gentleman says no funds shall be used for a wide range of initiatives. It would prohibit sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b)(iii), or 6(c) of an executive order; sections 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15(b) of an executive order; paragraphs (4), (9), (10), or (12) of subsection (c) or subsection (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code; section 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 under the last administration.

As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, sometimes we are very good at doing nothing. This would essentially block the Department of Defense from buying recycled paper.

The gentleman talked about solar arrays. Maybe if we continued to develop solar power and made them available to help in the field for tents, for example, we wouldn't have so many casualties in fuel convoys.

And we do have, unfortunately, a Metro stop at the Pentagon. This would block considering sites for pedestrian-friendly or public transportation access. So I assume we should essentially close the Metro stop at the Pentagon.

I think that this amendment is wrongheaded, unwarranted, and I am opposed to it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for pointing out just how much we are wasting in this program. If the Metro stop at the Pentagon cost us $10 billion a year, maybe we should close it; but that is not the point of this bill.

We have to ask ourselves how serious we are about meeting the defense needs of our Nation. We have been constantly warned how poorly funded our military is. The program this amendment would end is an estimated $10 billion of sheer waste, grossly inflated energy costs that come directly out of our military preparedness—$10 billion. Divide that by the number of families in America, and it comes to about $80 per family. It makes a mockery of claims that we have cut the military to the bone and puts the lie to any claim that we are serious about meeting our basic defense needs without bankrupting our country.

I would remind the House of Admiral Mullen's chilling warning that in his professional military judgment, our greatest national security threat is the national debt, because before we can provide for the common defense, we have to be able to pay for it, and waste like this robs us of our ability to defend our Nation and the Treasury upon which our defense depends.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, in his closing remarks, the gentleman suggested that if the Metro stop at the Pentagon costs $10 billion, perhaps we should close it. It doesn't. It doesn't cost $10 billion, and it doesn't cost that money to the Department of Defense.

We can debate and we can disagree on facts. We should not use exaggeration during debate in the House.

I am adamantly opposed to 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 California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. MULVANEY. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by title IX may be used in contravention of section 101(a)(13) of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I am here, once again, to talk about the overseas contingency operations budget. My opinion of it by now should be no secret to anybody. I don't like it very much. There are other folks who agree with me. Unfortunately, not enough. But I will continue to come here and try to draw attention to what I believe to be a tremendous waste of taxpayer dollars.

There are folks, by the way, who agree with me. I don't often come to this microphone and cite JOHN MCCAIN as somebody who agrees with me on something, but he has described it as a gimmick and thinks that we can do better. The CBO described it as a method of spending with ''relatively little backup.'' Other folks in this Chamber from both parties have described as a slush fund. I happen to agree with all of those statements.

In the past, I have come here, Mr. Chairman, to try and simply get rid of the OCO budget because of the weaknesses that I think it contains. We are not doing that today. We have tried something different. We have tried to drill down a little bit and be a little bit more detailed in how we address the OCO budget by simply trying to define what it means to be OCO. We call it the war budget, but we don't really know what it means.

We tried today to figure out a way to define what it means. Lo and behold, we found out that in law, it is already defined. If you turn to title 10, section 101 of the U.S. Code, the definition of the Armed Forces section of the U.S. Code, General Military Law, Organization and General Military Powers, Chapter 1—Definitions, lo and behold, in section 13, the term ''contingency

operation'' is defined. It reads as follows:

''The term 'contingency operation' means a military operation that:

''(A) is designated by the Secretary of Defense as an operation in which members of the armed forces are or may become involved in military actions, operations, or hostilities against an enemy of the United States or against an opposing military force; or

''(B) results in the call or order to, or retention on, active duty of members of the uniformed services . . . or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress.''

Contingency operations are defined in law, and have been for quite some time. Mr. Chairman, we have been ignoring that.

My amendment is very simple. It puts a stop to that. My amendment simply says that none of the funds available under title IX of this bill should be used in contravention of section 101(a)(13) title 10 of the United States Code. That is it. That is all it does. It simply says, in layman's terms, the overseas contingency operations will be used for contingency operations. To change the words a little bit to the stuff that ordinary people can understand, what the amendment does is make sure that the war budget is used for warfighters in the war effort and is no longer used as a slush fund to hide government spending from the taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues, even those who have opposed my efforts before, to completely discontinue the OCO budget, to bring some modicum of discipline to spending the war budget, making sure that it is spent on what the law provides, and not used on things that we have no idea where the money is being spent, which is so often the case.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the important investments our bill makes in our military, investments that the President's request simply did not make.

As I outlined in general debate, this bill shifts roughly $16 billion from the President's request for the overseas contingency account, which we call in our bill also the war on terror account, for their operations into critical investments in our personnel training and equipment by providing a bridge fund for our overseas operations through the end of April of next year.

Need I remind my colleagues that we currently have the lowest manning level in the Army since before World War II. At this time when North Korea, Iran, Russia are threatening international stability, ISIS isn't drawing back, and other groups are actually on the attack across the Middle East in northern Africa.

This legislation also boosts the Army and Marine Corps end strength to begin rebuilding our forces eroded in strength and morale by years of underinvestment. We also have the smallest Navy since before World War I—World War I. Let me assure my colleagues that Russia and China aren't slowing down their shipbuilding, and neither is Iran doing the same in terms of their Navy.

The readiness level for all of our services are alarmingly low, seriously risking our ability to defend American interests when called to do so. This is simply an unacceptable risk. It is the highest priority of all of us, and has been, on our committee, which is entirely bipartisan, to ensure that we have a strong national defense.

□ 1845

We have corrected deficiencies to the best of our ability. With what the President has provided us, we have provided oversight and have promoted accountability. These dollars are well spent. I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I say that with very strong respect for the gentleman who offered it. I think his heart is in the right place. He wants to see that we spend in a very disciplined manner. Yet, in the way that the amendment is currently crafted, we are going to see a significant downsize to our readiness.

As the chairman mentioned, we are on a path to having the smallest military since 1939. We just have a point of disagreement with the administration about that. We are trying to stop, roughly, 70,000 troops from getting pink slips between now and 2018, and we are doing that in a manner that ensures they have the kit—all the modernization, the operations, and maintenance—that goes with it.

I would suggest to the gentleman, if he withdrew his amendment and if he worked with us, that on my committee—the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee—there is a sentiment to begin to move and get it back. In fact, we even use language that it is designated for base requirements. To the gentleman's point, I would agree, but I would also say that, in the way the amendment is currently crafted, we will end up with the smallest military since 1939, and in this world, as described by the chairman, we cannot afford to do that.

I have one last thing, Mr. Chair. This whole House is united in its support for veterans. Veterans have had to continually go overseas and come back at a rapid pace because of its being a small force, so one way of looking after our servicemen and -women and our veterans is to make sure that we have the right-sized force. That is why we must reject this amendment.

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chair, again, with all due respect to my friend, the gentleman from New York, to suggest that if my amendment passes, that somehow readiness will go down admits that we are spending money in violation of the law. Contingency operations are not meant for readiness. That is what the base military budget is for. We should be doing that anyway. I share in the concern of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about the size of the military and our readiness, but that is not war. Readiness to go to war is not war. This is not supposed to be a replacement for the base budget. This should be, as my colleague from New York correctly pointed out, part of the war on terror. The OCO budget should be used to fight ISIS overseas, and it should be used to fight in Iraq and to fight in Syria. It should not be used for items that are not contingency operations.

I go back to the example of the MILCON-VA bill that we had here a couple of weeks ago. We had no direction as to where money was being spent. I had a subcommittee chairman get up and say, ''Well, it is going to be a health facility in Djibouti.'' Nothing in law says that—nothing. The only thing we passed out of this House was X number of dollars to be spent overseas before 2022. That is it. You could sit here and say, ''Well, this money is for the troops, or this money is for a base.'' No, it is not. This money is for whatever we decide we want to spend it on, and that is not right.

The OCO budget came into existence for a good reason. We were caught in 2011 without the ability to fund a war on terror, and we started spending money off budget to solve that problem. It is no longer an emergency. We should be having this money for readiness in the base budget. We should pass this amendment so that the OCO budget returns to what it is meant to be.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise to tell the gentleman from South Carolina that, in my opening remarks, I said, as I have said in previous years, we should eliminate the reliance on OCO funding, in the first instance, and shift activities to the base budget. I also said in my opening remarks that I am concerned that other committees have placed our subcommittee in a very difficult position by authorizing this particular transfer, while not violative of the caps, in violation, from my perspective, of the budget agreement we made last year when we were to have certainty for 2 years in a row.

I would point out that the one fallacy I see with the gentleman's amendment is that, under that agreement that, I believe, gave us 2 years of predictability, there was an internal agreement that you could have that transfer of $5 billion of OCO to base, and because I was upset that that continuity of certainty was broken, I would have to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but he is on the right track.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I strongly 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 South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

Mr. MULVANEY. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), 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. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to pay for any salaries or expenses of the office or position of the Special Envoy for Guantanamo Detention Closure or the Principal Director, Detainee Policy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, as we have seen with stark clarity recently, Islamic jihadists are on the march, not only abroad but here at home. I think, once we have individuals in our custody who we know are committed to this destructive ideology and to waging war against the United States—like we have almost 80 of them in Guantanamo Bay now—they should remain in custody. We don't want to get into a situation in which we are transferring these detainees unwittingly simply because we are on an ideological mission to close Guantanamo Bay, and this facility is a key part of our strategy in fighting the war on terror.

The Obama administration recently admitted that they were not seeking to use an executive order in order to close Gitmo's detention facility, and that is a welcome admission, because that was something that had been reported was being considered behind the scenes.

Recent news reports, perhaps, shed light on why this is a nonstarter. Recent news reports have shown that at least 12 released Guantanamo detainees have attacked U.S. personnel or allied forces in Afghanistan, and they are responsible for killing at least six Americans. These are terrorists we had in our custody who were then released and who went out to kill a half dozen Americans, according to U.S. officials. This is totally unacceptable.

This amendment, which I am cosponsoring with Congressman POMPEO, would ban funding to two DOD offices whose purposes are, simply, to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay.

The facts and the reality show that their mission is unwise and unneeded. My amendment would prohibit funds for salaries or expenses for the Office of the Special Envoy for Guantanamo Detention Closure and the Principal Director of the Office of Detainee Policy. The sole mission of the Principal Director of the Office of Detainee Policy is to end detainee operations at Guantanamo Bay. That means either transferring people to the United States or overseas, where we know many of them go back to the jihad once they are released. President Obama also established the Office of the Special Envoy for Guantanamo Detention Closure, which has the same objective.

This amendment will eliminate unnecessary bureaucracy and will help keep Americans safe. As President Obama himself begins to give up on his misguided campaign to close Gitmo, Americans, especially the people whom I represent, can rest assured that none of these terrorists will be brought to their States or, hopefully, will be transferred to countries that are not going to keep tabs on them.

It is time we end the funding for these two offices and get back to protecting Americans and holding those hardened terrorists in a secured facility we already have that is located off our shores.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, this amendment is another amendment in a series we have seen today to prevent any movement toward closing the Guantanamo Bay facility, obviously, and it would prevent the expenditure for any officials who are trying to do that. A number of myths have been propounded as to why we should do this.

One, we cannot bring terrorists to the United States. First of all, not everybody in Guantanamo is a terrorist. Some are. Some are not. There should be trials. There should be some form of due process. It is un-American to hold people there for life. Apparently, the people who are in favor of these amendments—this one included—want everyone in Guantanamo to be held forever because you can't spend any money to release them. You can't spend any money to close the prison. You can't spend any money to put them in a facility in the United States. You can't spend any money to do anything except to hold them in jail in Guantanamo forever and for $5 million a piece per year.

Several reasons have been introduced for doing this.

One, if they are brought to the United States and to a supermax prison, that is dangerous. No, it is not. No one has ever escaped from a supermax prison, and the executive director, Jim Gondles, of the American Correctional Association recently submitted a statement for the record to a House Homeland Security subcommittee stating that U.S. corrections systems, both military and civilian, already hold extremely dangerous people, including terrorists, and have done so for years. No matter how dangerous the detainees are, U.S. correctional systems professionals, military and civilian, have the ability, training, and capacity to take them on.

Second, we are told that there is a risk if these people are released—and some of them should be because they are not guilty—that, at some point, they could return to terrorism, assuming they are all terrorists. The fact of the matter is the recidivism rate—now it is true—under the Bush administration was 20.9 percent. Twenty-one percent of the detainees who were released under the Bush administration have returned to some sort of combat or insurgent activity. They didn't do a great job in screening under the Bush administration. Under the Obama administration—in other words, for the last 7½ years—the figure is not 21 percent; it is a little under 5 percent, 4.9 percent. The White House recently confirmed that no detainees who have been released in this administration—that is to say in the last 8 years—have been responsible for the death of any American. Let's get rid of that bogus point.

It has also been misstated on this floor tonight that we don't want to bring Guantanamo prisoners to a supermax facility in the United States: A, because it is dangerous, which is nonsense; B, because they can radicalize other prisoners, which they can be kept apart from; and, C, because they would have more constitutional rights in the United States than in Guantanamo. The Supreme Court has ruled that prisoners at Guantanamo have exactly the same constitutional rights as prisoners who are held in the United States—no more, no less. The attempts to give them fewer constitutional rights are why every single conviction in the military tribunal in Guantanamo has been overturned on appeal so far.

They should be brought to the United States or released, depending on the

case. They should be tried in a Federal court and put in a supermax prison forever if they are guilty, and if they are not guilty, they ought to be released. That is the American tradition. That is our way of life. It is what we are fighting to defend, at least presumably.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is, if you inject them into American prisons with the idea that you are going to be able to 100 percent segregate them and that they are not going to be able to radicalize any other inmates, why would you even want to run that risk?

In terms of bringing them to trial, the problem is that these guys were not captured under civilian law. They were captured under the law of war. If you are expecting our troops to amass legal cases against people they are capturing in war zones, that is going to put more of our troops' lives at risk. If you are in a hot fire zone but if you need to get evidence to make sure that that could withstand a court of law, they should be held under the law of war, not under civilian laws under which Americans would be.

I am sorry. I don't care if Bush released a detainee—or Obama. It is not about partisan games for me. If detainees are released in Afghanistan and they kill Americans, that is a bad thing, and I don't want to repeat that. The people who are there right now are some of the most radical detainees. These are people who have been reviewed for years, and no one would have ever thought that they should have been released. So why on Earth would you want to run the risk of putting more of these guys out into circulation given that we know Americans have already been killed?

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Number one, they can be segregated in Federal prisons in the United States, and maybe they should be. Number two, some of them are indeed great terrorists and some aren't. Number three, they may have been captured in war zones, but they weren't in uniform, which means some of them may not have been combatants. That is what has to be determined. If they were combatants, they can be held under the law of war; but if they weren't combatants and they haven't committed any crimes, they should be released.

There has to be some due process. We can't hold people in prison forever with no trial, no due process because we think maybe—and remember, some of these people were. We offered bounties to tribes in Afghanistan. And like the Hatfields and the McCoys, the Hatfields turned in the McCoys, and we don't really know that all the McCoys were guilty of anything or engaged in combat.

Before we can hold them under the laws of war, we ought to at least have some sort of review to find that out. It is not true that all of them are the most dangerous. Some are; some are not. We owe it to our own traditions to figure out the difference.

Not to mention the fact that, to hold them in the United States, it costs $34,000 a year, and to hold them in Guantanamo costs $5 million a year, each. Who is the fiscally responsible party today?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, like a lot of these numbers, I mean, they get around-the-clock medical care and halal meals. I would be fine with curtailing that. If we could have paid that money to save those American troops, I would pay it every day, every single day.

I am a little confused by this argument that we would actually reward people who were picked up in combat zones when they are not wearing uniforms. That is essentially rewarding these terrorists who are not wearing insignia and they are not following the laws of war. So to then give them a civilian trial where someone actually followed the laws of war, they would simply end up being held under Geneva III. To me, that totally skews the incentive.

I think it is a good amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support 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. DESANTIS).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. REICHERT. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out Executive Order 13688 entitled ''Federal Support for Local Law Enforcement Equipment Acquisition''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, tragically, as we saw in San Bernardino and most recently in Orlando, we are living in a time with increasing threats in our local communities. This leaves our law enforcement officers and first responders with the responsibility of fighting from the front lines against the war on terror.

Not only is more being asked of our first responders, but as local budgets get cut, they are asked to undertake these tasks with fewer and fewer resources. This is why the Defense Logistics Agency transfer of excess military equipment to civilian law enforcement agencies, otherwise known as the 1033 Program, has been critical for first responders throughout the country and a necessity to keep our cities and neighborhoods safe.

The name 1033, by the way, comes from a section of the 1997 National Defense Authorization Act that made that program permanent. However, the law enforcement officers who might be listening to this presentation tonight know that 1033 in the 10 code means ''officer needs help.'' As a former law enforcement officer for 33 years, I have had many occasions to use a 1033 call for officer needs help.

Mr. Chairman, we are in, today, a world where our first responders are saying: 1033, we need help; we need support; we need you to stand by us and support us, provide us with the tools that we need to protect this country.

This is a cost-neutral program that allows civilian law enforcement offices to acquire military equipment, giving them the tools to respond to the new and dangerous threats that America faces.

For example, during the tragic San Bernardino terrorist attack in December 2015, the local police used an armored vehicle acquired through the 1033 Program for officers to take cover in while the attackers were shooting hundreds of rounds at them. They were then able to move the vehicle, to maneuver and eventually take down the attackers.

Firefighters have also used the 1033 Program. In fact, in my own district, the Kittitas County Search and Rescue team has acquired a light military tactical vehicle that can access the mountain terrain in my district where wildfires constantly affect remote households. The Kittitas Valley Fire and Rescue agency spent $65,000 for a $250,000 machine that will be used to save lives in our community.

The President's Executive Order 13688 prohibits our law enforcement officers from acquiring some of the equipment needed to carry out their critical missions of protecting our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I have already said I served in law enforcement for 33 years. I know, from my own experience and from speaking with members of the law enforcement community, that by not fully equipping our first responders, we expose the American people to dangers that they don't need to be exposed to, and we can't be there to help them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REICHERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, law enforcement in my community, New Jersey sheriffs and police chiefs, are grateful for appropriate Defense Department equipment that allows them to do their jobs. It is all about, certainly, protecting the public, public safety, and allowing our law enforcement people to do their job on behalf of the people.

I am proud to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, 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 (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I don't think any of us are in disagreement in the Chamber that anything we can do, particularly as far as excess military equipment to help local law enforcement, is the right thing to do.

Relatively recently, in my congressional district, we were successful in helping the community of Munster, Indiana, secure a wheeled armored tactical vehicle for the very purpose that the gentleman recognized: to help people safely egress a very dangerous situation or to ingress one.

I do think, however, we need to make a distinction as to some of the types of help to be transferred to local communities. I don't think we can object—and the President's executive order allows it to take place—that those wheeled armored tactical vehicles continue to be transferred, or that, with justification, specialized firearms and ammunition be transferred to local authorities, or that explosives and pyrotechnics can be transferred under the executive order to local communities, or that riot equipment can be transferred to local communities under the executive order. There is broad discretion here.

What can't be transferred under the executive order are tanks. What can't be transferred are grenade launchers. What can't be transferred are bayonets.

So I do think there has to be some limit, and I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment. I think it was drafted overly broad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, well, with respect to the gentleman's comments, I think it is important for us to remember that this equipment is required to be demilitarized. You can't acquire this equipment and have it still maintain a military component. You can't mount machine guns on top of the armored vehicles.

I don't know of any police chief or sheriff in the country who has asked for grenade launchers or rocket launchers or explosives, Mr. Chairman. These are reasonable requests. And there is a process in place, a very restrictive process that has been in place prior to the President's executive order.

The problem is that the President's executive order has created so much restriction now that it has essentially prevented law enforcement agencies and fire departments and rescue agencies across the country from acquiring the needed equipment that they so need to protect our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a commonsense amendment, again, that really spells out the need for law enforcement to have this equipment. It has been used properly in the past. I myself have used this equipment as the sheriff in King County and as a SWAT team commander.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my colleague we should be discerning and to recognize, again, under the executive order, that things like specialized firearms and ammunition, riot equipment, explosives, and pyrotechnics still can be transferred.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in House Report 114–623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of 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 assistance to Pakistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman for all of the hard work they are putting into this very important piece of legislation. It is part of the job that we must do in Congress.

My amendment prohibits funds in the bill from being used to provide assistance to Pakistan. Since 9/11, we have given Pakistan well over $30 billion, the majority of which goes to military and security services of Pakistan. And Pakistan has used those services to murder and oppress their people, people like the heroic Baloch people or the Sindhis, who are struggling for freedom under Pakistani oppression.

It is a grotesque charade for us to suggest that our aid is buying Pakistani cooperation in the war on radical Islamic terrorism or in anything else. The Pakistani Government is neither our friend nor shares a common interest with our country. They are hardcore, two-faced enemies of our country.

If you don't believe that, then take a close look at what has happened to Dr. Afridi, a Pakistani medical doctor who helped pinpoint the location of Osama bin Laden and continues to languish in a Pakistani prison. This is because Dr. Afridi helped us bring to justice Osama bin Laden for the slaughter of 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

Last year, I came here to speak on this same issue, and this has been something we have been calling on. If the Pakistanis wanted to show a sign of good faith that they really were our friends, they would have released Dr. Afridi a long time ago.

While Dr. Afridi continues to remain in prison, we continue to provide weapons and cash to his tormenters. Arresting him and now keeping him in prison is a slap in the face to Americans and an insult to the families of those who died on 9/11.

Given the miserable human rights track record of the Pakistani Government—as well as the ongoing struggle of the people of Pakistan, who are seeking their own self-determination and freedom, such as the Baloch and Sindhi minorities—this is morally wrong for us to continue to give weapons and assistance to this dictatorial and corrupt government.

□ 1915

Unless my amendment passes, our aid will continue to strengthen and bolster a government that has committed crimes against their own people, and we will be then basically giving money to a government that not only represses its own people but, through its support of terrorism and terrorist organizations, threatens the people of the United States as well as those peoples elsewhere.

I would ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 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. First of all, I would like to recognize the gentleman's passion and perseverance on this issue. I do want to pay tribute to the gentleman's perseverance and strong feelings. We engage in the elevator since we share the same third floor. I just want to recognize his passion about this issue.

Let me say, whatever the failings of Pakistan, they have been one of our allies for over 30 or 40 years, and the Coalition Support Fund does remain a critical tool to enable Pakistan to effectively deal with present and future challenges that are coming, quite honestly, as a result of our drawdown. It is a more cost-effective tool than putting more of our troops on the ground.

I respect the gentleman's passion, but I strongly oppose his amendment.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me just note I respect the chairman's leadership and the hard work he is putting in on this as well as the ranking member. This is a needed piece of legislation, and I respect that. Our primary job is to watch out for the security of our country, and this bill is supposed to address that. That is one reason why I have decided that unless the Pakistanis prove to us that I am wrong by simply releasing Dr. Afridi, basically they are insulting us, they are insulting the victims and the families of 9/11, and the fact is they can't even do this.

If they can't even do this, how do we expect them not to be supporting terrorism behind the scenes, which many of us believe the Pakistanis are guilty of? I suggest that what more can they do—who will trust us around the world if we let our friends like Dr. Afridi linger and let them sit there in a dungeon? Here is the man who helped us get Osama bin Laden, and the Pakistanis won't even let him out of jail. He is an American hero, for God's sake. What more can they do to us before we cut them off from all the billions of dollars of aid we have given them? I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, this moral resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, let me say that Dr. Afridi needs to be freed. We certainly want to go on public record that Pakistan needs to free this man who did remarkable things. He needs to be recognized for his courage. He needs to get out of prison or jail, wherever he is. I think all Members of Congress feel very strongly that he needs to be released.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would associate myself with the chairman's remarks at this point in time. I do appreciate the gentleman's passion, his search for justice in this world, but I also do believe that the amendment is overly broad. The chairman of the committee certainly recognizes the difficulties we face in Pakistan. Hence, the inclusion of section 9017, which prohibits funds being spent unless there are certain certifications made. For that reason, I would be opposed and join with my chairman against the amendment. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, 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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 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 NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. WALBERG. 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), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce, implement, or carry out the second proviso in the paragraph designated ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' in Public Law 114–113.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for the work that has been done, and I look forward to supporting this important appropriations, but I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) that works to ensure 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 several times in bipartisan fashion, to limit funds for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, a program which has been poorly run and is lacking in oversight. Last year, the House passed my bipartisan amendment that would have prevented the Department of Defense from redirecting $50 million in funds from the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. Unfortunately, the fiscal year 2016 omnibus did not retain the House language and provided DOD the authority to obligate funds for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund through the end of fiscal year 2017.

My current amendment would turn off this authority. Mr. Chairman, we have spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan. In fact, 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, 2016, $488 million of these infrastructure funds have yet to be expended.

SIGAR has already expressed reservations about the Afghans' ability to even operate and maintain these projects upon completion. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask with almost 50 percent of funds remaining to be expended, why take away from other programs and give to this one?

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. Let me thank the gentleman for his amendment and his thoughtfulness and his concerns, which we share about a lot of projects we have invested in in Afghanistan.

I understand the gentleman's intentions are well placed. There were a few projects that were initiated, and the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund ran into hurdles, as construction projects do, and are yet to be completed. The construction hurdles are by and large complete. The Kandahar bridging solution—this is the plan to provide electrical power to Kandahar—should be completed soon. This was a top counterinsurgency priority.

Initiated in fiscal year 2011, the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund funded infrastructure projects in Afghanistan to lock in security gains and maintain stability by providing basic essential infrastructure to the people of Afghanistan. Our appropriations act enacted last year was not to extend funding or add any new projects but merely to have the authority to respond to out-of-scope adjustments on existing projects so they can be completed and functional for the Afghan people.

We, of course, realize we have infrastructure needs here at home in the United States, but what message does it send to the Afghan people, yet to the world, that we would leave nine major power-generation projects unfinished, including the Kajaki Dam? Six of these projects are estimated to be completed by the end of the year, with only three completions remaining.

May I say the committee opposes the amendment. They like to see these projects through so we can give the Afghani people a fighting chance. I am opposed to the amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman. I do appreciate the sentiments of the gentleman who offered the amendment. As I said earlier in our debate this evening, it is very hard at times to measure progress in Afghanistan, but I would agree with the chairman that after the sacrifice that has been expended—we are towards the end—we ought to give them a chance to stand on their own and join with the chair in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman and ranking member's concerns, but 50 percent of the funds still remain to be used. They are there for that purpose. I think that is sufficient. Last year, 233 of us voted in favor of this amendment in a bipartisan fashion. I think that directs also the will of the House.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

We have enormous infrastructure needs here in our own country. And, in fact, the Federal Highway Administration estimates that we have $106 billion of work to be done to our Nation's deteriorating bridges. As a country, it is absolutely critical that we make investments in repairing our own Nation's infrastructure.

Instead, we continue to invest taxpayer money in the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. To make matters worse, the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund is notorious for inefficiencies and shortfalls. Several government watchdog groups have said that projects under this account have lagged significantly behind schedule, have lacked proper oversight, and have been poorly administered. There has been documented serious waste and fraud in this program.

When this program was established in 2011, it was intended to identify a handful of infrastructure projects that were shovel-ready and able to be completed by the middle of 2013. According to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, projects funded under this account have been consistently over budget and behind schedule.

Since 2003, the taxpayers of the United States have spent $1.3 billion rebuilding Afghanistan. As of April of this year, the Department of Defense has yet to disburse nearly $500 million for this program. With so much funding still waiting to be spent, why should we, in fact, provide additional funds for this program in light of that?

It is time that we put the needs of our own roads and bridges first. This amendment would prohibit funds from being reprogrammed for this very troubled program. I urge my colleagues to support this so that we can really refocus our attention on rebuilding our own country and put an end to this wasteful, inefficient program that has been fraught with fraud and waste.

I thank my colleague for allowing me to cosponsor the amendment. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I ask my colleagues to support this. I appreciate the sentiment and the concern of the ranking member and the chairman of the committee, but this is an issue that has weighed concerns for too long. It is time to give the infrastructure improvements our direction. Afghanis understand that, I believe. SIGAR has proved the concerns, so I ask for support of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. 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.

It is the understanding of the Chair that amendment No. 38 will not be offered.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. 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. ____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, complete, process, or approve a public-private competition under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, with my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana, I rise today to offer a bipartisan amendment which would prohibit the Department of Defense from conducting new A–76 studies, a process that both the GAO and the inspector general of the Department of Defense concluded could not demonstrate any savings to the taxpayer, and which has been subject to a congressional moratorium since the year 2010.

Specifically, the A–76 process uses faulty methodology, not updated since 2003, to determine whether Federal civilian jobs should be outsourced. The DOD inspector general's report noted that this A–76 process fails to keep track of costs and savings.

A–76, Mr. Chairman, is unmoored from fact, incorporating an arbitrary 12 percent overhead factor cost for Federal employees as opposed to contractors. The inspector general concluded that ''multimillion-dollar decisions are based, in part, on a factor not supported by data . . . Unless DOD develops a supportable rate or an alternative method to calculate a fair and reasonable rate, the results of future competitions will be questionable . . .''

Making decisions based on such a faulty process is an irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars.

Maintaining the moratorium on the A–76 process is particularly important to the bipartisan House Military Depot, Arsenal, Ammunition Plant, and Industrial Facilities Caucus. While statutory law currently shields the core work of depots from the A–76 process, this process could still subject a depot's non-core work to its flawed assumptions.

Absent the protections of my amendment, significant depot workload, as well as arsenals, ammunition plants, and the rest of the organic industrial base operations, will be open to these flawed A–76 studies and eventual outsourcing.

This risks disruption, putting at risk the critical skills needed to support our warfighters, and interrupting workflow just when our military is in great flux. This kind of disruption could lead to significant delays in providing weapons and equipment to our warfighters, reducing readiness and weakening our organic industrial base, as well as reducing jobs in our local communities.

This body, this House, owes a duty to our warfighters and the taxpayers. Allowing A–76 studies to move forward would be a breach of both.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment to maintain the moratorium on A–76 studies, shielding our military readiness from a process in desperate need of drastic revision.

I thank Representative DON BEYER, as well as Representatives WALTER JONES and ROB BISHOP across the aisle, for their support on this important amendment.

Additionally, I would like to thank the American Federation of Government Employees for their support as well, especially the hardworking men and women at Tobyhanna Army Depot in my own district.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman offering his amendment. I believe it is a very good one, and I rise in support of it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Rep. CARTWRIGHT's Amendment to H.R. 5293, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Rep. CARTWRIGHT's amendment would keep in place a moratorium on the use of the Office of Management and Budget's Circular A–76 privatization studies at the Department of Defense. These studies use a faulty methodology to determine whether or not to outsource federal civilian jobs.

It is wrong to jeopardize their livelihood in the name of privatization, especially when the tools to justify it are so faulty and biased against our federal workforce. Multiple reports, including by the Government Accountability Office and the Department of Defense Inspector General, criticized the A–76 process for failing to properly track costs and savings.

A–76 studies improperly alienate our hard working civilian employees critical to the military. These personnel provide depot maintenance and equipment recapitalization, logistics capabilities, engineering expertise necessary for modernization, warfighter training, base support and facilities sustainment, medical care and treatment, and family care programs that are critical to our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and their families.

We cannot afford to leave such costly decisions up to faulty data. A–76 studies cost the Department of Defense money, at the expense of military readiness, troop safety, and our federal civilian workforce. We should not lift this moratorium.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 114–623.

Mr. CONYERS. 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. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or authorize the transfer of any cluster munitions to Saudi Arabia.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of every Member in this body for this amendment to block the transfer of American-made cluster bombs to Saudi Arabia.

This amendment is endorsed by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, as well as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and a number of other organizations.

American-manufactured cluster bombs are currently being used by the Saudi-led coalition that is bombing Yemen. That campaign has caused the deaths of over 900 children, 3,000 civilians, and has forced 2.8 million people from their homes.

In violation of American law, the Saudis have used cluster bombs in civilian areas, endangering innocent civilians and threatening agriculture and other industries in Yemen.

Since the United States is supplying cluster bombs to the Saudis, and is a member of the coalition led by the Saudis, the United States could be held responsible for careless Saudi actions in this widely criticized bombing campaign.

The Obama administration recently took unilateral action to stop the sale of some cluster bombs to the Saudis. This amendment would put that prohibition into law, and make it more transparent and accountable.

I urge my colleagues to pass this reasonable amendment.

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

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. The Department of Defense strongly opposes this amendment. They advise us that it would stigmatize cluster munitions, which are legitimate weapons with clear military utility, and are effective weapons, providing distinct advantages against a range of targets, and can result in less collateral damage than unitary weapons.

The United States should be encouraging other states, such as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to upgrade their cluster munitions stockpiles rather than making it more difficult for new sales and transfers.

Advancements in Sensor Fuzed technology have enabled newer types of cluster munitions to select and engage individual targets, which are not possible with older types of cluster munitions. These advancements in precisions dramatically reduce the likelihood of unintended harm to civilians and civilian infrastructure from the use of cluster munitions.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

We have all seen the horrific reports coming from human rights groups on the ground in Yemen, where American-made cluster bombs are being used by Saudi Arabia against innocent bystanders—all under the guise of attacking Houthi rebels.

Earlier this year, the Saudi-led coalition dropped cluster bombs in Yemen's capital of Sana'a, specifically targeting known civilian neighborhoods. One of the buildings hit was the Al Noor Center for Care and Rehabilitation for the Blind, which also has a school for blind children. The destruction of the school and the injuries sustained by the children was unbearably gruesome.

This deliberate and reckless use of cluster munitions by Saudi Arabia highlights their complete disregard for the welfare of innocent people.

These actions are unacceptable. There is something fundamentally wrong with preaching human and civil rights here at home while we export death abroad. We cannot ignore our duty to protect basic human rights and values here and around the world. Unfortunately, as long as we sell cluster munitions to Saudi Arabia, these outrageous violations will continue to occur.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

While I applaud the administration for their recent suspension of sales of these weapons to Saudi Arabia, as of May 23, the gentleman's amendment would add certainty to the administration's position. I do support him in his effort, and I appreciate him offering the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to oppose the amendment.

Relating to the newer munitions that I talked about a few minutes ago, with improved performance, Human Rights Watch stated that, in perhaps the greatest technological advance, Sensor Fuzed weapon munitions, known as Air Force tank busters, are capable of independently sensing and attacking specific targets, like armored vehicles.

Without the Saudi order—this is a lot of what this is focusing on—this U.S. production line will close in 2017, significantly impacting the industrial base and prevent future U.S. procurement. For the record, over 85 suppliers in 30 States will be shuttered.

If the administration holds up or Congress blocks the sale, Saudi Arabia will likely purchase legacy cluster munitions from Russia, China and others, which, when used, will leave significant hazardous, unexploded munitions on the battlefield, further endangering civilians, as opposed to improve manufactured munitions.

Therefore, for these and other reasons, I strongly reject this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. 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.

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. CARTER of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEWHOUSE, 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. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1945

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I noted with particular joy that the House Energy and Commerce Committee moved through, by unanimous vote and complete bipartisanship, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2426.

Without question, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation to address the serious mental illness crisis that has plagued our Nation since de-institutionialization turned millions of seriously ill citizens out on our streets, assuming they could function in the community in the second half of the 20th century. That proved not to be possible for millions of our fellow citizens.

Lacking effective treatment, many froze to death in back alleys, sat in their own excrement on the sidewalks of our cities, sought refuge under bridges and in doorways and street grates, became victims of abuse, and, too often, disappeared into the vapors of life, propelled by the force of their own unquiet minds.

Let me thank profusely and recognize Congressman TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, a psychologist who relied on his three decades of experience, and Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, a psychiatric nurse with two decades of experience in practice, for their visionary and unrelenting efforts to move the plight of the mentally ill into the main arena of this Congress.

I urge the Speaker to swiftly allocate time for its advancement to the House floor for a vote. Let us do something in our time and generation worthy of being remembered. This bill is it.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE GROWING THREAT OUR NATION FACES FROM ISLAMIC TERRORISM

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attack on Orlando should bring into sharp focus the growing threat that our Nation faces from Islamic terrorism, and that begins with realizing that although Islam is a religion, it is often accompanied by a poisonous political ideology that is antithetical to everything that our country stands for. That ideology now poses a direct threat to the liberty and safety of our people, and we have every right to defend ourselves against it.

We knew for years that the terrorist's father was broadcasting pro-Taliban and anti-American rhetoric aimed principally at a large and growing Afghan Islamic population within the United States.

We knew that the terrorist, himself, had traveled repeatedly to Saudi Arabia under mysterious circumstances, associated with known terrorists and Islamic radicals in the United States, and expressed the most virulent anti-American views. And we took no action because there are far more instances of such threats than we can begin to assess or address.

This administration has drastically increased the admission of refugees from regions where overwhelming majorities believe in imposing sharia law. Those who are fleeing sharia law and Islamist political ideology should be welcome in this country at assimilable levels; but those who are coming here to impose it are a direct threat to our Constitution, and they have no business being admitted to our shores. Yet this administration makes no distinction between the two.

Indeed, earlier this year, when Governor Rick Scott of Florida, acting on behalf of law enforcement, requested information on the Islamic immigrants being inserted into his State, he was refused that vital public safety information.

While seeking to rapidly increase the number of Islamists being admitted to this country, this administration has failed not only to enforce our immigration laws, but it has actively undermined those laws. As a result of these deliberate government policies, we are enduring Islamist attacks within our borders that will continue to increase in both frequency and severity.

There is no blinking at the fact that these policies have encouraged a large and growing fifth column that is violently hostile to our country, and it has become deeply embedded within our communities. San Bernardino and Orlando were just the first bloody foretaste of what is to come until and unless these policies are stopped and reversed.

Last year, the House passed the SAFE Act. That is an acronym for Safety Against Foreign Enemies. It was the first tentative step toward properly screening refugees from hotbeds of Islamic extremism. It merely required affirmative verification of a refugee's lack of hostile intent if they were coming from Islamist strongholds in Iraq and Syria. 135 Democrats in this House opposed the SAFE Act, and Senate Democrats killed it in January at the behest of their President.

The very same politicians who will not allow us even to confirm the intent of Islamists entering America are at the same time using the Orlando atrocity as an excuse to disarm loyal and law-abiding Americans. Within minutes of the attack, the left began to use this terrorist atrocity to justify more restrictions on the rights of Americans to defend themselves. They would have us believe that terrorists who are bent on destroying our country by violently killing Americans will somehow make one exception to their contempt for our Nation by meticulously obeying our gun control laws.

The leftists tell us to leave it to the police. Really? In Orlando, it took 3 hours for police to secure the scene and confront the attacker, while hostages were being shot and the wounded were left to bleed to death—3 hours. In San Bernardino, the terrorists had already fled before police even arrived at the scene.

The first line of defense against an armed terrorist is an armed American; yet the Democrats seek to make it harder for Americans to arm themselves, while increasing the threat posed by mass immigration from those countries where Islamist ideology is rampant.

Is it possible that they don't understand that there is an international arms market and that terrorists can get their hands on any kinds of weapons they want as effortlessly as teenagers can buy pot?

While the Orlando terrorist got his guns legally, he could just as easily have gotten them illegally. But that is not the case of law-abiding American citizens. Law-abiding citizens obey our laws; terrorists do not.

The left's vision for our country is one in which Americans cannot shoot back and must helplessly wait to be rescued while they are being terrorized by Islamic extremists who should never have been in this country in the first place. And that is going to continue in this country until it wakes up to the danger that it faces and takes decisive action at the ballot box.

That is ultimately the choice before us: we can either suffer increasingly violent attacks on increasingly defenseless Americans, or we can choose to finally take seriously the nature of

the enemy we face and finally demand leaders who will secure our borders, empower Americans to defend themselves, and act forthrightly to defend our country.

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

WORDS FROM A SEXUAL ASSAULT SURVIVOR TO HER ATTACKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, we are doing something tonight that has never been done before on the House floor. We will read the entire gut-wrenching statement of the sexual assault survivor who was attacked on the Stanford campus last year.

The sexual predator received a paltry sentence of 6 months in county jail, of which he will serve only 3 for committing a violent crime. We are not moved by the felon's excuse of alcohol. We are not moved by the judge, who said a longer sentence would have a ''severe impact'' on the offender. We are not moved by the felon's father, who said that his son should not serve jail time for ''20 minutes of action.''

Emily Doe is a survivor in every sense of the word, and her words deserve to be amplified.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we read the statement in its entirety without yielding, by name, to each Member, to preserve the continuity of the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SPEIER. ''Your Honor, if it is all right, for the majority of this statement I would like to address the defendant directly.

''You don't know me, but you've been inside me, and that's why we're here today.

''On January 17th, 2015, it was a quiet Saturday night at home. My dad made some dinner and I sat at the table with my younger sister who was visiting for the weekend. I was working full time and it was approaching my bed time. I planned to stay at home by myself, watch some TV and read, while she went to a party with her friends.''

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. ''Then, I decided it was my only night with her, I had nothing better to do, so why not, there's a dumb party ten minutes from my house, I would go, dance like a fool, and embarrass my younger sister. On the way there, I joked that undergrad guys would have braces. My sister teased me for wearing a beige cardigan to a frat party like a librarian. I called myself 'big mama', because I knew I'd be the oldest one there. I made silly faces, let my guard down, and drank liquor too fast not factoring in that my tolerance had significantly lowered since college.

''The next thing I remember I was in a gurney in a hallway. I had dried blood and bandages on the backs of my hands and elbow. I thought maybe I had fallen and was in an admin office on campus. I was very calm and wondering where my sister was. A deputy explained I had been assaulted. I still remained calm, assured he was speaking to the wrong person. I knew no one at this party. When I was finally allowed to use the restroom, I pulled down the hospital pants they had given me, went to pull down my underwear, and felt nothing.

''I still remember the feeling of my hands touching my skin and grabbing nothing. I looked down and there was nothing. The thin piece of fabric, the only thing between my vagina and anything else, was missing and everything inside me was silenced. I still don't have words for that feeling. In order to keep breathing, I thought maybe the policeman used scissors to cut them off for evidence.

''Then I felt the pine needles scratching the back of my neck and started pulling them out my hair. I thought maybe, the pine needles had fallen from a tree onto my head. My brain was talking my gut into not collapsing. Because my gut was saying, help me, help me.

''I shuffled from room to room with a blanket wrapped around me, pine needles trailing behind me, I left a little pile in every room I sat in. I was asked to sign papers that said 'Rape Victim' and I thought something has really happened. My clothes were confiscated and I stood naked while the nurses held a ruler to various abrasions on my body and photographed them. The three of us worked to comb the pine needles out of my hair, six hands to fill one paper bag. To calm me down, they said it's just the flora and fauna, flora and fauna. I had multiple swabs inserted into my vagina and anus, needles for shots, pills, had a Nikon pointed right into my spread legs. I had long, pointed beaks inside me and had my vagina smeared with cold, blue paint to check for abrasions.''

Mr. CICILLINE. ''After a few hours of this, they let me shower. I stood there examining my body beneath the steam of water and decided, I don't want my body anymore. I was terrified of it, I didn't know what had been in it, if it had been contaminated, who had touched it. I wanted to talk off my body like a jacket and leave it at the hospital with everything else.

''On that morning, all that I was told was that I had been found behind a dumpster, potentially penetrated by a stranger, and that I should get retested for HIV because results don't always show up immediately. But for now, I should go home and get back to my normal life.

''Imagine stepping back into the world with only that information. They gave me huge hugs and I walked out of the hospital into the parking lot wearing the new sweatshirt and sweatpants they provided me, as they had only allowed me to keep my necklace and shoes.''

□ 2000

''My sister picked me up, face wet from tears and contorted in anguish. Instinctively and immediately, I wanted to take away her pain. I smiled at her, I told her to look at me, I'm right here, I'm okay, everything's okay. I'm right here.

''My hair is washed and clean, they gave me the strangest shampoo, calm down, and look at me. Look at these funny new sweatpants and sweatshirt, I look like a P.E. teacher, let's go home, let's eat something. She did not know that beneath my sweatsuit, I had scratches and bandages on my skin, my vagina was sore and had become a strange, dark color from all the prodding, my underwear was missing, and I felt too empty to continue to speak. That I was also afraid, that I was also devastated. That day we drove home and for hours in silence my younger sister held me.

''My boyfriend did not know what happened, but called that day and said, 'I was really worried about you last night, you scared me, did you make it home okay?' I was horrified. That is when I learned I had called him that night in my blackout, left an incomprehensible voicemail, that we had also spoken on the phone, but I was slurring so heavily he was scared for me, that he repeatedly told me to go find [my sister]. Again, he asked me, 'What happened last night? Did you make it home okay?' I said yes, and hung up to cry.''

Ms. TSONGAS. ''I was not ready to tell my boyfriend or parents that actually, I may have been raped behind a dumpster, but I don't know by who or when or how. If I told them, I would see the fear on their faces, and mine would multiply by tenfold, so instead I pretended the whole thing wasn't real.

''I tried to push it out of my mind, but it was so heavy I didn't talk, I didn't eat, I didn't sleep, I didn't interact with anyone. After work, I would drive to a secluded place to scream.

''I didn't talk, I didn't eat, I didn't sleep, I didn't interact with anyone, and I became isolated from the ones I loved most. For over a week after the incident, I didn't get any calls or updates about that night or what happened to me. The only symbol that proved that it hadn't just been a bad dream, was the sweatshirt from the hospital in my drawer.

''One day, I was at work, scrolling through news on my phone, and came across an article. In it, I read and learned for the first time about how I was found unconscious, with my hair disheveled, long necklace wrapped around my neck, bra pulled out of my dress, dress pulled off over my shoulders and pulled up above my waist, that I was butt naked all the way down to my boots, legs spread apart, and had been penetrated by a foreign object by someone I did not recognize.

''This was how I learned what happened to me, sitting at my desk reading the news at work. I learned what happened to me the same time everyone else in the world learned what happened to me. That's when the pine needles in my hair made sense, they didn't fall from a tree. He had taken off my underwear, his fingers had been inside of me. I don't even know this person. I still don't know this person. When I read about me like this, I said, this can't be me, this can't be me. I could not digest or accept any of this information.''

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. ''I could not imagine my family having to read about this online. I kept reading. In the next paragraph, I read something that I will never forgive; I read that according to him, I liked it. I liked it. Again, I do not have words for these feelings.

''It's like if you were to read an article where a car was hit, and found dented, in a ditch. But maybe the car enjoyed being hit. Maybe the other car didn't mean to hit it, just bump it up a little bit. Cars get in accidents all the time, people aren't always paying attention, can we really say who's at fault.

''And then, at the bottom of the article, after I learned about the graphic details of my own sexual assault, the article listed his swimming times. She was found breathing, unresponsive with her underwear six inches away from her bare stomach curled in fetal position. By the way, he's really good at swimming. Throw in my mile time if that's what we're doing. I'm good at cooking, put that in there, I think the end is where you list your extracurriculars to cancel out all the sickening things that've happened.

''The night the news came out I sat my parents down and told them that I had been assaulted, to not look at the news because it's upsetting, just know that I'm okay, I'm right here, and I'm okay. But halfway through telling them, my mom had to hold me because I could no longer stand up.

''The night after it happened, he said he didn't know my name, said he wouldn't be able to identify my face in a lineup, didn't mention any dialogue between us, no words, only dancing and kissing.

''Dancing is a cute term; was it snapping fingers and twirling dancing, or just bodies grinding up against each other in a crowded room? I wonder if kissing was just faces sloppily pressed up against each other? When the detective asked if he had planned on taking me back to his dorm, he said no. When the detective asked how we ended up behind the dumpster, he said he didn't know. He admitted to kissing other girls at that party, one of whom was my own sister who pushed him away. He admitted to wanting to hook up with someone. I was the wounded antelope of the herd, completely alone and vulnerable, physically unable to fend for myself, and he chose me.''

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. ''Sometimes I think, if I hadn't gone, then this never would have happened. But then I realized, it would have happened, just to somebody else. You were about the enter four years of access to drunk girls and parties, and if this is the foot you started off on, then it is right you did not continue. The night after it happened, he said he thought I liked it because I rubbed his back. A back rub. Never mentioned me voicing consent, never mentioned us even speaking, a back rub. One more time, in public news, I learned that my ass and vagina were completely exposed outside, my breasts had been groped, fingers had been jabbed inside me along with pine needles and debris, my bare skin and head had been rubbing against the ground behind a dumpster, while an erect freshman was humping my half naked, unconscious body. But I don't remember, so how do I prove I didn't like it.

''I thought there's no way this is going to trial; there were witnesses, there was dirt in my body, he ran but he was caught. He's going to settle, formally apologize, and we will both move on. Instead, I was told he hired a powerful attorney, expert witnesses, private investigators who were going to try and find details about my personal life to use against me, find loopholes in my story to invalidate me and my sister, in order to show that this sexual assault was in fact a misunderstanding. That he was going to go to any length to convince the world he had simply been confused.

''I was not only told that I was assaulted, I was told that because I couldn't remember, I technically could not prove it was unwanted. And that distorted me, damaged me, almost broke me. It is the saddest type of confusion to be told I was assaulted and nearly raped, blatantly out in the open, but we don't know if it counts as assault yet. I had to fight for an entire year to make it clear that there was something wrong with this situation.

''When I was told to be prepared in case we didn't win, I said, I can't prepare for that.''

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. ''He was guilty the minute I woke up. No one can talk me out of the hurt he caused me. Worst of all, I was warned, because he now knows you don't remember, he is going to get to write the script. He can say whatever he wants and no one can contest it. I had no power, I had no voice, I was defenseless. My memory loss would be used against me. My testimony was weak, was incomplete, and I was made to believe that perhaps, I am not enough to win this. His attorney constantly reminded the jury, the only one we can believe is Brock, because she doesn't remember. That helplessness was traumatizing.

''Instead of taking time to heal, I was taking time to recall the night in excruciating detail, in order to prepare for the attorney's questions that would be invasive, aggressive, and designed to steer me off course, to contradict myself, my sister, phrased in ways to manipulate my answers. Instead of his attorney saying, Did you notice any abrasions? He said, You didn't notice any abrasions, right? This was a game of strategy, as if I could be tricked out of my own worth.

''The sexual assault had been so clear, but instead, here I was at the trial, answering questions like:

''How old are you? How much do you weigh? What did you eat that day? Well what did you have for dinner? Who made dinner? Did you drink with dinner? No, not even water? When did you drink? How much did you drink? What container did you drink out of? Who gave you the drink? How much do you usually drink? Who dropped you off at this party? At what time? But where exactly? What were you wearing? Why were you going to this party?

''What'd you do when you got there? Are you sure you did that? But what time did you do that? What does this text mean? Who were you texting? When did you urinate? Where did you urinate? With whom did you urinate outside? Was your phone on silent when your sister called? Do you remember silencing it? Really? Because on page 53 I'd like to point out that you said it was set to ring. Did you drink in college? You said you were a party animal? How many times did you black out? Did you party at frats?''

Ms. ESHOO. ''Are you serious with your boyfriend? Are you sexually active with him? When did you start dating? Would you ever cheat? Do you have a history of cheating? What do you mean when you said you wanted to reward him? Do you remember what time you woke up? Were you wearing your cardigan? What color was your cardigan? Do you remember any more from that night? No? Okay, well, we'll let Brock fill it in.

''I was pummeled with narrow, pointed questions that dissected my personal life, love life, past life, family life, inane questions, accumulating trivial details to try and find an excuse for this guy who had me half naked before even bothering to ask for my name. After a physical assault, I was assaulted with questions designed to attack me, to say see, her facts don't line up, she's out of her mind, she's practically an alcoholic, she probably wanted to hook up, he's like an athlete right, they were both drunk, whatever, the hospital stuff she remembers is after the fact, why take it into account, Brock has a lot at stake so he's having a really hard time right now. And then it came time for him to testify and I learned what it meant to be revictimized.

''I want to remind you, the night after it happened he said he never planned to take me back to his dorm. He said he didn't know why we were behind a dumpster. He got up to leave because he wasn't feeling well when he was suddenly chased and attacked.

Then he learned I could not remember. So one year later, as predicted, a new dialogue emerged. Brock had a strange new story, almost sounded like a poorly written young adult novel with kissing and dancing and hand holding and lovingly tumbling onto the ground, and most importantly in this new story, there was suddenly consent. One year after the incident, he remembered, oh yeah, by the way she actually said yes, to everything, so.

''He said he had asked if I wanted to dance. Apparently I said yes. He'd asked if I wanted to go to his dorm, I said yes. Then he asked if he could finger me and I said yes. Most guys don't ask, can I finger you? Usually there's a natural progression of things, unfolding consensually, not a Q and A. But apparently I granted full permission. He's in the clear. Even in his story, I only said a total of three words, yes yes yes, before he had me half naked on the ground.''

□ 2015

Mr. TAKANO. ''Future reference, if you are confused about whether a girl can consent, see if she can speak an entire sentence. You couldn't even do that. Just one coherent string of words. Where was the confusion? This is common sense, human decency.

''According to him, the only reason we were on the ground was because I fell down. Note; if a girl falls down help her get back up. If she is too drunk to even walk and falls down, do not mount her, hump her, take off her underwear, and insert your hand inside her vagina. If a girl falls down help her up. If she is wearing a cardigan over her dress don't take it off so that you can touch her breasts. Maybe she is cold, maybe that's why she wore the cardigan.

''Next in the story, two Swedes on bicycles approached you and you ran. When they tackled you why didn't you say, 'Stop! Everything's okay, go ask her, she's right over there, she'll tell you.' I mean you had just asked for my consent, right? I was awake, right? When the policeman arrived and interviewed the evil Swede who tackled you, he was crying so hard he couldn't speak because of what he'd seen.

''Your attorney has repeatedly pointed out, well we don't know exactly when she became unconscious. And you're right, maybe I was still fluttering my eyes and wasn't completely limp yet. That was never the point. I was too drunk to speak English, too drunk to consent way before I was on the ground. I should never have been touched in the first place. Brock stated, 'At no time did I see that she was not responding. If at any time I thought she was not responding, I would have stopped immediately.'

''Here's the thing; if your plan was to stop only when I became unresponsive, then you still do not understand. You didn't even stop when I was unconscious anyway! Someone else stopped you. Two guys on bikes noticed I wasn't moving in the dark and had to tackle you. How did you not notice while on top of me?

''You said, you would have stopped and gotten help. You say that, but I want you to explain how you would've helped me, step by step, walk me through this. I want to know, if those evil Swedes had not found me, how the night would have played out.''

Mrs. DINGELL. ''I am asking you; Would you have pulled my underwear back on over my boots? Untangled the necklace wrapped around my neck? Closed my legs, covered me? Pick the pine needles from my hair? Asked if the abrasions on my neck and bottom hurt? Would you then go find a friend and say, Will you help me get her somewhere warm and soft? I don't sleep when I think about the way it could have gone if the two guys had never come. What would have happened to me? That's what you'll never have a good answer for, that's what you can't explain even after a year.

''On top of all this, he claimed that I orgasmed after 1 minute of digital penetration. The nurse said there had been abrasions, lacerations, and dirt in my genitalia. Was that before or after I came? To sit under oath and inform all of us, that yes I wanted it, yes I permitted it, and that you are the true victim attacked by Swedes for reasons unknown to you is appalling, is demented, is selfish, is damaging. It is enough to be suffering. It is another thing to have someone ruthlessly working to diminish the gravity of validity of this suffering.

''My family had to see pictures of my head strapped to a gurney full of pine needles, of my body in the dirt with my eyes closed, hair messed up, limbs bent, and dress hiked up. And even after that, my family had to listen to your attorney say the pictures were after the fact, we can dismiss them. To say, yes her nurse confirmed there was redness and abrasions inside her, significant trauma to her genitalia, but that's what happens when you finger someone, and he's already admitted to that.

''To listen to your attorney attempt to paint a picture of me, the face of girls gone wild, as if somehow that would make it so that I had this coming for me. To listen to him say I sounded drunk on the phone because I'm silly and that's my goofy way of speaking. To point out that in the voicemail, I said I would reward my boyfriend and we all know what I was thinking. I assure you my rewards program is nontransferable, especially to any nameless man that approaches me.''

Ms. KAPTUR. ''He has done irreversible damage to me and my family during the trial and we have sat silently, listening to him shape the evening. But in the end, his unsupported statements and his attorney's twisted logic fooled no one. The truth won, the truth spoke for itself.

''You are guilty. Twelve jurors convicted you guilty of three felony counts beyond a reasonable doubt, that's twelve votes per count, thirty-six yeses confirming guilt, that's one hundred percent, unanimous guilt. And I thought finally it is over, finally he will own up to what he did, truly apologize, we will both move on and get better. Then I read your statement.

''If you are hoping that one of my organs will implode from anger and I will die, I'm almost there. You are very close. This is not a story of another drunk college hook-up with poor decision making. Assault is not an accident. Somehow, you still don't get it. Somehow, you still sound confused. I will now read portions of the defendant's statement and respond to them.

''You said, Being drunk I just couldn't make the best decisions and neither could she.

''Alcohol is not an excuse. Is it a factor? Yes. But alcohol was not the one who stripped me, fingered me, had my head dragging against the ground, with me almost fully naked. Having too much to drink was an amateur mistake that I admit to, but it is not criminal. Everyone in this room has had a night where they have regretted drinking too much, or knows someone close to them who has had a night where they regretted drinking too much. Regretting drinking is not the same as regretting sexual assault. We were both drunk. The difference is I did not take off your pants and underwear, touch you inappropriately, and run away. That's the difference.

''You said, If I wanted to get to know her, I should have asked for her number, rather than asking her to go back to my room.

''I'm not mad because you didn't ask for my number. Even if you did know me, I would not want to be in this situation. My own boyfriend knows me, but if he asked to finger me behind a dumpster, I would slap him. No girl wants to be in this situation. Nobody. I don't care if you know their phone number or not. You said, I stupidly thought it was okay for me to do what everyone around me was doing, which was drinking. I was wrong.''

Ms. GABBARD. ''Again, you were not wrong for drinking. Everyone around you was not sexually assaulting me. You were wrong for doing what nobody else was doing, which was pushing your erect dick in your pants against my naked, defenseless body concealed in a dark area, where partygoers could no longer see or protect me, and my own sister could not find me. Sipping fireball is not your crime. Peeling off and discarding my underwear like a candy wrapper to insert your finger into my body, is where you went wrong. Why am I still explaining this.

''You said, During the trial I didn't want to victimize her at all. That was just my attorney and his way of approaching the case.

''Your attorney is not your scapegoat, he represents you. Did your attorney say some incredulously infuriating, degrading things? Absolutely. He

said you had an erection, because it was cold.

''You said, you are in the process of establishing a program for high school and college students in which you speak about your experience to 'speak out against the college campus drinking culture and the sexual promiscuity that goes along with that.'

''Campus drinking culture. That's what we're speaking out against? You think that's what I've spent the past year fighting for? Not awareness about campus sexual assault, or rape, or learning to recognize consent. Campus drinking culture. Down with Jack Daniels. Down with Skyy Vodka. If you want to talk to people about drinking go to an AA meeting. You realize, having a drinking problem is different than drinking and then forcefully trying to have sex with someone? Show men how to respect women, not how to drink less.

''Drinking culture and the sexual promiscuity that goes along with that. Goes along with that, like a side effect, like fries on the side of your order. Where does promiscuity even come into play? I don't see headlines that read, Brock Turner, Guilty of drinking too much and the sexual promiscuity that goes along with that. Campus Sexual Assault. There's your first powerpoint slide. Rest assured, if you fail to fix the topic of your talk, I will follow you to every school you go to and give a follow up presentation.''

Mr. POE of Texas. ''Lastly you said, I want to show people that one night of drinking can ruin a life. A life, one life, yours, you forgot about mine. Let me rephrase for you, I want to show people that one night of drinking can ruin two lives. You and me. You are the cause, I am the effect. You have dragged me through this hell with you, dipped me back into that night again and again. You knocked down both our towers, I collapsed at the same time you did. If you think I was spared, came out unscathed, that today I ride off into sunset, while you suffer the greatest blow, you are mistaken.

''My independence, natural joy, gentleness, and steady lifestyle I had been enjoying became distorted beyond recognition. I became closed off, angry, self deprecating, tired, irritable, empty. The isolation at times was unbearable. You cannot give me back the life I had before that night either. While you worry about your shattered reputation, I refrigerated spoons every night so when I woke up, and my eyes were puffy from crying, I would hold the spoons to my eyes to lessen the swelling so that I could see. I showed up an hour late to work every morning, excused myself to cry in the stairwells, I can tell you all the best places in that building to cry where no one can hear you.

''The pain became so bad that I had to explain the private details to my boss to let her know why I was leaving. I needed time because continuing day to day was not possible. I used my savings to go as far away as I could possibly be. I did not return to work full time as I knew I'd have to take weeks off in the future for the hearing and trial, that were constantly being rescheduled. My life was put on hold for over a year, my structure had collapsed.

''I can't sleep alone at night without having a light on, like a five year old, because I have nightmares of being touched where I cannot wake up, I did this thing where I waited until the sun came up and I felt safe enough to go to sleep. For three months, I went to bed at six o'clock in the morning.

''Nobody wins. We all have been devastated, we all have been trying to find some meaning in all of this suffering. Your damage was concrete; stripped of titles, degrees, enrollment. My damage was internal, unseen, I carry it with me. You took away my worth, my privacy, my energy, my time, my safety, my intimacy, my confidence, my own voice, until today.''

□ 2030

''See one thing we have in common is that we were both unable to get up in the morning. I am no stranger to suffering. You made me a victim. In newspapers my name was 'unconscious, intoxicated woman', ten syllables and, nothing more than that.

''For a while, I believed that that was all I was. I had to force myself to relearn my real name, my identity. To relearn that this is not all that I am. That I am not just a drunk victim at a frat party found behind a dumpster, while you are the All-American swimmer at a top university, innocent until proven guilty, with so much at stake. I am a human being who has been irreversibly hurt, my life was put on hold for over a year, waiting to figure out if I was worth something . . . I used to pride myself on my independence, now I am afraid to go on walks in the evening, to attend social events with drinking among friends where I should be comfortable being. I have become a little barnacle always needing to be at someone's side, to have my boyfriend standing next to me, sleeping beside me, protecting me. It is embarrassing how feeble I feel, how timidly I move through life, always guarded, ready to defend myself, ready to be angry.

''You have no idea how hard I have worked to rebuild parts of me that are still weak. It took me eight months to even talk about what happened. I could no longer connect with friends, with everyone around me. I would scream at my boyfriend, my own family whenever they brought this up. You never let me forget what happened to me.''

Mr. SWALWELL of California. ''At the end of the hearing, the trial, I was too tired to speak. I would leave drained, silent. I would go home turn off my phone and for days I would not speak. You bought me a ticket to a planet where I lived by myself. Every time a new article came out, I lived with the paranoia that my entire hometown would find out and know me as the girl who got assaulted. I didn't want anyone's pity and am still learning to accept victim as part of my identity. You made my own hometown an uncomfortable place to be.

''You cannot give me back my sleepless nights. The way I have broken down sobbing uncontrollably if I'm watching a movie and a woman is harmed, to say it lightly, this experience has expanded my empathy for other victims. I have lost weight from stress, when people would comment I told them I've been running a lot lately. There are times I did not want to be touched. I have to relearn that I am not fragile, I am capable, I am wholesome, not just livid and weak.

''When I see my younger sister hurting, when she is unable to keep up in school, when she is deprived of joy, when she is not sleeping, when she is crying so hard on the phone she is barely breathing, telling me over and over again she is sorry for leaving me alone that night, sorry sorry sorry, when she feels more guilt than you, then I do not forgive you. That night I had called her to try and find her, but you found me first. Your attorney's closing statement began, '[Her sister] said she was fine and who knows her better than her sister.' You tried to use my own sister against me? Your points of attack were so weak, so low, it was almost embarrassing. You do not touch her.

''You should have never done this to me. Secondly, you should have never made me fight so long to tell you, you should have never done this to me. But here we are. The damage is done, no one can undo it. And now we both have a choice. We can let this destroy us, I can remain angry and hurt and you can be in denial, or we can face it head on, I accept the pain, you accept the punishment, and we move on.

''Your life is not over, you have decades of years ahead to rewrite your story. The world is huge, it is so much bigger than Palo Alto and Stanford, and you will make a space for yourself in it where you can be useful and happy. But right now, you do not get to shrug your shoulders and be confused anymore. You do not get to pretend that there were no red flags. You have been convicted of violating me, intentionally, forcibly, sexually, with malicious intent, and all you can admit to is consuming alcohol. Do not talk about the sad way your life was upturned because alcohol made you do bad things. Figure out how to take responsibility for your own conduct.''

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. ''Now to address the sentencing. When I read the probation officer's report, I was in disbelief, consumed by anger which eventually quieted down to profound sadness. My statements have been slimmed down to distortion and taken out of context. I fought hard during this trial and will not have the outcome minimized by a probation officer who attempted to evaluate my current state and my wishes in a fifteen

minute conversation, the majority of which was spent answering questions I had about the legal system. The context is also important. Brock had yet to issue a statement, and I had not read his remarks.

''My life has been on hold for over a year, a year of anger, anguish and uncertainty, until a jury of my peers rendered a judgment that validated the injustices I had endured. Had Brock admitted guilt and remorse and offered to settle early on, I would have considered a lighter sentence, respecting his honesty, grateful to be able to move our lives forward. Instead he took the risk of going to trial, added insult to injury and forced me to relive the hurt as details about my personal life and sexual assault were brutally dissected before the public. He pushed me and my family through a year of inexplicable, unnecessary suffering, and should face the consequences of challenging his crime, of putting my pain into question, and of making us wait so long for justice.''

Mrs. DAVIS of California. ''I told the probation officer I do not want Brock to rot away in prison. I did not say he does not deserve to be behind bars. The probation officer's recommendation of a year or less in county jail is a soft time-out, a mockery of the seriousness of his assaults, an insult to me and all women. It gives the message that a stranger can be inside you without proper consent and he will receive less than what has been defined as the minimum sentence. Probation should be denied. I also told the probation officer that what I truly wanted was for Brock to get it, to understand and admit to his wrongdoing.

''Unfortunately, after reading the defendant's report, I am severely disappointed and feel that he has failed to exhibit sincere remorse or responsibility for his conduct. I fully respected his right to a trial, but even after twelve jurors unanimously convicted him guilty of three felonies, all he has admitted to doing is ingesting alcohol. Someone who cannot take full accountability for his actions does not deserve a mitigating sentence. It is deeply offensive that he would try and dilute rape with a suggestion of 'promiscuity'. By definition rape is not the absence of promiscuity, rape is the absence of consent, and it perturbs me deeply that he can't even see that distinction.''

Mr. GOSAR. ''The probation officer factored in that the defendant is youthful and has no prior convictions. In my opinion, he is old enough to know what he did was wrong. When you are eighteen in this country you can go to war. When you are nineteen, you are old enough to pay the consequences for attempting to rape someone. He is young, but he is old enough to know better.

''As this is a first offense I can see where leniency would beckon. On the other hand, as a society, we cannot forgive everyone's first sexual assault or digital rape. It doesn't make sense. The seriousness of rape has to be communicated clearly, we should not create a culture that suggests we learn that rape is wrong through trial and error.

''The consequences of sexual assault needs to be severe enough that people feel enough fear to exercise good judgment even if they are drunk, severe enough to be preventative. The probation officer weighed the fact that he has surrendered a hard earned swimming scholarship. How fast Brock swims does not lessen the severity of what happened to me, and should not lessen the severity of his punishment. If a first time offender from an underprivileged background was accused of three felonies and displayed no accountability for his actions other than drinking, what would his sentence be? The fact that Brock was an athlete at a private university should not be seen as an entitlement to leniency, but as an opportunity to send a message that sexual assault is against the law regardless of social class.''

Ms. KUSTER. ''The Probation Officer has stated that this case, when compared to other crimes of similar nature, may be considered less serious due to the defendant's level of intoxication. It felt serious. That's all I'm going to say.

''What has he done to demonstrate that he deserves a break? He has only apologized for drinking and has yet to define what he did to me as sexual assault, he has revictimized me continually, relentlessly. He has been found guilty of three serious felonies and it is time for him to accept the consequences of his actions. He will not be quietly excused.

''He is a lifetime sex registrant. That doesn't expire. Just like what he did to me doesn't expire, doesn't just go away after a set number of years. It stays with me, it's part of my identity, it has forever changed the way I carry myself, the way I live the rest of my life.

''To conclude, I want to say thank you. To everyone from the intern who made me oatmeal when I woke up at the hospital that morning, to the deputy who waited beside me, to the nurses who calmed me, to the detective who listened to me and never judged me, to my advocates who stood unwaveringly beside me, to my therapist who taught me to find courage in vulnerability, to my boss for being kind and understanding, to my incredible parents who teach me how to turn pain into strength, to my grandma who snuck chocolate into the courtroom throughout this to give to me, my friends who remind me how to be happy, to my boyfriend who is patient and loving, to my unconquerable sister who is the other half of my heart, to Alaleh, my idol, who fought tirelessly and never doubted me.''

Mr. GOHMERT. ''Thank you to everyone involved in the trial for their time and attention. Thank you to girls across the nation that wrote cards to my DA to give to me, so many strangers who cared for me.

''Most importantly, thank you to the two men who saved me, who I have yet to meet. I sleep with two bicycles that I drew taped above my bed to remind myself there are heroes in this story. That we are looking out for one another. To have known all of these people, to have felt their protection and love, is something I will never forget.''

□ 2045

Mr. SPEIER. ''And finally, to girls everywhere, I am with you. On nights when you feel alone, I am with you. When people doubt you or dismiss you, I am with you. I fought everyday for you. So never stop fighting, I believe you. As the author Anne Lamott once wrote, ''Lighthouses don't go running all over an island looking for boats to save; they just stand there shining.'' Although I can't save every boat, I hope that by speaking today, you absorbed a small amount of light, a small knowing that you can't be silenced, a small satisfaction that justice was served, a small assurance that we are getting somewhere, and a big, big knowing that you are important, unquestionably, you are untouchable, you are beautiful, you are to be valued, respected, undeniably, every minute of every day, you are powerful and nobody can take that away from you. To girls everywhere, I am with you. Thank you.''

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

VICTIM STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank my friend. I am very grateful to my friend from California, Congresswoman SPEIER, for having the idea and doing this. Powerful. As a former judge who heard cases like this, it is a powerful reminder of the evil or, as the poet said, the inhumanity of man to man. It is such an outrage.

This was a special evening to bring attention to a grave injustice, so I am very grateful that Congresswoman SPEIER did what she did.

It also brings to mind the fact that there is grave injustice. Nobody should get 6 months in prison for what was done in that case. In Texas, the minimum would be 5 years. I saw Judge POE, a former district judge, also reading part of the statement of the victim in the case. And I just cannot imagine Judge POE or myself giving a sentence anywhere close to 5 years. We would have been heading for the top, if not the top. It is just so outrageous.

In considering an appropriate sentence, a judge—we were taught and the rule was—considered punishment just for what was done. You considered deterrence to the individual who committed the act. You considered general deterrence to the public at large and

the message that would be sent with the sentence that was assessed. And you considered the protection of the general public.

The sentence in this case was just outrageous beyond measure. It is no deterrence to the defendant, criminal actor. It is no general deterrence to the public at large. Somebody thinks they could get away with what he did and get the kind of light sentence he did; it is no deterrence at all.

It certainly didn't protect the public. If he had done 30, 40 years in prison, the public would have been protected all that time. It certainly wasn't much punishment for punishment's sake.

ORLANDO SHOOTING

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to the issue of the Orlando shooting. There is an article from The Daily Caller from June 12, ''Did FBI Training Material Purge Cause Agency to Drop the Ball on Orlando Shooter?'' I would submit that it absolutely did.

The FBI agents who questioned or investigated this matter I do not believe are at fault for shortcomings. I don't see them. Because I know, Michele Bachmann knows, LYNN WESTMORELAND knows, as we went over and were going through material that the FBI had classified—I thought it was ridiculous; the public should know—the documents about radical Islam that have been purged from the FBI training. Some were ridiculous, cartoon, this or that. But they classified them so that none of us could tell you, Mr. Speaker, or anyone publicly how ridiculous some of the purging was.

According to this administration and Homeland Security, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, is an honorable organization. So are they all—all—honorable organizations? The Islamic Society of North America, all organizations that were named as coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial: there were coconspirators named, and the judge found plenty of evidence to keep the named coconspirators in the pleading, though some of them tried to have them removed. But they say they are offended.

They convince people in this administration that somehow the fact that nothing emboldens ISIS more than seeing a weak America and a weak American response is made to be somehow false, though it is absolutely the truth.

Somehow, with the help of some of the media, some in this administration have been able to convince a lot of people that somehow, if you describe radical Islamist terrorists as what they are, you somehow are the reason that there is terrorism. They forget so quickly.

Bill Clinton as President of the United States did more to try to help Muslims around the world, Eastern Europe than most any President. What happened? They tried to bring down the World Trade Center in 1993 on his watch. Not only that, it turns out that the whole time President Clinton was sacrificing American life and limb and treasure to protect Muslims, they were plotting to try again to bring down the World Trade Center.

No, Mr. Speaker, calling radical Islam is not what evokes terrorism. There are a number of factors, but weakness is definitely one of them. And this is a paraphrase, but Ronald Reagan pointed out that, in his lifetime, there was no war that was begun because the country was too strong. That prevents wars. It doesn't cause them. It doesn't cause terrorist attacks.

I go again and again back to the comment from the African gentleman. My wife and I were visiting the Mercy Ship there and the good they were doing treating the thousands and thousands there in West Africa who didn't have proper medical care. This wonderful charitable institution was doing great things. We were there for a week, washed dishes, assisted any way I could in surgery, anything I could do.

But it was the Africans, at the end of the week, who wanted to meet with me and told me: Look, we were so excited when you elected your first Black President, but we have seen, since he has been President, you have gotten weaker and weaker in America. And when America gets weak, we suffer.

Basically, we know where we are going when we die, but our only chance of having peace in this life is if America is strong. And this country has been weakened.

As Muslims leaders have asked in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia: How do you not understand the Muslim Brotherhood has been at war with you since 1979? We don't understand. You placate, you help the Muslim Brotherhood, and you turn on your Muslim friends. We don't understand it. All around the world, they don't understand it.

Iran is an enemy of the United States. They continue to say that. They continue to say that they lied and they would never submit to the terms that this administration said they agreed to. And it is one more thing that makes the radical Islamists or Islamists who are thinking about radicalizing, it helps them realize America is weak and they are stupid and they need to be wiped off the map.

So what does this administration do? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken from the floor here about a fellow Texan, Mr. Elibiary, who was a featured speaker at the 20th Century Man of Peace, the Ayatollah Khomeini, big closed-door event. He was a featured speaker to honor the Ayatollah Khomeini. When the convictions came through for supporting terrorism in the largest, most important terrorist case in America, he took up for the defendants. He said they were wrongly treated.

We know that Osama bin Laden said that the writings of the Muslim brother Qutb—Q-U-T-B is how it is spelled—that Qutb, especially his booklet, ''Milestone,'' helped radicalize him.

Mr. Elibiary was online encouraging people to read ''Milestone,'' that it was a great thing to read, that it was very helpful. And Osama bin Laden said it sure helped radicalize him.

With all the warning signs, Janet Napolitano didn't care. She wanted to show the Muslim world that she was so above the fray and above these silly mortals, what fools these mortals be, that she was above all of that, that she could bring someone who named his foundation the same name as the political party of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. And he never would disclose—as far as I have seen, he still has not disclosed—where he got all the money for what he did.

And yet she made him part of the Countering Violent Extremism advisory committee and then promoted him to the Homeland Security Advisory Council and gave him a classification so he could get online and review classified information.

And Janet Napolitano, as Secretary of Homeland Security, testified falsely before our committee, first, that she didn't know anything about what I was talking about, him downloading documents and trying to offer them to news media, specific national news media, to publish. Thankfully, they turned it down.

□ 2100

She said she didn't know anything about it, yet the night before, her chief told the director of the Department of Public Safety in Texas—because he called me right after the call—I just got a call from Napolitano. He says he has just finished fully briefing Secretary Napolitano on what Elibiary did on his own laptop at his home downloading this information.

She said the next day: I have no idea, basically, what you are talking about.

The next time, I told her: You said you would investigate.

She said: We investigated. There was nothing to it.

None of that was true. When documents were sought to show what was done in the investigation, it turns out there was no investigation. She was testifying falsely about that as well.

So what are radical Islamists supposed to take from all this?

You have an administration that is protecting them. When you review documents that have been cleaned out, taken, purged out of the training material for the FBI, for the State Department, for the Defense Department, for the CIA, for our intelligence, Department of Defense, it is no wonder FBI agents cannot discern that Tsarnaev had been radicalized even though Russia told us twice. And still this administration, they had so miseducated and undereducated our agents, they didn't know what to ask.

How do you establish that somebody had been radicalized?

My dear friend, Philip Haney, one of the original members of Homeland Security, it probably was a record the

number of people that he put together the information to show their terrorist ties. He got a commendation for it. But when he started showing there were ties that people with this administration were having with known terrorists, they deleted thousands of pages of entries of what he had done. When he filed an IG report, they came after him. They impaneled a grand jury to try to destroy him, and he was so squeaky clean. Even though it put his wife in the hospital, nearly killed her, this patriot who has given his life and the opportunity to make millions of dollars with the kind of brilliant mind he has gave it all for his country.

And what did this administration do in return?

This award-winning, wonderful patriot was harassed and investigated, had rumors spread so that they could make sure that the other agents within Homeland Security knew that you don't want to say anything about people with terrorist ties because this will happen to you next.

You know, he has been run through the wringer with a grand jury, and now we are going to take away his gun, his weapon in front of others—terrible humiliation—and then basically put in a closet to push him into retirement. Thank God he was close to retirement. Now he is where he can tell all that was not classified. And we find out just how bad things have been, as this administration did more to protect radical Islamists than it has done really to help keep America safe.

I know I am critical a lot, but I am grateful. I am very grateful that after this terrorist attack, the President didn't go play golf this time. He didn't call the Governor of Florida, but I am very grateful he didn't go play golf. He didn't go to a baseball game. He wasn't on the kiss camera somewhere. I think he is making progress now after 7½ years, and I am grateful for that. I thank him for that, Mr. Speaker, through you.

But this article from the Daily Caller by Peter Hasson says: ''Syrian Immigrant Who Said 9/11 'Changed the World for Good' is a Homeland Security Adviser.'' It goes through and it talks about, you know, that she was picked by Jeh Johnson to help advise him. And here are some of the tweets—oh, and by the way, Mr. Elibiary, like I said, they finally let him end his term after he said the international caliphate was inevitable. Obviously, the United States, by his comments, will have to fall on our knees in front of the ultimate caliph, perhaps the 12th Imam in his mind. But he said Americans need to get used to it.

Well, here is a new replacement. It looks like she has some of the views of Mr. Elibiary. This is a lady with the last name Alawa. So Ms. Alawa, on February 4, 2013, tweeted out: ''I can't deal with people saying America is the best nation in the world. Be critical. Be conscious. Don't be idiots.''

Well, this Nation has previously been the best nation in the world. It has been the freest nation in the world, and that has been shown. But in recent years, we have fallen further and further down the list of the most free nations in the world. So we are certainly not the most free nation anymore, although we have been the most blessed nation with personal freedoms and personal assets. The only nation in history, that I am aware of, where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor involved obesity.

This adviser to Jeh Johnson also tweeted out that ''The US has never been a utopia unless you were a straight white male that owned land. Straight up period go home shut up.''

Isn't that great, Mr. Speaker, that we have people with this mentality and hatred from Americans and bigoted racial positions that she can advise our Secretary of Homeland Security?

Here is another one, September 17, 2014: ''9/11 is your day to pull out your flag themed clothing, and my day to look behind my back as I walk home.''

Well, actually, I don't see a lot of attacks on Muslims in America, especially by true Christians because that is not a Christian thing to do. It is a radical Islamist thing to do.

That is actually quite confirmed by this tweet on 26 April of 2013. She says: ''You can't say something intolerant and not expect consequences. Not on my watch.''

Well, what she is advocating there, in America, under our Constitution, under every law of every State, is called a crime. She is advocating a crime.

Our American Revolution saw the quoting, usually attributed to Voltaire—some differ for the proper attribution, perhaps Voltaire, but the saying was, ''I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.''

Now, according to this high-flying adviser to our own American Homeland Security Department, that is now being changed. Basically, to put it more in Voltaire's potential terms, Miss Alawa is saying: I disagree with what you say, and I am going to cause hell to come down on you. There will be consequences because I disagree with what you say, and I am going to make you suffer for it.

Well, see, that is under sharia law, and we find, obviously, she follows sharia law. She doesn't believe in the United States Constitution, she doesn't believe in freedom of speech, and yet here she is, a top adviser to our own Homeland Security Secretary.

Here is another tweet. This was after Pamela Geller was exposing the lies and hypocrisy of radical Islam and had a drawing contest about Mohammed, and she says: How the blank is—and she fills in blanks. How the blank is the S blank @PamelaGeller is spewing ''free speech''? It's straight up warmongering hate speech. It's xenophobia.

No. The hatred is belonging to Miss Alawa.

Here is another to show her racism. She says: ''Because, Ya know, @TheBachelor, white people in America? They're not gonna be dominant majority for much longer.''

So it is wonderful that Secretary Johnson feels that the way to protect America is to have racist, sharia-loving, above-the-Constitution advisers telling him that you have to go easy on the radical Islamists and not call them what they are, and be mean and tough on people who are concerned about their physical safety, and you need to take the guns away.

I mean, I found this statement. This is consistent. This administration says, when radical Islam attacks, it is time to take guns away from law-abiding Americans. And he keeps proposing this idea that this list that only this administration can compile—nobody in Congress is allowed to even know how they put their list together, potential watch list, terrorist list. We don't know how they put it. They won't tell us. They won't tell people how you get off the list. And yet this unconstitutional way of depriving people of their constitutional rights is being advocated by mostly everybody in this administration. We have to take away Americans' right to keep and bear arms if the President puts them on a list that says he doesn't want them to have guns.

I mean, we have already seen what this administration has done to seniors. Okay. If you are a senior citizen and you have found—because of arthritis in your hands, whatever reason—it is easier for a family member to take care of your checking account and pay your bills so you don't have to suffer the problems—I know, I have had relatives deal with this, and it is happening now.

So somebody is taking care of your checking account, you lose your Second Amendment right to protect yourself with a gun. But what I have seen repeatedly is seniors who may have a family member take care of their checking account, but they sure do know when somebody is breaking into their home, and they need to defend themselves. They know that. It is instinct. But apparently not in this administration.

And how about this?

The security firm that employed the Orlando gunman guards U.S. nuclear sites. Well, we had heard he worked for this—I believe it was G4S, something like that. Yeah, G4S. They have thousands of employees, and they guard nuclear sites.

I have read before publicly from the request for proposal to provide security for Dulles Airport right out here from Washington. Such an important airport to our Nation's government. It is a request for proposal for independent contractors to provide security. The only qualification to providing the security for Dulles Airport, for the toll roads, for the perimeter around Dulles where you don't want somebody that might leave a gate open for a terrorist friend, well, your only qualification is you

have to be over 21 and legally allowed to work, which means you can be a Syrian refugee and have gotten one of the work permits this administration hands out as a basic form of amnesty or maybe be part of a gang bang group that came up from Central America and lied about who you were, where you were coming from, and got a work permit through this President's amnesty bill, you are welcome to go to work at Dulles providing security. Great stuff.

And then this article: ''American-born children of immigrants proving fruitful recruiting ground for jihad in the U.S.'' It seems like I have been talking about that for 6 years. People come over here on visas, they have children, and then the children are taught to hate America.

In fact, our own al-Awlaki, the first American citizen to have been killed by presidential order with a drone strike, even though he had worked with the administration, he has led prayers. He is so dangerous, the Muslim staffers here on Capitol Hill had him lead their prayers a number of times. So dangerous, the President had to take him out with a drone strike, and yet he was an American citizen only because his parents came over on college visas, had him here, took him back to Yemen and taught him to hate America.

□ 2115

''Orlando Terrorist Worked for Same Security Contractor That Has Been Moving Illegal Aliens Into the United States by the Vanload.'' This is from Debra Heine, June 13, from PJ Media.

''FBI Twice Probed Orlando Gunman,'' from Devlin Barrett, June 13, The Wall Street Journal.

The FBI, the government, and homeland security had all kinds of warnings, but they chose to keep playing patsy with people that hate America, who are bigoted, racist Islamic supremacists, and the Nation has suffered as a result.

So what are we going to do? We are supposed to take up a bill. And I applaud our party's leaders. They have made very clear that the President is making a severe mistake by not using the term ''Islamic terrorists.'' So we are taking up a nine-page bill tomorrow that uses the President's term repeatedly, over and over, ''countering violent extremism.'' We never use the term ''Islam.''

We require reports and training, basically, in the Secretary's discretion, if he wants to. The bottom line is it gives cover for countering violent extremism when we are supposed to be pointing out radical Islamists are our enemy.

This is not the bill we should be passing.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5687. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Biennial Core Report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2464(d); Public Law 112-239, Sec. 322(d); (126 Stat. 1695); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5688. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report to Congress entitled ''Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads for Fiscal Years 2015 through 2017'', pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(1); Public Law 100-456, Sec. 326(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-65, Sec. 333); (113 Stat. 567); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5689. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James F. Jackson, United States Air Force Reserve, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5690. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing four officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0119; FRL-9945-72-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS11) June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0544; FRL-9947-30-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS94) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Chemical Reporting: Community Right-to-Know; Revisions to Hazard Categories and Minor Corrections [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2010-076 3; FRL-9945-07-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AG85) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5694. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — D-glucurono-6-deoxy-L-manno-D-glucan, acetate, calcium magnesium potassium sodium salt (diutan gum); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0350; FRL-9946-48] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5695. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Completeness Findings for 110(a)(2)(C) State Implementation Plan Pertaining to the Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) NAAQS; California; El Dorado County Air Quality Management District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0300; FRL-9947-35-Region 9] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5696. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; California Mobile Source Regulations [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0622; FRL-9947-59-Region 9] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5697. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alpha-2,4,6-Tris[1-(phenyl)ethyl]-Omega-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) poly(oxypropylene) copolymer; Tolerance Exemption; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0485; FRL-9946-43] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5698. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alcohols, C>14, ethoxylated; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0858; FRL-9946-16] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Sulfur Dioxide [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0136; FRL-9947-48-Region 5] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Removal of Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0315; FRL-9947-39-Region 5] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; NAAQS Updates [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0009; EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0314; FRL-9946-80-Region 5] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the text of Recommendation

No. 204, ''Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy'', adopted June 12, 2015, by the 104 Session of the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, in accordance with the obligations of the United States as a member of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5703. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5704. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5705. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Federal Election Commission Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5706. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati 2015 management report, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5707. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103), also the ''Management Report on Final Actions for the Six Month Period Ending March 31, 2016''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5708. A letter from the President, James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's Annual Report for 2015 in accordance with 20 U.S.C., Chapter 57; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5709. A letter from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2015 — March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5710. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Peace Corps' Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016 pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5711. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5712. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, in Livermore, California, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5713. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Idaho National Laboratory in Scoville, Idaho to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5714. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Argonne National Laboratory-West in Scoville, Idaho, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5715. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report entitled ''Public Assistance Program Alternative Procedures — Third Quarterly Status Report for FY 2015'', pursuant to House Report 113-481 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (Public Law 114-4); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5716. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report entitled ''Public Assistance Program Alternative Procedures — Fourth Quarterly Status Report for FY 2015'', pursuant to House Report 113-481 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (Public Law 114-4); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5717. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRENSHAW: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5485. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 5483. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 5484. A bill to modify authorities that provide for rescission of determinations of countries as state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 5485. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 5486. A bill to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Poarch Band of Creek Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 5487. A bill to increase purchasing power, strengthen economic recovery, and restore fairness in financing higher education in the United States through student loan forgiveness, caps on interest rates on Federal student loans, and refinancing opportunities for private borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 5488. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to meet standards for the location and operation of polling places used in elections for Federal office, including a standard requiring States to ensure that no individual waits for longer than one hour to cast a vote at a polling place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 5489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make qualified biogas property and qualified manure resource recovery property eligible for the energy credit and to permit new clean renewable energy bonds to finance qualified biogas property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 5490. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to require that no deference be given to the interpretation of consumer financial law by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to define the scope of judicial review of Bureau actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for

a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 5491. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to verify the accuracy of consumer complaint information before making such information available to the public; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 5492. A bill to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 5493. A bill to direct the Librarian of Congress to ensure that each version of a bill or resolution which is made available for viewing on the Congress.gov website is presented in a manner which permits the viewer to follow and track online, within the same document, any changes made from previous versions of the bill or resolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HARDY, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HILL):

H. Res. 785. A resolution recognizing the Boy Scouts of America for its long history of service on the 100th anniversary of the day it was granted a Federal charter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. BERA):

H. Res. 786. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that India should be a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LEE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 787. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2016, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NUNES:

H. Res. 788. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Arctic lease sales which are already included in the Draft Proposed Plan must stay in the proposed 2017-2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

262. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 40, encouraging reform in the military investigatory and prosecutorial systems governing child sexual abuse and increased transparency in the military justice system and military reporting of criminal sex offenses involving children; to the Committee on Armed Services.

263. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 32, requesting the revision of federal regulations so that housing subsidies through the Section 8 rental assistance and homeownership program paid directly to an applicant of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program are excluded from the calculation of household income to determine eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 5483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress may enact laws necessary and proper to the execution of its enumerated powers. As this legislation solely amends the amount of time available for execution of previously granted authority, it is merely technical in nature and an appropriate exercise of Congress' authority to amend its previous actions through necessary and proper statutes.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 5485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 5486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order the enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 5487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I.

Section 1.

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. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall orginate in the House of Representatives"

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 5490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, and Article III, Sections 1 and 2, of the Constitution.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 5491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. "To regulate Commerce . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14. "To make Rules for the Government . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 115: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 140: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 210: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 302: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 391: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 525: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 608: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 752: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 932: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 997: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1062: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1076: Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1217: Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1220: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1391: Ms. TITUS and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1453: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1707: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1859: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2254: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2732: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2799: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2804: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2896: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2980: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3012: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 3051: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3084: Mr. JEFFRIES and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3095: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3099: Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3117: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3119: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3129: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 3130: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3229: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 3284: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3299: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3323: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3463: Ms. SINEMA and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3514: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3523: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 3535: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3666: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3734: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3846: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3913: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4117: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 4247: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 4269: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4365: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4474: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4479: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4480: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4481: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4538: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4558: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 4567: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 4603: Mr. FARR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4614: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4616: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4654: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4662: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4665: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4760: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4959: Mr. KIND and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4979: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 5094: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 5127: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 5147: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5166: Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BARTON, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 5172: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5177: Mr. TONKO and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5178: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 5180: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 5190: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 5213: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 5216: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5275: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 5292: Mr. OLSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENT, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5319: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5351: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 5364: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5365: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 5392: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 5417: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 5447: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 5456: Ms. BASS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 5457: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 5458: Mr. BOUSTANY and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 5471: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.J. Res. 94: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 590: Mr. WELCH, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 647: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 686: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 728: Mr. MEADOWS.
H. Res. 729: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 740: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 750: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 752: Mr. SIRES, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 758: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 769: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 777: Ms. LEE, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. HUFFMAN.