Richard continues to serve NCCU and its alumni community in numerous capacities at the local, State, and national levels. He gives of his time, talent, and resources to help students from across the country succeed in obtaining a quality education from historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Richard Smith has been married to Jacqueline Beatty Smith for 28 years. They met 40 years ago as NCCU students.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to fully describe Richard’s many other contributions; but suffice it to say that Richard Smith is most deserving of this high honor—the NCCU Alumni Association 2017 Alumni Founder’s Lifetime Achievement Award.

I am proud of Richard Smith, and I thank him for his extraordinary work. I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating this great American hero.

HEALTHCARE TOWNHALLS

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, 118,000—the number of people in my district alone who will lose healthcare if TrumpCare passes.

250—the number of people who joined me for a healthcare townhall on Monday in Charlotte.

Zero—the number of public hearings the Senate has held on TrumpCare.

Despite the potential for 22 million people who will lose their healthcare if TrumpCare passes, Senator MCCONNELL hasn’t asked to hear from any of them.

On Monday, I held a townhall where my constituents shared their stories and asked that I share them with you. Katie Mpelkas, a mother of a 3-year-old with autism, relies on Medicaid for her son’s healthcare. She is terrified at the thought that without Medicaid coverage her son won’t get the care he needs.

Adrienne Gonzalez’s son, diagnosed with autism at age 2, has been receiving care paid for by Medicaid since he was 11 months old.

Sadly, their stories aren’t unique. Thirty-nine percent of children are on Medicaid for the care they need, and TrumpCare cuts the program by 35 percent by 2036. Our constituents are begging for help. It is our responsibility to fight for them.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Pursuant to House Resolution 440 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. 2810.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

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. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, July 13, 2017, a second set of amendments en bloc, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORN-BERRY) had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-217.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 115-217.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Florida, and 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 title XXXV add the following:

SEC. 932. APPLICATION OF LAW.

Section 503 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) For purposes of any Federal law except the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), any vessel, including a foreign vessel, being repaired or dismantled is deemed to be a recreational vessel, as defined under section 201(25), during such repair or dismantling, if that vessel—

(1) shares elements of design and construction of traditional recreational vessels (as so defined); and

(2) when operating is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment that is offered by my good friend from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

I would just note that this is an amendment that has been around the last couple Congresses, and the intent clearly is to carve out a larger exemption from the longshoremen’s act which is a law that goes back to 1927.

I would note that if that is the intent, the language of this amendment actually is kind of—like legislating with a chainsaw instead of a scalpel because by carving out a larger exemption for recreational vessels above or beyond 55 feet long, basically there is a whole series of Coast Guard rules and regulations that have been enforced by the Coast Guard for many years that this amendment, unfortunately, is going to sweep up and undermine, including the rules related to alcohol on board vessels, waste management, Coast Guard inspection categories, vessel sales to non-U.S. citizens, tonnage taxes, and safety management systems.

The Coast Guard is out there every single day making sure that these rules which really protect our ports and make sure that our foreign, large, super yachts are paying their fair share, in terms of the costs of environmental protection, and boating safety is enforced. That is, again, what this amendment will undermine.

That is why last year the Coast Guard issued a statement pointing out the fact that because of the broad sweep of the language of this amendment, it is really undermining some key missions that the Coast Guard has been doing for decades for the American people.

So I would note that, at the outset, obviously there is, I think, another allow more employers to purchase State workers’ compensation.

Unfortunately, in 2011, the Department of Labor issued a burdensome and confusing rule creating a new definition of recreational vessel. This change contradicted legislation passed by the Congress in 2009, and effectively denied recreational vessel repair workers access to more affordable State workers’ compensation insurance.

This regulatory confusion and uncertainty is reducing access to affordable workers’ compensation policies and also hurting the overall recreational repair industry.

Our bipartisan amendment increases strong protections to ensure that no vessel used for commercial or military purposes is inappropriately excepted from the Federal requirements.

This amendment would provide regulatory relief for small businesses, including those in coastal Alabama, while also ensuring the maritime workers receive the protections they need.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
issue which is just as significant which is undermining the longshoremen’s act which goes back to Calvin Coolidge. It recognizes the fact that the folks who are engaged in longshoremen activity but also shipyard construction are engaged in a very high-risk type of occupation.

The longshoremen’s act was a recognition that State workers’ compensation systems, because of the fact that they varied up and down in terms of purpose, are essentially required a Federal minimum standard. That is really something that has obviously withstood the test of time over the last 90 years.

Again, if you look at the data, people who were involved in shipyard work, their risk of injury is much higher than many other occupations.

I am a proud Representative from a district that has the second largest employment level in shipbuilding according to the American Shipbuilding Association, and these folks are dealing with processes, equipment, and parts that, again, really are much higher risk than even aerospace or other forms of manufacturing.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we ought to do is stick to the Coast Guard definition of what a recreational vessel is because that has been on the books for many years, and it is something that is, I think all of us should listen closely to in terms of evaluating this amendment.

I think also we should recognize that we can build a great American shipbuilding sector in this country for commercial and recreational vessels, but we should not do it on the backs of worker protection.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman. He and I have worked together on shipping issues a lot of times, and I appreciate his leadership in that industry.

There are DO-1 vessels companies. They are small companies doing small things on different types of vessels than the ones that Mr. COURTNEY and I are typically working together on. So trying to apply the same rules when it is a completely different activity to where, when we are usually talking about very large ships, it just doesn’t make any sense.

This has traditionally been a Democratic amendment. I have always supported it. I am happy to be here to support it today. I would like for us to continue our tradition of bipartisanship on this issue.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who is a colleague from another great shipbuilding district and also the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment shifts workers who repair super yachts and large, luxury watercraft out of coverage under the Longshore and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Act and into coverage under State workers’ compensation programs.

But it doesn’t just amend the longshoremen act. Rather, it creates a problem with the Coast Guard law. The Coast Guard opposed an identical amendment last year because it creates widespread damage to Coast Guard regulatory authority, implicates U.S. treaty obligations, and could affect the collection of tonnage taxes on foreign flagged vessels.

The Department of Labor also opposes the amendment because it could lead to uncertainty and foster litigation under the longshoremen coverage. Moreover, by shifting workers out of longshoremen into the weak State workers’ comp laws such as Florida, it could permanently impoverish workers.

Last year, the Florida Supreme Court held that the Florida workers’ compensation law was so anemic that it was unconstitutional.

If the goal is to provide reasonable insurance rates, then it should be in the insurance industry not by complicating the Coast Guard, by complicating the Department of Labor, and denying workers their benefits under the Longshoremen’s Compensation Act.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Committee on Education and the Workforce opposing this amendment.

MEMBER SLAUGHTER: I am writing to request RECORD a letter from the Committee on Education and the Workforce opposing Amendment 302.


To: The Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT, Ranking Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Sessions and Ranking Member Slaughter:

I am writing to request that you not make Amendment 302 in order under the Longshore and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Act for FY 2018 (H.R. 2810). This identical amendment was included in the NDAA for FY17.

The proposed change to the definition of a recreational vessel implicate U.S. treaty obligations, and affect regulatory and enforcement authorities, implicates U.S. treaty obligations, and could affect the collection of tonnage taxes on foreign flagged vessels. The USCG statement, attached to this letter, notes that this provision could:

Exclude vessels now covered under the U.S. implementing legislation for the International Convention of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships, and reduce available civil monetary penalties to deter violations.

Allow a foreign flagged vessel owner to exempt itself from tonnage taxes by declaring its vessel to be under repair; and,

Allow foreign flagged vessels to avoid requirements for safety management systems under the International Safety Management Code.

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) objected to this provision in the last Congress, as it would “lead to uncertainty and foster litigation regarding Longshore Act coverage” because the definition of “recreational vessel” introduces subjective criteria.

This identical amendment was included in the previously referenced amendment to 46 U.S.C. § 4909, the NDAA for FY17.

The Coast Guard would oppose the previously referenced amendment to 46 U.S.C. § 4909. As a general matter, it seems like this proposed amendment is out of place. Sec. 803 of the American Investment and Recovery Act amended sec. 2(3) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 901(3) as it would “lead to uncertainty and foster litigation regarding Longshore Act coverage.” Therefore, the proposed amendment contains no limitation of the “dismantling” language to those activities “in connection with the repair of such vessel.” Irrespective of the drafting issues, the proposed amendment would not provide any immediate relief as the draft language contains terms undefined by statute that prevent it from being self-executing. Finally, if adopted, the amendment would likely create a wholly unnecessary bifurcated regulatory scheme between the DOL regulations under 29 C.F.R. §§ 1901 et seq. and the Coast Guard regulations promulgated by the Coast Guard.

The proposed change to the definition of a “recreational vessel” to include “any vessel, that is not participating in a foreign flagged vessel or dismantled [. . .] during such repair or dismantling if the vessel (1) shares elements of
design and construction of traditional recreational vessels (as so defined); and (2) when operating is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking, has significant impacts on Coast Guard regulatory and enforcement authorities.

The change in the definition would expand the current exception for “recreational vessels” from the U.S. implementing legislation for the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships. Specifically, civil penalties for owners of “recreational vessels” are statutorily limited to $5,000 as compared to the $37,500 maximum penalty for all other vessel owners.

The definition could be construed to allow a foreign vessel owner to exempt itself from tonnage taxes required under 46 U.S.C. § 60301, by claiming that its vessel is “being repaired” and thereby a recreational vessel exempted from tonnage taxes.

The change in the definition could also be construed to allow foreign flagged vessels to avoid the requirements to maintain a safety management system onboard under 46 U.S.C. §20107, possibly claiming that its vessel is “being repaired” and thereby a recreational vessel exempted from Safety Management Requirements under the International Safety Management Code.

In addition to these statutory impacts, there are numerous Coast Guard regulations not related to Longshoreman and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Act authorities that would be impacted by the change. These include:

- 33 C.F.R. § 85.003
- 33 C.F.R. § 151.51
- 46 C.F.R. § 2.01–7
- 46 C.F.R. § 4.03–50
- 46 C.F.R. § 6.04–20
- 46 C.F.R. § 67.11
- 46 C.F.R. § 136.105

This list is by no means exhaustive. Given the time the Coast Guard has not been able to conduct a comprehensive review of statutory and regulatory impacts that would be implicated by this change. Furthermore, as drafted, this change would require the Coast Guard to reallocate a substantial amount of financial and personnel resources to ensure that its regulations were in alignment with the revised definition. Such an undertaking is wholly incompatible with the current fiscal climate.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard nothing from the Coast Guard this year in opposition to this amendment. In years past, I think the gentleman is correct, we have heard from them, but this year we have heard no opposition for review. A recreational vessel being repaired is the same as a recreational vessel being manufactured to use as a public vessel and should be treated the same in law.

The Coast Guard already strictly enforces all existing laws and regulations that determine whether a vessel is recreational and enforces the law against those who would unlawfully use recreational vessels for commercial purposes. So I would suggest to the gentleman that this is not something the Coast Guard opposes.

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. BYRNE).

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

Mr. COURTNEY. 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. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115-217, Mr. HUNTER. 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 title XXXV add the following:

SEC. 3. RECOUPMENT FOR NON-U.S. SEAMEN.

Section 37183 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(g) RESTRICTION.—(1) Notwithstanding section 30104, a claim for damages or expenses related to personal injury, illness, or death of a seaman who is a citizen of a foreign nation, arising during or from the engagement of the seaman by or for a passenger vessel duly registered under the laws of a foreign nation or a vessel identified as obsolete under subsection (a) or acquired under chapter 563, may not be brought under the laws of the United States if—

(A) such seaman was not a legal permanent resident of the United States at the time the claim arose;

(B) the injury, illness, or death arose outside the territorial waters of the United States; and

(C) the seaman or the seaman’s personal representative has or had a right to seek compensation for the injury, illness, or death in, or under the laws of—

(i) the nation in which the vessel was registered at the time of the claim arose; or

(ii) the nation in which the seaman maintained citizenship or residency at the time the claim arose.

(2) COMPENSATION DEFINED.—As used in paragraph (1), the term ‘compensation’ means—

(A) a statutory workers’ compensation remedy that complies with Standard A4.2 of Regulation 4.2 of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006; or

(B) in the absence of the remedy described in paragraph (A), any other legal remedy that complies with Standard A4.2 of Regulation 4.2 of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, that permits recovery for lost wages, pain and suffering, and medical expenses.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this important amendment would help safeguard U.S. courts against crowding of court docket by foreign maritime claims. It simply clarifies where the claim must be brought when the case has no meaningful connection to the United States.

Specifically, the amendment limits the ability of foreign seamen working on foreign ships in foreign waters to sue in U.S. courts when a remedy is available in their home countries or the country of the ship on which they served. If no such remedy is available abroad, the amendment would allow those seamen to file suit in the United States, assuming they could meet the same burden needed to file any other suit.

I need to be clear, again, this amendment in no way restricts a foreign crewmember’s access to judicial relief if they are injured or suffer some other damage as a result of working on a foreign vessel. It simply says that they need to seek relief in their home country or the home country of the vessel on which they served before seeking relief in U.S. courts.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this pernicious antilabor amendment that would do nothing but make it easier for U.S.-owned but foreign-flagged cruise ship operators to exploit and abuse the seafarers they employ.

The right for seafarers to seek maintenance and cure for injuries, illness, and damages at sea has been a part of U.S. maritime law for as long as U.S. ships have flown the flag on the high seas.

The effect of this amendment is clear: it would restrict foreign seafarers employed on foreign-flagged cruise ships from filing claims for damages or expenses related to personal injury, illness, or even death in a U.S. court.

This provision is completely contrary to a general maritime law principle that has been around since at least the 12th century, a principle that has remained applicable because of the international nature of shipping and the plain fact that, even today, ship operators maintain considerable leverage over individual seafarers.

This provision also violates an international convention that the U.S. has ratified. Under the Shipowners’ Liability Convention, national laws or regulations have to be interpreted and enforced to ensure equality of treatment to all seafarers, irrespective of nationality, domicile, or race. This amendment would shred that international obligation.

It is also contrary to the principles and terms defining seafarers’ rights under the International Maritime Labor Convention.

It is also worth mentioning that the amendment before us may be unnecessary because, in many cases, seafarer contracts contain binding arbitration clauses.

In any event, it makes no sense to deny access to U.S. courts for foreign
seafarers seeking compassion for maintenance and cure claims. The cruise lines can easily avoid frivolous lawsuits. All they need do is honor their longstanding customary responsibility to pay for the care and recovery of the seafarers they employ when they are ill or injured.

In closing, no one has provided any evidence—much less, compelling evidence—to justify the reversal of longstanding seafarer protections. In the absence of evidence, the House should reject the amendment.

This vote is purely to injure seafarers, purely to disobey maritime conventions to which we are a party, purely to disobey laws of the sea from the 12th century that we have obeyed since we obtained our independence from England, for no purpose other than to help often American-owned—not always—but foreign-flagged cruise ship lines.

There is no purpose for this amendment. The House should reject this amendment as it has in the past.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today, I join with my colleague and friend, Representative DUNCAN HUNTER, in offering an amendment to the maritime administration title in the NDAA.

The cruise industry, which is a vital source of economic opportunity for my constituents, has come to me with concerns about lawsuits it says are clogging U.S. courts and making it more difficult to conduct business and create opportunities in my district and elsewhere.

I take these concerns seriously and want to help address them, but I also want to make sure that they are protected and that we don't take away opportunities for them to be fairly compensated if they become ill or injured in the course of their employment.

The Hunter-Wilson amendment is intended to do just that. It safeguards U.S. courts against further crowding of court dockets, while not denying foreign-citizen seafarers remedies.

This provision has been passed in the House five times in the past 3 years, and more recently, the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee included it in the maritime administration title of the Defense Authorization bill for FY 2017.

I want to thank Chairman HUNTER and Chairman SHUSTER for their work on this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hunter-Wilson amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I simply associate myself with the remarks of Mr. NADLER. I think he explained the history of this law very, very well.
Emmer amendment, which would simply create a service medal to be awarded to atomic veterans or their surviving family members in honor of their service and sacrifice to our Nation.

Between 1945 and 1962, about 225,000 members of our Armed Forces participated in hundreds of nuclear weapons tests. Now known as atomic veterans, these GIs were placed in extremely dangerous areas and were constantly exposed to potentially dangerous levels of radiation while performing their duties. They were sworn to secrecy, unable to even talk to their doctors about their past exposure to radiation.

Thankfully, Presidents Bill Clinton and George H.W. Bush recognized the atomic veterans’ value and service and acted to provide specialized care and compensation for their harrowing duty.

In 2007, our allies, Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia, enacted their versions of this amendment by authorizing a medal to honor their atomic veterans who served with the United States.

Regrettably, the Pentagon remains silent on honoring the service of our atomic veterans, arguing that to do so would diminish the service of other military personnel who are tasked with dangerous missions. Mr. Chairman, this is a pitiful excuse.

Tragically, more than 75 percent of atomic veterans have already passed away, never having received this recognition. They served honorably and kept a code of silence. Because of that, it most certainly led to many of these veterans passing away prematurely.

Past administrations and Congresses have dealt with the thornier issues of legality in compensation. What remains is recognizing these veterans’ duty, honor, and faithful service to our Nation. Time is running out. That is what this amendment seeks to do.

I call upon my House colleagues to support this amendment that I, along with my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), have introduced. We owe it to our veterans to recognize their selfless service to our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to work with him on this issue.

During my time in Congress, I have been privileged to meet with many of our Nation’s veterans. The men and women in our Armed Forces are true heroes and truly the best our Nation has to offer. Yet far too often, they do not get the recognition and credit they deserve. This is especially true when it comes to our Nation’s atomic veterans.

From 1945 to 1962, nearly a quarter of a million military personnel had a role in the testing of nuclear weapons, earning them the title, “atomic veterans.”

Since 1990, our Federal Government has taken different approaches to try and recognize and thank our atomic veterans, but we have never given official recognition through an award or medal. Today, that will change with the support of the men and women in this Chamber.

With the McGovern-Emmer amendment, we have an opportunity to finally acknowledge the incredible sacrifice these courageous individuals made over a century ago. Our amendment will require the Department of Defense to issue a service medal to the veterans or surviving families of those members of our Armed Forces who participated in the tests, were part of the U.S. military occupation forces in or around Hiroshima and Nagasaki before 1946, or were held as POWs in or near Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

This amendment has been included in the House NDAA bill for the past 2 years and is supported by the National Association of Atomic Veterans. These veterans left their homes, left their families, and put their lives on the line to protect the freedoms and liberties we enjoy each and every day.

I am honored to work with Mr. McGovern and our colleagues here in the House to ensure these brave soldiers get the recognition they deserve.

Again, I want to thank Congressman McGovern for his efforts on this issue as well as to thank Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and the entire staff of the House Armed Services Committee for their work on the underlying bill, and I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I have supported it in the past. And as Mr. EMMER just mentioned, the House has supported it in the past in each of the last 2 years.

I admire the persistence of the gentleman from Massachusetts in pursuing this issue. I think it is the right thing to do. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to convince our colleagues across the Capitol or the Pentagon to do this. I know of no opposition to the amendment.

I think the House should continue to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. EMMER for his support, and I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their support in the past.

As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has stated, the House has, by voice vote, approved this twice before in the NDAA bills. Unfortunately, the Senate has chosen to not respect the request of the House, so I think it is important that we show a strong bipartisan vote on this. So I will ask for a recorded vote because I think it important that we inform the Senate that we are serious about this and we are serious about honoring our Atomic Veterans.

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

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

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

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

Mr. McGovern. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 440, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc. Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 16, 49, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 printed in House Report 115–27, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. DESJARLAIS OF TENNESSEE

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

SEC. 3124. ANNUAL REPORTS ON UNFUNDED PRIORITIES OF THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 10 days after the date on which the budget of the President for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Administrator for the National Nuclear Security Administration shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the unfunded priorities of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report under subsection (a) shall specify, for each unfunded priority covered by such report, the following:

(A) A summary description of such priority, including the objective to be achieved if such priority is funded (whether in whole or in part).

(B) The additional amount of funds recommended in connection with the objectives under subparagraph (A).

(C) Account information with respect to such priority.

(ii) Prioritization of priorities.—Each report shall present the unfunded priorities covered by such report in order of urgency of priority.

(c) UNFUNDED PRIORITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "unfunded priority", in the case of a fiscal year, means a program, activity, or mission requirement that—

(1) is not funded to at least the level of the President for the fiscal year as submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31;
the Military Health System Genesis.

a) IN GENERAL.—Section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

1. in the heading, by inserting “AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES”; and

2. in subparagraph (1), by inserting “AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES”; and

3. in paragraphs (2), (3)(A), and (6), by inserting “OR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES” each place it appears.

b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 403(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

1. in the heading, by inserting “OR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES”;

2. in paragraphs (1), (2), (3)(A)(i), and (3)(B), by inserting “OR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES” each place it appears.

c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to payments under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, beginning on January 1, 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The amendment as modified is as follows: Insert after section 724, the following:

SEC. 725. REPORT.

For each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the Department of Defense’s—

1. activities and programs with respect to infectious disease;

2. priority areas with respect to infectious disease; and

3. current policy and planning documents with respect to infectious disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

SEC. 725. PROVIDE SUPPORT TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO DEFEND ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD SYSTEM.

(a) SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense may support the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to the extent the Secretaries jointly consider feasible and advisable, in the development of the implementation of an electronic health record system that—

1. is derivative of the Military Health System Genesis record currently being developed and implemented by the Secretary of Defense; and

2. achieves complete interoperability with the Military Health System Genesis.

(b) SECULAR SELF-SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct an annual review of the efforts undertaken by the Secretaries to achieve complete interoperability between the electronic health record of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Military Health System.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

1. REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after completing each annual review under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the review.

2. ELEMENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) Milestones reached as part of the schedule of development and acquisition as developed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) Costs associated with development and implementation.

(C) Actions, if any, of the Secretary of Defense in supporting the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to the development and implementation of an electronic health record system and in achieving complete interoperability with the Military Health System Genesis.

(D) Status of the adoption of the national standards and requirements identified by the Interagency Program Office of the Departments and in collaboration with the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements under subsection (b) and (c) shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly certify to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the electronic health records of both the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs are completely interoperable.

(f) INTEROPERABILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “interoperability” refers to the ability of different electronic health records systems or software to meaningfully exchange information in real time and provide useful results to one or more systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

SEC. 780. INCREASED COLLABORATION WITH NIH TO COMBAT TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER.

The Office of Health of the Department of Defense shall work in collaboration with the National Institutes of Health to—

1. identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for triple negative breast cancer; and

2. provide information useful in biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trials design that will enable both—

(A) triple negative breast cancer patients to be identified earlier in the progression of their disease; and

(B) the development of multiple targeted therapies for the disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 785. ENCOURAGING TRANSITION OF MILITARY TANDEM TECHNICAL PROFESSIONALS INTO EMPLOYMENT WITH VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish for the purpose of encouraging an individual who serves in the Armed Forces with a military occupational specialty relating to the provision of health care to seek employment with the Veterans Health Administration when the individual has been discharged or released from service in the Armed Forces or is contemplating separating from such service.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any additional authority not otherwise provided in law to convert a former member of the Armed Services to an employee of the Veterans Health Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 800. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH CERTAIN TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROVIDERS.

(a) LIST OF COVERED CONTRACTORS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop a list of covered contractors, to be updated as frequently as necessary by the Director, and shall make such list available to the Secretary of Defense.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract with a covered contractor on the list described under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 805. ASSESSMENT AND AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE OR PROHIBIT CONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT FROM CHINESE COMPANIES PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR PROCUREMENT FROM CHINESE COMPANIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

1. IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct an

780A. REPEAL OF CERTAIN AUDITING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 190 of title 10, United States Code, as proposed to be added by section 820(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2274), is amended by striking subsection (f).

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 870A. INCREASED COLLABORATION WITH NIH TO COMBAT TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER.

The Office of Health of the Department of Defense shall work in collaboration with the National Institutes of Health to—

1. identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for triple negative breast cancer; and

2. provide information useful in biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trials design that will enable both—

(A) triple negative breast cancer patients to be identified earlier in the progression of their disease; and

(B) the development of multiple targeted therapies for the disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 785. ENCOURAGING TRANSITION OF MILITARY TANDEM TECHNICAL PROFESSIONALS INTO EMPLOYMENT WITH VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish for the purpose of encouraging an individual who serves in the Armed Forces with a military occupational specialty relating to the provision of health care to seek employment with the Veterans Health Administration when the individual has been discharged or released from service in the Armed Forces or is contemplating separating from such service.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any additional authority not otherwise provided in law to convert a former member of the Armed Services to an employee of the Veterans Health Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 800. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH CERTAIN TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROVIDERS.

(a) LIST OF COVERED CONTRACTORS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop a list of covered contractors, to be updated as frequently as necessary by the Director, and shall make such list available to the Secretary of Defense.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract with a covered contractor on the list described under subsection (a).

(c) REMOVAL FROM LIST.—To be removed from the list described in subsection (a), a covered contractor may submit a request to the Director in such manner as the Director determines appropriate. Upon certification of the request, the Director shall remove the covered contractor from the list.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirements of subsection (b) if the President determines that the waiver is justified for national security reasons.

(e) COVERED CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—The term “covered contractor” means a provider of telecommunications or telecommunication equipment that has been found by the Director, to have knowingly assisted or facilitated a cyber attack carried out by or on behalf of the government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea or persons associated with such government.

SEC. 870A. REPEAL OF CERTAIN AUDITING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 190 of title 10, United States Code, as proposed to be added by section 820(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2274), is amended by striking subsection (f).

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 871. ASSESSMENT AND AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE OR PROHIBIT CONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT FROM CHINESE COMPANIES PROVIDING SUPPORT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

1. IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct an
assessment of trade between the People’s Republic of China and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, including elements deemed to be important to United States national security and defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall—
(A) assess the composition of all trade between the United States and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, including trade in goods and services;
(B) identify whether any Chinese commercial entities that are engaged in such trade materially support illicit activities on the part of North Korea;
(C) evaluate the extent to which the United States procures goods or services from any commercial entity identified under subparagraph (B); and
(D) provide a list of commercial entities identified under subparagraph (B) that provide defense goods or services for the Department of Defense; and
(E) evaluate the ramifications to United States national security, including any impacts to the defense industrial base, Department of Defense acquisition programs, and Department of Defense logistics or supply chains that are procured from commercial entities listed under subparagraph (D).

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment required by paragraph (1). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(4) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may terminate existing contracts or prohibit the awarding of new contracts for the procurement of goods or services for the Department of Defense from a Chinese commercial entity listed under subsection (a)(2)(D) based on a determination by the Secretary of Defense required under subsection (a).

(5) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of, and detailed justification for, any exercise of the authority in subsection (b) not less than 30 days before the date on which the authority is exercised.

(6) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—
(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and
(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle C of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 860A. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FROM INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.

Subparagraph (B) of section 1908(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "3131 to 3133," after "sections.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 8. INCLUSION OF SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Subsection (c) of section 2418 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by striking "issued under" and inserting the following: "issued—
"(1) under;"
and
(2) by striking "and on" and inserting ", and on";
and
(3) by striking "requirements," and inserting "requirements; and"

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
"(2) under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), and on compliance with those additional requirements of the Section 9 program;"

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 345, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 924. COMPLETION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE 2310.07E REGARDING MISSING PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall make the completion of Department of Defense Directive 2310.07E a top priority in order to improve the efficiency of locating missing persons.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "missing person" has the meaning given such term in section 1513 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, insert the following:

SEC. 9. RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION WITHIN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

(a) BRIEFING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on a strategy to ensure that there is sufficient expertise, oversight, and policy direction on developmental test and evaluation within the organizational structure of the Office of the Secretary of Defense after the completion of the reorganization of such Office required under section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2339).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by paragraph (1) shall address the following:
(A) The structure of the roles and responsibilities of the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation.
(B) The location of the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation Department of Defense-wide.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a report to Congress that—
(A) describes the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation Department of Defense-wide.

(4) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may—
(A) terminate existing contracts or prohibit the awarding of new contracts for the procurement of goods or services for the Department of Defense from a Chinese commercial entity listed under subsection (a)(3); and
(B) ensure that such official has sufficient authority and resources to provide oversight and policy direction on developmental test and evaluation Department of Defense-wide.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. USE OF VIDEO TELECONFERENCING.—(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The military judge may, at the request of the accused, defense counsel, trial counsel, and any other participants by video teleconferencing for any matter for which the military judge may call the military commission into session. Any party who participates through the use of video teleconferencing shall be considered as present for purposes of subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF MILITARY COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS.

Section 949d of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) USE OF VIDEO TELECONFERENCING.—(1) The military judge may, at the request of the accused, defense counsel, trial counsel, and any other participants by video teleconferencing for any matter for which the military judge may call the military commission into session. Any party who participates through the use of video teleconferencing shall be considered as present for purposes of subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING VIDEO TELECONFERENCING IN MILITARY COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS.

Section 949d of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) In the case of any proceeding of a military commission under this chapter that is made open to the public, the military judge may order arrangements for the availability of the proceeding to be watched remotely by the public through the internet.".

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 469, after line 17, add the following new paragraphs:

(6) The projected casualties and costs associated with the deployment of members of the Armed Forces to Afghanistan, including a time line for such objectives as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. DILANEY OF MARYLAND

Page 375, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1040. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE BIOSAFETY LEVEL 4 LABORATORIES.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act may be used to support the closure or transfer of a biosafety level 4 laboratory until the heads
of the Federal agencies that use the laboratory jointly certify to the covered congressional committees that the closure or transfer of the lab would not have a negative effect on national defense capabilities and would not result in a lapse of biological defense capabilities.

(b) COVERED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term ‘‘covered congressional committees’’ means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives;

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

(5) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(6) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(7) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(8) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

Page 378, strike lines 19 through 23.

Page 396, after line 4, insert the following:

(5) STARBASE PROGRAM REPORT.—By inserting after section 3402, (4), as added by paragraph (4), the following new paragraph:

‘‘(5) Section 8419(b)(1)(D) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

‘‘(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the Congress, the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.’’

AMENDMENT NO. T OFFERED BY MR. CARRAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 383, lines 2 through 8, strike subsection (b) of section 1051.

Page 396, after line 11, insert the following:

‘‘(y) PRESERVATION OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES.—Section 302(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—(1) by striking the first sentence; and

‘‘(2) by adding at the end—

‘‘(A) the Committees on Armed Services of the Congress, the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.’’

Page 396, line 13, strike subsections (w) and (x) and insert subsections (w), (x), and (y).

The Acting Chair. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding, and I now look forward to entering into a discussion with Mr. POLIQUIN for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman WITTMAN for their support on my important amendment. Bath Iron Works is a critical national security asset to our country. It is a source of great pride for all Mainers, and the shipyard employs some 6,000 of our most talented, hardworking citizens who care greatly about the contributions they make every day to keeping America and our allies safe.

Mr. SMITH OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. MURPHY OF FLORIDA. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for including my amendment in this en bloc package.

My amendment authorizes Procurement Technical Assistance Centers to assist small business owners in pursuing funding opportunities during all phases of the SBIR and STTR programs.

These Federal programs enable small businesses to perform research and development that advances the national interests and has the potential for commercialization.

My central Florida district is poised to benefit from these programs since it is home to a large and growing number of small firms that harness the power of technology, produce innovative products for customers in the public and private sector, and, in the process, create well-paying jobs and generate broad-based economic growth.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chair, I would like to also thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman SESSIONS for making my amendment in order and allowing floor consideration.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It prohibits telecommunications companies that provide material support for North Korea cyber attacks from contracting with our Defense Department.

While my amendment is simple in nature, it strikes at the heart of what I believe to be the cornerstone of North Korea policy.

For far too long, China has enabled the North Korean Government to pursue nuclear development, global provocation, and egregious human rights violations. The Chinese Government is simply not a good faith partner on the issue of North Korea.

For example, there have been multiple public reports indicating that China’s largest government-affiliated telecommunications firm, Huawei, has been subpoenaed by the Commerce Department as part of an ongoing investigation into whether it broke our export control laws by conducting business with North Korea.

Additionally, earlier this year, a similar Chinese Government-affiliated firm, ZTE, was hit with a record-breaking billion-dollar fine in connection with comparable North Korea-related export violations.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is one of many steps that our Congress needs to take to demonstrate our commitment and partnership with North Korea.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. SMITH OF VIRGINIA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the majority for including my amendment in this bloc.

My amendment is straightforward. Mr. Chair, it recognizes that any U.S. strategy for Syria must acknowledge and respond to the tremendous success of civil society in the millions who have been forced from their homes, who face starvation, cholera, a lack of access to adequate healthcare and education, not as an afterthought, but as an active imperative.

The Trump administration has already used the suffering created by the use of chemical weapons as a reason for expanding U.S. involvement in Syria and to launch attacks against the Syrian Government. My amendment would ask the administration for a description of the legal authority relied upon or needed for the use of U.S. military force in Syria, information which is even more critical now, given the recent attacks by U.S. forces against the Syrian Government and reports that we may continue to send more troops into Syria.

It is foolish and unwise for us to think that the suffering being imposed upon innocent civilians in Syria should not be a consideration in any U.S. response or strategy outlining how military forces or aid will be used there. The humanitarian crisis spawned by
yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSEKAM).

Mr. ROSEKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY, and I rise today in strong support of the Lamborn amendment requiring a report on Iran’s use of commercial aircraft to support terrorist groups in rogue regimes around the Middle East.

The Lamborn amendment delivers a simple message to Iran, to Assad, and all companies considering selling aircraft to the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism, and that is: Congress is watching.

Congress is watching midnight flights take off from military bases in Iran and land in war-torn Damascus carrying terrorists, guns, and explosives, which will only be used to shed more innocent blood in the Syrian civil war.

Congress is watching as Boeing and Airbus shake hands and cut deals with former leaders of Iran’s National Revolutionaries of Khomeini, like Hossein Alaei, CEO of Aseman Airlines, who has called to destroy U.S. naval ships sailing in international waters.

Congress is watching as iconic American and European companies are choosing to fuel Iran’s terror campaign around the world.

Mr. Chair, Congress is watching, and Congress will act to ensure that Western companies do not become complicit in the Syrian massacre.

Please support the Lamborn amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for agreeing to include my amendment en bloc in the NDAA.

The fact that we have is a transitioning of the Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve from overseas housing allowance to basic allowance for housing.

We know that, in 2013, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness reported that a change would be feasible and would not be difficult to allow Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve members to be part of the basic housing allowance.

Congress didn’t intend inequitable and unfair treatment to the Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve members, and this amendment provides an equitable solution to the disparate treatment of the housing allowance for Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve members.

We are grateful for the support and are thankful that our servicemembers will now, in their housing, be treated the same as those in the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DeSANTIS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

As we all know, North Korea has targeted the United States with cyber attacks, and they are well on their way to being able to strike the United States with conventional and nuclear weapons. These two amendments would prohibit the Department of Defense from contracting with American companies found to be complicit with North Korean cyber attacks or Chinese companies found to be providing support for the North Korean regime. There is no reason that we should be contracting with countries that are enemies of the United States.

I also support the amendment offered by my friend from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP). Without a doubt, NATO is the greatest military alliance in the world, but that alliance is most effectively when the members of those various countries are pulling their weight and fulfilling their commitments in regard to their own defense budgets. This amendment calls on the President to encourage NATO allies to fulfill their commitments and recognize those who are currently doing so.

I wholeheartedly agree with these amendments, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment simply declares that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this bill can be used to deploy members of the Armed Forces to participate in the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

By passing this amendment, we ensure that no hero, no patriot in a U.S. military uniform will be put in harm’s way in a conflict that can only be settled by the parties involved.

My second amendment simply cuts off funds to any so-called friendly rebels in Iraq or Syria who make a mockery of our good intentions by misusing American arms and resources, and, in far too many instances, using them against us.

We have already spent trillions of dollars, lost thousands of precious lives in these endless wars of choice in the Middle East. It is time to put a stop to it, time to start investing in America and the American people. So I urge the adoption of these amendments en bloc.

I would only add that the President, in his last campaign, had a message that we need to embrace, and I think the en bloc group of amendments takes us in that direction. He pointed out we spend $6 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan with telecom, we could have graduated every kid in America from college debt-free. For another one of those trillion, there is your trillion dollars for infrastructure to fix the trains that are coming off the track and the bridges that are falling down. For another one of those trillion, we could have found a cure for cancer or Alzheimer’s or diabetes, and we still would have had $3 trillion for deficit reduction.

I applaud this committee for all the work that they are doing and the direction that they are taking us back to in getting us out of these endless wars of choice and start reinvesting in America, the American people, and the American infrastructure. That creates good jobs and the quality of life that we embrace.

To be sure, we must have a strong national security. There are evil people and evil forces out there that we need to protect ourselves against, but that doesn’t mean we have to get involved in every civil war and every war of choice in the world.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this en bloc package. I especially want to thank the chairman for including my amendment as part of the other amendments that he has included in this en bloc package.

My amendment would condition the allocation of certain funds to Pakistan upon a certification from the Secretary of Defense that Pakistan is not using its military or its funds or equipment provided by the United States to repress minority groups, and to make sure that they do not repress these minority groups who are seeking their own political or religious freedom.

At a time of high budgets, we should reserve our aid for friends and allies, and end assistance to Pakistan in particular, which does not meet the standards of democracy and freedom that the American people believe have to be part of any decision that we make here.

Pakistan has acted as an adversary not only to the United States, but has been aiding our enemies and repressing its own people. Let us not forget that Pakistan harbored Osama bin Laden. This is the prime mover, the man who organized the slaughter of 3,000 Americans.

We are fools if we continue to support a regime like that in Pakistan today that represses its own people and is using what we give them to actually do things that make us less safe as a people and put us in jeopardy with the terrorists around the world.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for including my amendment to the en bloc package.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including this amendment in the en
bloc package, because I remain concerned about the lack of a clear plan or strategy in Syria.

As the Syrian opposition supported by U.S. and coalition forces fight to liberate Raqqa from ISIS control, we are confronted with the complex and critical question of what comes next. Freeing Syrians from the brutality of ISIS is but one part of a complex, grinding civil war that began with the Assad regime’s heinous violence against civilians and has endured for over 10 years. More than 400,000 Syrian civilians were killed, 6 million Syrians displaced within Syria, and over 4.5 million forced to flee as refugees.

We now have over 500 U.S. troops deployed to Syria to advise and assist Syrian opposition forces. However, we have yet to have a clear, comprehensive political strategy that describes what the end goals are for U.S. involvement and how we hope to achieve those goals.

The amendment requires just that, and follows a similar effort I led with General and Representative John Bacon on Iraq that received bipartisan support in the Armed Services Committee last year.

The amendment requires a comprehensive political and military strategy for U.S. policy in Syria to be submitted by the Departments of Defense and State to Congress and the American people within 90 days of enactment.

We owe it to our troops, those young men and women whom we ask to risk their lives in Syria today, to tell them what their job is, what it entails, what the end goal is, and why it is worth the risks that they take every single day. Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for yielding and for his great work leading us on the NDAA.

I would like to address two amendments that are coming up in en bloc packages.

First of all, on Iran, my amendment to the NDAA. No. 361, requires the President, along with various agencies, to provide the House with a report regarding Iran’s use of commercial aircraft for illicit activities. I am doing this with Representative Roskam.

Diligent research from think tanks, such as the Foundation for Defense of Democracies and the American Enterprise Institute, have demonstrated the need for the intelligence community to provide Congress with a report of their activities.

In total, Iran Air, Mahan Air, Pouya Air, Cham Wings Airlines, and the Iranian Air Force operated at least 404 flights from Iran to Syria since the Iran nuclear deal was adopted on July 14, 2015.

Now, this report does not block the sale of commercial aircraft to Iran, but asks the intelligence community to take a serious look at these sales so Congress can determine if they should continue.

The other amendment I would like to address, Mr. Chairman, is No. 364 on boost-phase missile defense. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for including this amendment, which was co-sponsored by Mr. King, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Frank, and Mr. Wilson from South Carolina, to advance boost-phase missile defense programs.

As you know, ballistic missiles are at their most defenseless when they are in their briefest, initial phase of flight. They are at their slowest, and they have not yet deployed decoys and countermeasures that would make it more difficult to shoot them down in later phases of flight.

This amendment would make Americans safer as we move towards advancing this absolutely critical technology.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting Chair. The question is on the amendments in en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 410, I offer amendments in en bloc.

The Acting Chair. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GOTHENBERG OF NEW JERSEY

Page 386, beginning on line 11, strike subsection (l).

Page 386, after line 11, insert the following:

(p) ANNUAL REPORT ON SUPPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES CONDUCTING COUNTER-TELECOMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES.—Effective as of December 23, 2016, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1061(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

"(g) Section 1022(c)."

Page 396, line 12, strike "(y)" and insert "(g)"

Page 396, lines 12 through 13, strike "subsections (w) and (x)" and insert "subsections (w), (x), and (y)".

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of title E of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1058. STUDY ON HEALTH EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO PERFLUOROOCTANE SULFONATE AND PERFLUOROOCTANOIC ACID FROM FIREFIGHTING FOAM USED AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, shall carry out a study on any health effects experienced by individuals who are exposed to perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid from firefighting foam used at military installations or former military installations, including exposure through a well that provides water for drinking or consumption that the Secretary determines is contaminated with perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid from such firefighting foam.

(b) DESIGN OF STUDY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the study under subsection (a) meets the following criteria:

(1) The study includes a review of relevant literature.

(2) The study includes community input through community advisory groups or focus groups.

(3) The study identifies existing research regarding health effects relating to exposure described in subsection (a).

(4) The study includes protocols based on expertise from epidemiologists.

(5) The study identifies and characterizes one or more sources of water contamination and collects preliminary information on the magnitude and distribution of such exposure.

(6) Based on the information learned under paragraphs (1) through (5), the study determines the specific health effects and perfluorooctane sulfonates and perfluorooctanoic acids to evaluate.

(7) The study includes biomonitoring from a sample of community members, including with respect to specific subgroups considered at risk for such exposure.

(8) The study collects data on possible biological changes potentially associated with such exposure.

(9) The study includes detailed exposure and health questionnaires.

(10) The study includes the review of medical records.

(11) The study analyzes data for an association between such exposure and potential health effects.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congresional defense committees the study under subsection (a). The Secretary shall make such study publicly available pursuant to section 122a of title 10, United States Code.
Roger B. Chaffee were killed in an electrical fire that broke out inside the Apollo I Command Module on Launch Pad 34 at the Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, Florida.

(2) Command Pilot Virgil Grissom was selected by NASA in 1959 as one of the original seven Mercury astronauts. He piloted the Liberty Bell 7 spacecraft on July 21, 1961, in the second and final Mercury suborbital test flight, served as command pilot on the first manned Gemini flight on March 23, 1965, and was named Commander of the first Apollo flight. He began his career in the United States Army Air Corps and was a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Air Force in the event of the accident, and he is buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

(3) Senior Pilot Edward H. White II was selected by NASA as a member of the second astronaut team in 1962. He piloted the Gemini-4 mission, a 4-day mission that took place in June 1965, during which he conducted the first extravehicular activity in the United States human spaceflight program. He was named as Command Module Pilot for the first Apollo flight. He began his career as a ROTC cadet before commissioning as an ensign in the United States Navy, he was a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy at the time of the accident, and he is buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

(4) Pilot Roger B. Chaffee was selected by NASA as a member of the third group of astronauts in 1963. He was named as the Lunar Module Pilot for the first Apollo flight. He began his career as a cadet in United States Military Academy and was a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army Air Force at the time of the accident.

(5) All 3 astronauts were posthumously awarded the Congressional Space Medal of Honor.

(6) As Arlington National Cemetery is where we recognize heroes who have passed in the service of our Nation, it is fitting on the 50th anniversary of the Apollo I accident that we acknowledge those astronauts by building a memorial in their honor.

(b) CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIAL TO THE CREW OF THE APOLLO I LAUNCH TEST ACCIDENT AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY.

(1) CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall, in consultation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, construct an appropriate memorial in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, a memorial marking the location of the three men who served as the crew of the Apollo I crew who died during a launch rehearsal test on January 27, 1967, in Cape Canaveral, Florida.

(2) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 4201 for management support, Space and Missile Center (SMC) civilian workforce (Line 152), as specified in that section, not more than $50,000 shall be available for the construction required under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 451, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 1073. NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMIST GROUPS.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2018, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on a comprehensive, interagency national strategy for countering violent extremist groups.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The comprehensive, interagency national strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) Identification and prioritization of the threats, including a description of capability and intent posed to the United States and United States interests, from violent extremist groups and their ideologies, by region and affiliated group, including any state-sponsors for such groups.

(B) Identification of the interagency tools for combating violent extremist groups, including—

(i) countering violent extremist group messaging and ideological support;

(ii) combating the flow of group financing; intelligence gathering and cooperation;

(iii) law enforcement activities; sanctions; counterterrorism and counterintelligence activities;

(iv) support by civil-society groups, commercial entities, allies and counter rationalization activities of such groups; and

(v) support by the Armed Forces of the United States to combat violent extremist groups.

(C) Use of, coordination with, or liaison to international partners, non-governmental organizations, or commercial entities that support United States policy goals in countering violent extremist ideologies and organizations.

(D) Synchronization processes for use of these interagency tools against the priority threats, including the roles and responsibilities of the Global Engagement Center, as well as the National Security Council in coordinating the interagency tools.

(E) Recommendations for improving coordination between Federal Government agencies, as well as with State, local, international, and non-governmental entities.

(F) Other matters as the President considers appropriate.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the submission of the strategy required by subsection (a), the President shall submit to the Committees on Foreign Relations, the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of Congress an assessment of the strategy, including—

(1) the status of implementation of the strategy; and

(2) progress toward the achievement of benchmarks or implementation of any recommendations; and

(3) any changes to the strategy since such submission.

(c) FORM.—Each report required by this section shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term "appropriately" means the following:

(A) The Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Appropriations, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) The Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, Appropriations, Homeland Security, and the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1073. ADEQUACY OF THE REPORT ON THE VULNERABILITIES OF THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON VULNERABILITIES OF, AND CONCENTRATION OF PURCHASES IN, THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE.

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at least annually until September 30, 2023, before the enactment of a defense authorization act, the President shall issue to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive report combining all of the elements of the reports described in paragraph (4) and any other relevant reports on the adequacy of, vulnerabilities of, and concentration of purchases in the defense industrial base.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In preparing a report under paragraph (1), the President shall consult with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the National Security Agency, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the adequacy and effectiveness of Federal efforts to ensure that sufficient, adequate, and secure industrial infrastructure is maintained.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report issued under paragraph (1) shall be in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(4) REPORTS OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Each report issued under paragraph (1) shall contain all relevant information and analysis from the following reports, as well as such other relevant information as the President determines to be appropriate:

(A) The report described under section 721(m) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(m)), relating to offsets in defense procurement.

(B) The report described under section 723(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4568(a)), relating to the adequacy of, vulnerabilities of, and concentration of purchases of the defense industrial base.

(C) The report described under section 2504 of title 10, United States Code, relating to annual industrial capabilities.


(K) The report related to "Monitoring and Enforcement of Mitigation Agreements Related to Foreign Investments in the United States" described under House Report 113-102.

(L) The additive manufacturing recommendation described in House Report 113-46.


(N) COMPREHENSIVE DATABASE OF PROPOSED TRANSACTIONS OR PURCHASES IN THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE INVOLVING A FOREIGN PERSON.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—In general.—The President shall establish and keep current a database of proposed transactions that would result in all
of a substantial part of, or a controlling interest in, a U.S. corporation, or the U.S. assets of a foreign corporation, being owned or controlled by a foreign person, in the defense industrial base and any manufacturing or intellectual property related to the defense industrial base.

(B) Confidentiality of information.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the President shall ensure that the information contained in the database is kept confidential.

(C) Access to database.—The President shall—

(i) ensure that access to information in the database is strictly controlled;

(ii) make the database available to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Security Agency, with such limitations as the President may determine appropriate;

(iii) require that records are kept each time a person accesses information in the database; and

(iv) require that any person receiving information from the database continues to preserve the confidentiality of the information.

(2) Mandatory filing requirement.—

(A) In general.—With respect to any proposed transaction described under paragraph (1)(A), the proposed purchaser and proposed seller of the proposed transaction shall file, and keep current, a report with the database containing a description of the proposed transaction.

(B) Additional information for proposed transactions involving a foreign government-controlled corporation.—If, with respect to proposed transaction described in subparagraph (A), any foreign person in a foreign government-controlled corporation, the report required under subparagraph (A) shall also disclose whether such foreign government-controlled corporation is—

(i) a Chinese corporation;

(ii) a Russian corporation;

(iii) an Iranian corporation;

(iv) a North Korean corporation.

(C) Civil penalty.—Any person who willfully violates a provision of this paragraph shall be fined not more than $100,000 per violation.

(D) Defense industrial base technologies controlled.—

(i) The term ''defense industrial base technologies'' means—

(a) the sense of Congress that statutes and mechanisms to provide for the identification of the needs of populations abroad for assistance, and other nonlethal assistance provided to the Department and the Armed Forces for which any assistance is provided by the corpora-

(ii) to personnel of the corporation (whether in the United States or abroad) who are carrying out the purposes of the corporation;

(b) distribution of corporation assistance abroad through department of defense.

(1) Acceptance and coordination of assistance.—The Department of Defense (in-cluding members of the Armed Forces) may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense and in accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary:

(A) accept from Spirit of America, a federally-chartered corporation under chapter 2005 of title 36, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), humanitarian, economic, and other nonlethal assistance provided to local populations abroad humanitarian, economic, and other nonlethal assistance provided to the Department by the corporation pursuant to this subsection.

(B) respond to requests from the corpora- tion for the identification of the needs of local populations abroad for assistance, and coordinate with the corporation in the provision and distribution of such assistance, in carrying out of such purposes.

(2) Distribution of assistance to local populations.—In accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary, members of the Armed Forces abroad may provide to local populations abroad humanitarian, economic, and other nonlethal assistance provided to the Department by the corporation pursuant to this subsection.

(3) Scope of guidance.—The guidance issued pursuant to this subsection shall en- sure that any assistance distributed pursuant to this subsection shall be for purposes of supporting the mission or missions of the Department and the Armed Forces for which such assistance is provided by the corpora-
SEC. 10. AIR TRANSPORTATION OF CIVILIAN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO AND FROM AFGHANISTAN.

(a) Policy Review.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a policy review regarding the use of commercial air transportation or alternative forms of air transportation to transport civilian personnel of the Department of Defense to and from Afghanistan.

(b) Report to Congress.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the policy review required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of such review.

(c) Updated Guidelines.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the policy review required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall issue updated guidelines, based on the report required under subsection (b), regarding the use of commercial air transportation or alternative forms of air transportation to transport civilian personnel of the Department to and from Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title F of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1221A. REPORT ON IMPACT OF HUMANITARIAN CRISIS ON ACHIEVEMENT OF UNITED STATES SECURITY OBJECTIVES IN SYRIA.

(a) In General.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 120 days thereafter, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Attorney General, shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of the humanitarian crisis in Syria caused by attacks on the people of Syria by its government, including attacks on hospitals and other medical and educational facilities; and

(b) Consultation.—The President shall consult with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State regarding the impact of the humanitarian crisis in Syria on U.S. security objectives in Syria.

This Act may be cited as the "Humanitarian Assistance for Syrian Refugees Act."
Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics, the Bashar al Assad Regime, Hezbollah, Hamas, Kata’ib Hezbollah, or any other Foreign Terrorist Organization or entities designated by the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of how military relations between Serbia and Russia affect the United States and the Russian Federation on Measures to Counter Extremist Organizations.
- An assessment of intelligence cooperation between Serbia and Russia.
- An assessment of defense and security cooperation between Serbia and the United States.
- An assessment of how military relations between Serbia and Russia affect United States defense and security cooperation with Serbia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
- Form.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of section 12 of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. PLAN TO RESPOND IN CASE OF RUSSIAN NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE NEW START TREATY

(a) In general.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of how military relations between Serbia and Russia affect the United States and the Russian Federation on Measures to Counter Extremist Organizations.
- An assessment of intelligence cooperation between Serbia and Russia.
- An assessment of defense and security cooperation between Serbia and the United States.
- An assessment of how military relations between Serbia and Russia affect United States defense and security cooperation with Serbia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
- Form.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

At the end of section D of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON DEFENSE COOPERATION BETWEEN SERBIA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

(a) In general.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Congress a report on the defense and security relationship between Serbia and the Russian Federation.

(b) Matters to be included.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

- A list of Russian weapons systems and other military hardware and technology valued at $10,000,000 or more that have been provided to Serbia since 2012.
- A description of the participation by Serbian armed forces in Russian military training or exercises since 2012.
- A list of any defense and security cooperation agreements between Serbia and Russia entered into since 2012.
- An assessment of how the countries bordering Serbia assess the risk the Serbian armed forces pose to their national security.
- An assessment of intelligence cooperation between Serbia and Russia.
- An assessment of defense and security cooperation between Serbia and the United States.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY OF WYOMING

At the end of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(a) Report required.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of section D of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(a) Report required.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of section D of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(a) Report required.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of section D of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(a) Report required.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of section D of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(a) Report required.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of section D of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(a) Report required.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

(b) Form.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.
Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, perfluorinated compounds, namely PFOS and PFOA, have been found in public and private drinking water wells in communities surrounding over 600 military installations nationwide, including the Taliban in Afghanistan.

While the military does not dispute its responsibility for the water contamination, the response thus far has been unacceptable. For all of our constituents, they all have the right to safe, clean drinking water, and they deserve to know if PFOS or PFOA have compromised their long-term health.

The bipartisan amendment I have introduced instructs the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out a study on any health effects experienced by those exposed to PFOS and PFOA at military installations or former military installations.

What we alone will not fix the serious concerns about water contamination, it will provide us with critical information about the health impact these unregulated chemicals may have, and aid the Federal Government in conjunction with State and local agencies to reverse the contamination and protect the health and welfare of our residents.

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for yielding time.

Mr. Chair, Pakistan has been supporting all kinds of terrorist groups for years, those with Aghanistan blood on their hands. But instead of penalizing Pakistan, the government has been rewarding them with hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. aid. Some of that money goes to support terrorists.

Previously, we placed conditions on military aid to Pakistan, but these conditions are only focused on Pakistani cracking down on one terrorist group, the Haqqani Network. Meanwhile, Pakistan is aiding and abetting a long list of terrorists in the region, including the Taliban in Afghanistan.

My amendment No. 100 places a new condition on any aid to Pakistan. The condition requires the administration to certify that Pakistan is not providing military, financial, or logistical support to any terrorists operating in Pakistan or Afghanistan.

The United States has a long overdue choice: either go after terrorists or lose millions of dollars of American aid.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership on this matter.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in the ashes of World War II, bringing decades of considerable peace and prosperity. Still, there are powers today that wish to challenge the order from which millions throughout the world have benefited.

My amendment to the NDAA, amendment No. 98, is a straightforward and simple amendment. It would call on all NATO allies to fulfill their mutual defense commitments, secure national and regional security interests, and recognize our NATO allies who are achieving those objectives.

The underlying bill takes steps to strengthen our national defense on many fronts. It improves our overseas contingency operations, provides significant resources to rebuild our military, and strengthens our initiatives to deter Russian aggression.

My amendment builds upon those principles. As we begin to rebuild our military capability, it is time for our allies to do the same, especially when it pertains to our NATO alliance.

For far too long, the United States has shared an unequal financial burden in contributing to the global and regional security that NATO provides. With new challenges from an increasing belligerent Russian state, instability across the Middle East and North Africa, and emerging cybersecurity threats, it is time for all allies to honor their commitment and invest in defense spending.

In order for NATO to be completely effective, all NATO members must meet their GDP commitment for defense spending. This is our responsibility for our allies to do the same, especially when it pertains to our NATO alliance.

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

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

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Congressman LAMBORN's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act to require the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on the use of commercial aircraft by the Government of Iran for illicit activities. I am proud to be the lead Democratic co-sponsor of this bipartisan amendment, along with Reps. LAMBORN, ROSKAM, ZELDIN, and SHERMAN.

As we are all aware, U.S. firms have reached multi-billion-dollar agreements to sell or lease hundreds of aircraft to Iran, supposedly to help bring the country's fleet into the 21st century. I am deeply concerned, however, that these aircraft are identified for civilian use, could instead be used for nefarious purposes, such as transporting fighters to Syria or weapons to Iran's proxies, Hamas and Hezbollah.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terrorism, with a longstanding record of human rights violations. In support of radical groups throughout the Middle East poses a threat both to our greatest ally in the region, Israel, and also to U.S. interests. For this reason, we must keep a watchful eye on Iran's actions, including how it uses dual use exports from the United States.

If Iran is indeed only using American-made commercial aircraft for legitimate purposes, there should be no concern that a report confirming this would have an adverse effect on American trade. If Iran is using aircraft to conduct illicit activities, we must be made aware, and we must hold Iran accountable.

I am also proud to have co-sponsored another amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that will help hold Iran accountable for its actions. This bipartisan amendment, offered by my friend Rep. KIHUEN, would extend a presidential reporting requirement to ensure that we have an integrated strategy between the Administration and Congress to deter Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Two years ago today, the United States, China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and Iran agreed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan Of Action (JCPOA), which aimed to ensure that Iran's nuclear program would be exclusively for peaceful purposes, and that Iran would not obtain a nuclear weapon. I was not a Member of Congress when the JCPOA came to the floor for Congressional approval, but had I been, I would have opposed the agreement. However, I have said since before I first came to Congress that now that the JCPOA is the law of the land, the United States must demand that Iran abide by it completely, and that any cheating or subversion should be dealt with swiftly.

Both the Lamborn and Kihuen Amendments that I have co-sponsored are manifestations of this principle. If Iran is directly violating the JCPOA by developing a nuclear weapons program, the Administration and Congress must be ready to respond. And if Iran is violating
the spirit of the JCPOA by taking advantage of new streams of commerce to wage war in the Middle East, it should not matter what financial ties U.S. companies have to the regime.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the National Defense Authorization Act, which includes both the Lamborn and Khuyen amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Armed Services Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their support of my amendment to direct the Secretary of Defense to report on military cooperation between Serbia and Russia. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Aderholt, for cosponsoring the amendment.

Countries of the Balkans are a part of Europe. Period. From the former Yugoslavia, three have already entered NATO and two are now part of the European Union. In the wider Balkans, even more countries have joined NATO and the EU and others want to be part of both . . . all, except for Serbia, that is, which is unwilling to put itself on a path to future NATO membership.

Frankly, Serbia is not only keeping NATO at arms’ length. As we speak, it is continuing to rearm with Russian weapons. In a deal reached on December 21 of last year, Russia agreed to supply Serbia with MiG–29 ‘Fulcrum’ fighter aircraft, 30 T–72 tanks, and 30 BRDM–2 armored reconnaissance vehicles. Rather than forcing Belgrade to pay for these items worth more than $600 million on the open market, the Kremlin just gave them to Belgrade. Arming Serbia is seeing Russian—rather than NATO—open market, the Kremlin just gave them to Belgrade. And, now Serbia is seeking Russian weapons. In a deal reached on December 21 of last year, Russia agreed to supply Serbia with MiG–29 ‘Fulcrum’ fighter aircraft, 30 T–72 tanks, and 30 BRDM–2 armored reconnaissance vehicles.

I was sitting in one of Serbia’s neighbors, most of which are NATO members, I don’t think I would be comfortable with Belgrade’s tilt toward Moscow.

Even more, only last month, Serbia joined Russia and Belarus in what the countries’ called ‘Slavic Brotherhood’ drills very close to NATO-member Poland. This is only the latest in a series of military exercises where Serbian forces are training with Russian troops. According to RFE/RL, “The first were held in 2015 in Russia’s Krasnodar Krai, which is close to Western-leaning Georgia and Ukraine”.

(2) The second were held in November 2016 in Serbia, while NATO was staging a civil emergency drill in neighboring Montenegro.

If Serbia wants to become part of the West, this isn’t the way to get there. Frankly, I’m growing increasingly concerned with the choices Belgrade is making on military and security matters. This is why I wrote today’s amendment. We need to take a closer look at Russian-Serbian military ties and judge their implications for US national security policy. Serbia’s membership in NATO’s Partnership for Peace, and the impact on Serbia’s neighbors.

I know that Vice President PENCE is meeting with Serbian President Vucic on Monday. This occasion represents a good opportunity to present our U.S. concerns about Belgrade’s direction on security policy and a variety of other matters.

Mr. Chair, again, I thank the Chairman and Ranking member for their support, and I look forward to seeing the report required by the amendment.

Mr. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I am proud to have introduced the Apollo I Memorial Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This year is the 50th Anniversary of the Apollo I spacecraft fire that claimed the lives of three American heroes. With this amendment we ensure that these courageous astronauts, who gave their lives in service to our great nation, will be appropriately honored.

On January 27, 1967, Astronauts Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom, Edward H. White, II, and Roger B. Chaffee were killed when an electrical fire broke out inside their Apollo I Command Module on Launch Pad 34 at the Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, Florida. The accident led to a detailed internal investigation and congressional hearings. As a result of their sacrifice, NASA made needed changes to the Apollo program which ultimately resulted in the successful Apollo 11 landing on the moon two years later.

My Amendment requires the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), to construct a memorial marker at Arlington National Cemetery in their honor. This marker corrects an unfortunate omission, namely, that these three fearless astronauts, who were set to be the ones to fly the first Apollo mission into space, have not received a memorial at Arlington as was done for the Space Shuttle Challenger and Columbia crews. As Arlington National Cemetery is where we recognize heroes who have passed in the service of our Nation, it is fitting that on the 50th anniversary of the launchpad accident we acknowledge the sacrifice of the Apollo I Astronauts.

Mr. Chair, it is past time to install a memorial marker at Arlington so that current and future Americans never forget their sacrifice as we continue to reach for the stars.

Before closing, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who supported the original bill from which this Amendment was drawn, H.R. 703, the Apollo Memo- rial Act. I would also like to express my deep appreciation to both Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH of Indiana and Mr. POSEY of Florida who both offered to cosponsor this Amendment.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will continue to come together to support this amendment honoring these heroes.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 440, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERY of Texas.

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

SEC. 12. NOTICE OF CHANGES TO THE LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS GUIDING THE UNITED STATES’ USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND RELATED NATIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS.

(a) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a change is made to any of the legal or policy frameworks described in the report entitled “Report on the Legal and Policy Frameworks Guiding the United States Use of Military Force and Related National Security Operations” prepared by the national security departments and agencies published on December 5, 2016, the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such change, including the legal, factual, and policy justification for such change.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. TID LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 12. REPORT ON MILITARY ACTION OF SAUDI ARABIA AND ITS COALITION PARTNERS IN YEMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit the appropriate congressional committees a report on military action of Saudi Arabia and its coalitions partners in Yemen.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description of the following:

(1) The extent to which the Government of Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners in Yemen are abiding by their “No Strike List and Restricted Target List”;

(2) Roles played by United States military personnel with respect to operations of such coalition partners in Yemen;

(3) Progress made by the Government of Saudi Arabia in improving its targeting capabilities;

(4) Progress made by such coalition partners to implement the recommendations of the Joint Incident Assessment Team and direction if any by the United States in the implementation of such recommendations;


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

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on—

(1) the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, or
The date on which the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State jointly certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the conflict in Yemen has come to a conclusion, whichever occurs earlier.

Appropriately Congressionally Created Committees Defined.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Amendment No. 95 offered by Mr. Crowley of New York

Amendment No. 96 offered by Mr. Yoho of Florida

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. ASSESSMENT ON UNITED STATES DEFENSE IMPLICATIONS OF CHINA’S EXPANDING GLOBAL ACCESS.

(a) Assessment.

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall assess the foreign military and non-military means in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region and globally, including tourism, media, influence campaigns, investment projects, infrastructure, and access to foreign ports and military bases, and whether such means could affect United States national security or defense interests, including operational access.

(2) Implications. — The implications, if any, of such means for the military force posture, access, training, and logistics of both the United States and China.

(b) The United States strategy and policy for mitigating any harmful effects resulting from such means.

(c) The resources required to implement such strategy and policy, and the mitigation plan and the phases in capability gaps in capability or resources necessary for such implementation.

(d) Measures to bolster the roles of allies, partners, and other countries to implement such strategy and policy.

(e) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State determines to be appropriate.

(c) Report required.—

(A) In general.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the assessment required under subsection (b).

(B) Form.—The report required by this paragraph may be submitted unclassified or classified form.

Amendment No. 96 offered by Mr. Yoho of Florida

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. NORMALIZING THE TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES TO TAIWAN.

(a) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that any requests from the Government of Taiwan for defense articles and defense services should receive a case-by-case review by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, that is consistent with the standard processes and procedures for evaluating and normalizing the arms sales process with Taiwan.

(b) Report.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense receives a Letter of Request from Taiwan, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) the status of such request;

(B) if the transfer of such article or service would require a certification or report to Congress pursuant to any applicable provision of section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776), the status of any Letter of Offer and Acceptance the Secretary of Defense intends to issue with respect to such request; and

(C) an assessment of whether the transfer of such article or service would be consistent with United States obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8; 22 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

(2) Elements.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall specify the following:

(A) The date the Secretary of Defense received the Letter of Request;

(B) The value of the sale proposed by such Letter of Request;

(C) A description of the defense article or defense service proposed to be transferred;

(D) The view of the Secretary of Defense with respect to such proposed sale and whether such sale would be consistent with defense plans.

(3) Form. — Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(c) Briefing.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to the security challenges faced by Taiwan and the military cooperation between the United States and Taiwan, including a description of any requests from Taiwan for the transfer of defense articles or defense services and the status, whether signed or unsigned, of any Letters of Offer and Acceptance with respect to such requests.

(d) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Appropriately Congressionally Created Committees—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) Defense Article; Defense Service.—The terms ‘defense article’ and ‘defense service’ have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).


Amendment No. 97 offered by Mr. Duncan of South Carolina

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE REGION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the security, stability, and prosperity of the Western Hemisphere region are vital to the national interests of the United States;

(2) the United States should maintain a major capability in the Western Hemisphere region that is able to project power; build partner capacity, deter acts of aggression, and respond, if necessary, to regional threats to the national security of the United States by the activities of Iran, China, Russia, North Korea, transnational criminal organizations, or terrorist organizations in the region;

(3) continuing efforts by the Department of Defense to commit additional assets and increase investments to the Western Hemisphere are necessary to fulfill a robust United States commitment to the region;

(4) the Secretary of Defense should—

(A) assess the current United States force posture in the Western Hemisphere to ensure that the United States maintains an appropriate forward presence in the region;

(B) prioritize—

(i) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;

(ii) maritime patrol aircraft to support detection and monitoring missions; and

(iii) efforts to support the maritime security environment in the region, including increased deployment of surface ships;

(C) enhance regional force readiness through joint training and exercises; and

(D) the United States should continue to engage in closer cooperation with the Western Hemisphere region through strengthening alliances and partnerships, working with regional institutions, addressing the shared challenges of illicit trafficking of humans, drugs, and other contraband, transnational criminal organizations, and foreign terrorist fighters, and supporting the rule of law and democracy in the region.

Amendment No. 98 offered by Mr. Bishop of New Hampshire

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO INCREASES IN DEFENSE ABILITIES OF UNITED STATES ALLIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the President, in furtherance of increased unity, equitable sharing of the common defense burden, and international stability, should—

(1) encourage all member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (‘‘NATO allies’’) to fulfill their commitments to levels and composition of defense expenditures as agreed upon at the NATO 2014 Wales Summit and NATO 2016 Warsaw Summit;

(2) call on NATO allies to finance, equip, and train their armed forces to fulfill their national and regional security interests; and

(3) recognize NATO allies that are meeting their defense spending commitments or otherwise providing adequately for their national and regional security interests.

Amendment No. 99 offered by Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania

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

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING FOR MODERNIZATION OF THE ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) In general.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available after fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to fund a Secretariat or any
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other international organization established to support the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty, to sustain domestic prosecutions based on any charge related to the Treaty, or to implement the Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty and implementing legislation for the Treaty has been enacted into law.

(b) Duties.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Department of Defense from assisting foreign countries in bringing their laws, regulations, and procedures related to export control up to United States standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO
At the end of subtitle B of title XVII, add the following new section:

SEC. 1623. REPORT ON SPACE-BASED NUCLEAR DETECTION.

(a) Report.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on space-based nuclear detection, including—

(A) a description of the space-based nuclear detection program (including the space-based atmospheric burst reporting system);

(B) an integrated strategic plan, including with respect to current and planned space platforms, to host the relevant payloads for such program;

(C) the current and planned national security requirements for space-based nuclear detection, including—

(1) an attribution of such requirements to specific missions of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

(2) how such requirements compare to past requirements.

(b) How current and future funding for the space-based nuclear detection program is being provided by each such department or agency to the Congress.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA
Page 687, line 13, strike “Tamir interceptors” and all that follows through “system components of the Iron Dome Defense short-range rocket defense program, through the coproduction of such system components.”

Page 689, line 6, strike “to procure” and all that follows through “System,” on line 7 and insert “for the David’s Sling Weapon System Program, of which not more than $120,000,000 may be used to procure the David’s Sling Weapon System.”

Page 689, line 11, strike “for the” and all that follows through “Program,” on line 12 and insert “for the Arrow Weapon System, including the Arrow 3 Upper Tier System, of which not more than $120,000,000 may be used to procure the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor System.”

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO
At the end of subtitle F of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1694. BOOST PHASE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) Initial Operational Deployment.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that an effective boost phase ballistic missile defense capability is available for initial operational deployment not later than December 31, 2020.

(b) Together with the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to achieve the requirement in subsection (a). Such plan shall include—

(1) the budget requirements;

(2) a robust test schedule;

(3) a plan to develop an enduring boost phase ballistic missile defense capability, including costs and technical challenges.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA
Add at the end of title XVI the following new subtitle:
SEC. 1699G. MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY REPORT ON INCREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is the policy of the United States to continue to expand the missile defense system as quickly as possible, with the utilization of the United States, an effective, robust layered missile defense system capable of defending the citizens of the United States, allies of the United States, and deployed Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on any sites identified in subparagraph (A).

(A) An identification of potential sites—new or existing—to allow for the increase of up to 100 ground-based interceptors.

(B) An analysis of the strategic, operational, tactical, and cost benefits of each site.

(C) A description of any environmental, legal, or tactical challenges associated with each site.

(D) A description of the infrastructure needed and costs associated with each site.

(E) A summary of any completed or outstanding environmental impact statements (EISs) on each site.

(F) An operational evaluation and cost analysis of the deployment of transportable ground-based interceptors, including an identification of potential sites, including in the eastern United States and at Vandenberg Air Force Base, and an examination of any environmental, legal, or tactical challenges associated with such deployments, including to any sites identified in subparagraph (A).

(G) A determination of the appropriate fleet mix of ground-based interceptor kill vehicles and boosters to maximize overall system effectiveness and increase its capacity and capability, including the costs and benefits of continued inclusion of capability enhancements.

(H) Evaluation of technologies such as the Long Range Discrimination Radar and the COBRA DANE radar, including—

(i) the unique capabilities of each radar;

(ii) the overlapping capabilities of each radar; and

(iii) the advantages and disadvantages of each radar’s location.

(C) A modernization plan and costs for the long-term continued operations and maintenance of the COBRA DANE radar or a plan to replace the facility if COBRA DANE cannot remain operational, and the costs associated with each plan.

(b) ASSESSMENT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Director submits the report required by subsection (a)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) complete a review of the plan required by subsection (a)(2)(C); and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such review that includes the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General.

(c) FORM.—The reports submitted under sections (a) and (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1699I. AUTHORIZATION FOR MORE GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE TEST-FIRING.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) at a minimum, the Missile Defense Agency should continue to flight test the ground-based midcourse defense element at least once each fiscal year;

(2) the Department of Defense should allocate increased funding to homeland midcourse defense testing to ensure that our defenses continue to exceed the threats against which they are postured to defend while pursuing a robust acquisition process; and

(3) in order to rapidly innovate, develop, and field new technologies, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency should continue to focus testing campaigns on delivering increased capabilities to the Armed Forces as quickly as possible; and

(4) the Director of the Missile Defense Agency should seek to establish a more prudent balance between low risk experimentation and the more rapid testing pace needed to quickly develop and deliver new capabilities to the Armed Forces.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the integrated layers of missile defense programs.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed analysis of the expected improvements resulting from the integration of the Long Range Discrimination Radar into the missile defense system architecture of the United States;

(B) An analysis of the strategic, operational, and tactical implications of the integration of the Long Range Discrimination Radar into the midcourse defense system; and

(C) A determination of the appropriate testing campaign plan that accelerates the development and deployment of new midcourse defense capabilities.

SEC. 1699J. EVALUATION AND EVOLUTION OF TERRITORIAL GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SENSORS.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the integrated layers of missile defense programs.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a revised missile defense testing campaign plan that accelerates the development and deployment of new midcourse defense capabilities.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed analysis of the costs and benefits of accelerating each following program:

(i) Redesigned kill vehicle;

(ii) Multi-object kill vehicle;

(iii) Configuration-3 booster.

(iv) Lasers mounted on small unmanned aerial vehicles.

(v) Space-based missile defense sensor architecture.

(vi) Such additional technologies as the Director considers appropriate.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Service Acquisition Executive responsible for each covered program shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the procurement process for increments of the system procured after the date of the enactment of this Act will be carried out in accordance with section 2377 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 711, strike lines 7 through 15 and insert the following:

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I inform my friend from Washington I have no speakers on this en bloc package, and I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I don’t have any speakers either, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were adopted to:

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 440, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 6 consisting of amendment Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 121 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON OF IDAHO

Insert after section 2822 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

SEC. 2823. LAND CONVEYANCE, MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to the City of Mountain Home, Idaho (in this section referred to as the “City”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements, consisting of approximately 4.25 miles of railroad spur located near Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, as further described in subsection (c), for the purpose of economic development.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary. The City shall provide an amount to the Secretary, whether by cash payment, in-kind consideration as described under paragraph (2), or a combination thereof, of any facility or infrastructure under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(2) IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.—In-kind consideration provided by the City under paragraph (1) may include the acquisition, construction, or improvement of improving, maintaining, repairing, or restoring (including environmental restoration), or combination thereof, of any facility or infrastructure under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(3) TREATMENT OF CONSIDERATION RECEIVED.—Consideration in the form of cash payment received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the special fund in the Treasury described in section 572(a)(1) of title 40, United States Code.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall publish a final map and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a), except that the Secretary may correct minor errors in the map and legal description after its initial publication.

(2) TBCHIN.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require the City to cover the costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the Secretary, in carrying out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, the costs of environmental remediation, or administrative costs relating to the conveyance (other than costs for environmental remediation of the property conveyed). If amounts are collected from the City of Ogden or Weber County in advance of the conveyance incurred by the Secretary, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received under paragraph (1) as reimbursement for costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance, or to an appropriate fund or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the costs were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations on the use of such fund or account.

(e) RESERVATION OF USE BY SECRETARY.—After the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall allow the Secretary of the Air Force to temporarily remove the deed restrictions and reversionary provisions on the property conveyed under subsection (a) for the purpose of economic development.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a), including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The Secretary may require the City to enter into an agreement with respect to the property to be conveyed with the City or County (as the case may be), including survey and appraisal costs.

(2) The Secretary may require the City to allow the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(3) The Secretary may require the City to cover the costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the Secretary, in carrying out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, the costs of environmental remediation, or administrative costs relating to the conveyance (other than costs for environmental remediation of the property conveyed). If amounts are collected from the City of Ogden or Weber County in advance of the conveyance incurred by the Secretary, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS OF ILLINOIS

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII the following:

SEC. 28. CERTIFICATION RELATED TO CERTAIN ACQUISITIONS OR LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY.

Section 2662(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ‘‘, as well as the certification described in paragraph (5),’’; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(5) For purposes of paragraph (2), the certification described in this paragraph with respect to an acquisition or lease of real property is a certification that the Secretary concerned—

‘‘(A) evaluated the feasibility of using space in property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense to satisfy the purposes of the acquisition or lease; and

‘‘(B) determined that—

‘‘(i) space in property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense is not reasonably available to be used to satisfy the purposes of the acquisition or lease;

‘‘(ii) acquiring the property or entering into the lease would be more cost-effective than the use of the Department of Defense property; or

‘‘(iii) the use of the Department of Defense property would interfere with the ongoing military mission of the property.’’.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. BRAT OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII (as redesignated by line 24 of caption)

SEC. 2818. IMPROVED PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY LOCATED OVERSEAS.

(a) PETITION TO ACQUIRE SURPLUS PROPERTY.—2687a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

‘‘(g) PETITION PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL OF OVERSEAS SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process by which a foreign government may request the transfer of surplus real property or improvements under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense in the foreign country.

‘‘(2) Upon the receipt of a petition under this subsection, the Secretary shall determine within 90 days whether the property or improvement subject to the petition is surplus. If surplus, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the foreign government within one year for the disposal of the property.

‘‘(3) If real property or an improvement is determined not to be surplus, the Secretary...’
shall not be obligated to consider another petition involving the same property or improvement for five years beginning on the date on which the initial determination was made.

(b) ADDITIONAL USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEA MILITARY FACILITY INVESTMENT RECOVERY ACCOUNT.—Section 2687a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "property disposal agreement," after "forces agreement;" and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A); and

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B), and inserting "and" before "the other mandatory requirements."
(1) DEADLINE.—Not later than April 15, 2018, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the plan developed under subsection (b).

(2) Plan developed under subsection (b) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but, consistent with the protection of intelligence sources and methods, may include a classified annex.

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

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(3) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(4) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(5) The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(6) The Committee on Homeland Security, the leaders of other United States allies and partners, and other countries in the region in establishing regional stability.

(7) A description of the military conditions that must be met for the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria to be considered defeated.

(c) Appropriation committees.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means:

(1) The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of section 305 of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 3129. PLAN TO FURTHER MINIMIZE THE USE OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM SPILLOVERS.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall develop and assess a plan, including with respect to the benefits, risks, costs, and opportunities of the plan, to—

(1) take additional actions to promote the wider utilization of molybdenum-99 and technetium-99m produced without the use of highly enriched uranium targets, such as, at a minimum, by—

(A) eliminating the availability of highly enriched uranium for Mo-99 by buying back U.S.-origin highly enriched uranium in raw or target form from global Mo-99 suppliers; and

(B) restricting or placing financial penalties on the import of Mo-99 produced with highly enriched uranium targets;

(2) work with global molybdenum suppliers and regulators to reduce the proliferation hazard from reprocessing waste from medical isotopes containing U.S.-origin highly enriched uranium; and

(3) ensure an adequate supply of molybdenum-99 and technetium-99m at all times, and both assess and mitigate any risks to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(b) SUBMISSION.—

(1) GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2018, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the plan and assessment under subsection (a).

(2) FORMAL.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

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

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MOUTON OF LOUISIANA

At the end of title XXXV add the following:

SEC. 12. STRATEGY FOR SYRIA AND IRAQ.

(a) GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for the following:

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the political and military objectives and end states for Syria and Iraq.

(2) A description of the plan for achieving the political and military objectives and end states for Syria and Iraq, including—

(A) with respect to Syria, a plan for political transition;

(B) with respect to Iraq—

(i) a plan for political reform and reconciliation among ethnic groups and political parties; and

(ii) an assessment of the required future size and structure of the Iraqi Security Forces, including irregular forces; and

(c) A description of the roles and responsibilities of the United States and other countries in the region in establishing regional stability.

(d) AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LANGFREIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subsection (b)(3)(A) of section 1015(c) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2715(c)) is amended, in the third sentence, by adding before the period at the end of the following:

(2) or offshore facility, the persons or entities that are

(3) the persons or entities that are

(4) the persons or entities that are

(5) the persons or entities that are

(e) AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. MARTIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of section 311(a)(11) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

(B) ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF FUND.—Section 1015(c) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2715(c)) is amended, in the third sentence, by adding before the period at the end of the following:

(1) and any facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(2) and inserting “any facility”; and

(3) and inserting “any facility”; and

(f) AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. PLUCZYNSKI OF MICHIGAN

At the end of section 311(a)(11) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or offshore facility, the persons who” and inserting “or offshore facility, the persons who” and inserting “any facility”;

(2) by inserting “onshore facility, offshore facility, or foreign offshore facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, the persons or entities that”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

(D) FOREIGN FACILITIES.—In the case of a foreign offshore facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(g) AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. LAW of WASHINGTON

At the beginning of section 311(a)(11) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (e), and (o), any facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(2) and inserting “any facility”; and

(3) and inserting “any facility”; and

(4) and inserting “any facility”;

(5) by inserting “offshore facility, the persons who” and inserting “offshore facility, the persons who” and inserting “any facility”;

(6) by inserting “onshore facility, offshore facility, or foreign offshore facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, the persons or entities that”;

(7) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(8) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

(B) ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF FUND.—Section 1015(c) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2715(c)) is amended, in the third sentence, by adding before the period at the end of the following:

(1) and any facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(2) and inserting “any facility”; and

(3) and inserting “any facility”; and

(h) AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. FATTAL OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of section 311(a)(11) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

(D) FOREIGN FACILITIES.—In the case of a foreign offshore facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

(B) ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF FUND.—Section 1015(c) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2715(c)) is amended, in the third sentence, by adding before the period at the end of the following:

(1) and any facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(2) and inserting “any facility”; and

(3) and inserting “any facility”; and

(i) AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the beginning of section 311(a)(11) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (e), and (o), any facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or entity (including the United States, its agencies, and instrumentalities) having any rights to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(2) and inserting “any facility”; and

(3) and inserting “any facility”; and

(j) AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of section XXX add the following:
Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 80 as en bloc No. 4.

My amendment encourages collaboration between the FAA and DOD on unmanned aircraft systems so that the FAA may leverage DOD's capabilities and expertise in this area of the DOD. These are important activities as the FAA moves forward with incorporating unmanned systems into the national airspace.

The efforts highlighted in my amendment are already ongoing activities between the FAA and the DOD, but more work needs to be done, as documented in a 2014 joint report to Congress.

The Air Force Research Laboratory located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, AFRL, in particular, has expertise in these sense-and-avoid technologies. AFRL is planning to conduct unmanned aircraft research activities at Springfield, Ohio’s, Air National Guard base in Ohio’s Eighth District, upon FAA approval.

I am an original sponsor of our airmen and the work conducted at both Springfield and Wright-Patterson to offer this amendment to help the FAA make good use of the capabilities located there.

I also rise in support of my amendment No. 120 as part of this en bloc package.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVIDSON. My amendment is critical for ensuring Congress reclaims its war-making powers by prohibiting funding for U.S. operations in Yemen that are not in compliance with the 2001 AUMF. I am concerned about any U.S. operations in Yemen that are outside the scope of the current AUMF and have no identifiable authorization from Congress.

My amendment is very simple. If the military operation is within the scope of the 2001 AUMF, it is permissible. If it has not been authorized by Congress, then it is not permissible.

I look forward to working with the chairman and my colleagues in the Senate to ensure this provision is adopted in the final NDAA conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill. I want to begin by thanking the chairman and all of the members of the committee. As has been noted many times, this is the most bipartisan committee in Congress; and I think, once again, even in difficult circumstances, we have proved that this year. That is, in large part, due to the leadership of Chairman THORNBERRY. I thank him for that.

I also thank our staff, which does an unbelievable job. There are hundreds, if not thousands of amendments, that come at them. They manage that. You see the very few that actually come through either in committee or on the floor. They work through literally thousands of ideas and do an amazing job, so I really want to thank our staff for their great work.

In particular, I want to thank Vickie Plunkett. This will be her last markup. She has done an outstanding job for our staff. She basically exemplifies everything I just said about how great our staff is, how they work in a bipartisan manner and do a great job to serve our country. So, I thank Vickie for her incredible work to our committee and to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill that we should support because, make no mistake about it, what the chairman and many others have said is true; we face a complex threat environment. The U.S. national security is at risk.

I take Mr. Nolan from Minnesota’s point that spending a lot of money on wars that we didn’t need to engage in during the past 20 years at a point is valid, but so is the point that we face threats we must confront.

North Korea is testing intercontinental ballistic missiles. It is no doubt that their goal is to develop a nuclear missile capable of striking the U.S.

Being from the West Coast—and they always say that it could hit Seattle. I don’t know why they don’t talk about any other city on the West Coast. It could hit a lot of different places. We need to be prepared to stop that.

Russia continues to undermine not just our elections, but democracy itself, across Europe, and even down in the Middle East and Africa. We need to be prepared to confront that.

We face a terrorist threat. 9/11 killed 3,000 people in this country because we weren’t ready to prevent it. The groups that supported that attack have not gone away; they have metastasized.

I will completely agree with some of my friends on the left, who think that the terrorism threat is often overstated. I think it is often also a mistake to demonize the Muslim religion. And even though I know some people don’t do that, they simply want to confront groups like al-Qaida and ISIS, Steve Bannon, who works right next to the White House, has said that Islam is a totalitarian ideology of subjugation, it is not a religion. He thinks all Muslims are that, too.

To the extent that we adopt a national security policy that views the world that way, we make the problem worse. That is what ISIS wants; that is what al-Qaida wants. They want a clash of civilizations. We should not want that. They have killed more Muslims than any other religion on Earth.

Muslims have the biggest stake in this. We must work with them, not against them, to confront that terrorist threat that ISIS and al-Qaida and others pose.

On the broader budget issue, as I mentioned a couple of times, the first 6 months of this year, we had a number
of folks in the Pentagon come over and spell out all kinds of nightmare scenarios about every bad thing that could conceivably happen—some of those that I mentioned, and hundreds of others that I haven't. And I understand that. That is their job. Their job is to worry about what is going to happen to us.

But, past a certain point, that isn't helpful. We need a plan, we need a strategy to confront this, and we need to make choices. That is the one thing that I am still concerned about with this President, and really doesn't make choices. It continues to spend money in a variety of different places, without a recognition of finite resources and choices that need to be made about how to confront the threats that are most dangerous to us—how to spend that money in the best way possible. That is something that I think we need to work on going forward.

We also have the budget problem that I described. And I won't give the same full speech that I gave before. But I will simplify it and say that there is a consensus in Congress and in the country that we need to balance the budget without raising taxes and without cutting any programs that people might like. That doesn't work. It simply is not possible. It doesn't add up.

That is why we don't have a budget resolution. Any budget resolution that the Republican Congress could put on the floor will fail to meet some of the promises that they, and others, have made. We have got to be honest about that, because this bill, again, is $72 billion over the budget caps. It is actually $91 billion over the budget caps, if you add in—well, sorry, $81 billion over the budget caps, if you add in the money that we took from OCO to put into the base.

So, if we do not raise the budget caps, this goes away and leaves us, once again, in the land of uncertainty for the Department of Defense. We have to make choices on the budget going forward so that we don't leave the Defense Department in the lurch, not knowing how much money that they are going to have. So, we still don't have a budget resolution in front of us.

And, lastly, I do want to point out that the rest of the budget does matter. The chairman and I have had a little bit of an argument about this: we are the Armed Services Committee. We should pay attention to that. You know, don't sacrifice our troops for the sake of domestic—he always says political priorities. That is the one word in his argument that I find not really appropriate.

There is nothing political about it. It is a policy choice. It is basically deciding what domestic priorities are important.

And, make no mistake about it, the discretionary budget is a zero-sum game. I mentioned yesterday the President's budget: a $54 billion plus-up for defense, and $54 billion cut from non-defense discretionary. So don't tell me that one thing doesn't have anything to do with the other.

But even the so-called budget resolution, the budget agreement that the House Republicans have come up with, but have not yet dared to put to a vote, has a $72 billion plus-up for defense, and $72 billion cut from non-defense spending. So, again, the two are absolutely connected.

What are we talking about with domestic spending? I won't go through all of it. I will just mention a couple of things.

Yesterday, I mentioned our infrastructure. Bridges are collapsing all across the country. I saw a big story yesterday about how the Memorial Bridge is about to fall down. We have incredible infrastructure needs that lead to the strength of our country that are connected, just like national defense is to the strength of this Nation.

But another example, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center—it is close to my district, it is in Seattle—does incredible research right now, that figured out how to not use chemotherapy but actually go in, take out the white blood cells that aren't working in the body, and then send them back in to successfully fight cancer. This has worked for blood cancers. They just started studies on lung cancer. But, basically, we could cure cancer, without going through the hell of chemotherapy. The President's budget would cut Fred Hutchinson's funding by over two-thirds.

I don't think curing cancer is a political agenda. That is a very real need that has an incredible impact on the lives of Americans, just like national security. It is like making sure that North Korea doesn't hit us with a nuclear weapon, making sure that terrorist groups don't attack us. Curing cancer, stopping bridges from collapsing, these are priorities.

Because we are not making budget choices, these are priorities that get pushed aside. And if you plus-up defense and take it from nondefense discretionary, then you are having that very real impact.

Now, I am not going to say it has to be dollar for dollar. I think it probably should be, but we can negotiate around that. But, in order to simply get the national security of this country, it would raise taxes to pay for it instead of simply adding to the deficit or stopping the ability of somebody like the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center from finding a cure for cancer. That is the choice that I would make. These choices are not being made in this budget resolution, and I think that places us at risk.

Lastly, the nondefense discretionary budget is the State Department, it is USAID, it is the Department of Homeland Security. If you are going to have a national security that can't just be the military. And you know who will tell you that more often than anybody? The military. They don't want to bear the entire burden.

General Secretary Mattis had the best quote on this. If you are going to cut diplomacy, if you are going to cut development, you better give me four more divisions because that is how many more wars I am going to have to fight.

So to say we are going to add all this money to defense, and defense is so important, and if you are against it because of other priorities, then you just don't care about the troops, is incredibly disingenuous because all of these other things matter to the national security of this country. And all we are getting out of the majority right now is an effort to plus-up defense at the expense of everything else.

I say an effort because they haven't actually voted on it yet. It hasn't actually happened. And it is more likely than not that this bill—good, though, it is—and the great work that has been done on a number of different policy divisions that don't have anything to do with the money, the good work on acquisition reform to try to make sure we get more for the money that we spend, all of that is in jeopardy because this bill has at least $72 billion in it over the budget caps that is, more likely than not, going to come October 1 or the end of this year.

So if we don't make the choices on the budget that reflect the priorities of the entire country, that actually reflect the budget numbers, then we are doing a disservice to the men and women who serve our country.

It is a good bill. It is going to be better once we figure out the budget issues and actually start making the choices that are necessary to make us stronger in every aspect of society.

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

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman from Washington when he expresses his appreciation to the members of our committee. Each one of the 62 members of our committee has contributed to the bill that is here before us today and, as the Chair knows, we have had more amendments considered over the last 3 days than any other provisions for a National Defense Authorization bill. So Members of the whole body have contributed in many ways.
I also agree with the gentleman that our staff on both sides of the aisle, led by Jenness Simler and Paul Arcangeli, have done a terrific job in helping to manage this process and to shape and guide what has been historic levels of interest by Members on particular provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I think that you would find among our committee virtually, if not unanimous, agreement on two points. One is we live in an increasingly dangerous world. The second one is we have done deep damage to our military because of the budgets cuts, the continuing resolutions, the erratic nature of funding over the last few years.

Certainly, the members of our committee who go out and actually talk to the people who serve have heard, seen, witnessed firsthand airplanes that can't fly, ships that can't sail, training that has not gone on, movers—we are trying to save money for the military, so we are trying to cut-rate movers, and the members of the military are experiencing incredible damage to their household goods as they are shuffled about from place to place involuntarily. Sometimes there are movers with broken trucks who can’t actually get on the military base they are supposed to be delivering to. I mean, just example after example of how these cuts have affected the men and women who serve.

Secretary Mattis says, the only reason we are doing so well around the world is because they have sucked it up and borne the burden. Deep damage that this bill starts to reverse.

I appreciate all the Members who support fixing our planes, getting the training, having ships that sail, better missile defense, all the things that are in this bill.

I am not going to engage in a detailed discussion about the budget. The gentleman and I discuss this frequently.

I would just say, Mr. Chairman, I believe the first obligation of the Federal Government is to defend the country. Article I, section 8 says that Congress has the power and the responsibility to raise and support armies, provide and maintain navies, provide the rules and regulations for the military forces of the United States. That is our job, and I think that is our first job.

So I say that some of the cuts that have been proposed in other domestic programs, discretionary programs, are inappropriate, and we ought to evaluate each of them on their merits. And that continues to be my point when it comes to defense.

We evaluate our obligations to the country and to the men and women who serve, based on the merits of this argument. We don’t tie it to other domestic programs. We do not say that we are only going to increase defense to fix our planes if we can increase the EPA an equal amount. We don’t tie it to other things.

The obligations to the men and women who risk their lives stand on their own, and that, at least in my view, is our first obligation.

Now, when we start talking about budgets, we get into all sorts of conversations about, how many mandatory programs is it really where more than two-thirds of the budget is; how that is what has been growing; how defense is down to about 16 percent of the budget, and as it has been shrinking, the deficit has been going up. Obviously, defense is not the cause when it comes to deficits.

We can also, when we talk about tax, start talking about economic growth and this lackluster growth that the economy has suffered, at least over the last 8 years, and the need to get things going to help with the deficit.

Lots of issues to discuss, but the issue before us today is how we fulfill our responsibilities to the men and women who serve and to the country that relies on us to protect them from missiles, to help protect them from terrorist attacks, to support the men and women who are actually performing those missions.

I think this bill advances that cause. A number of Members on both sides of the aisle have contributed to it. I think and hope it deserves the support of most all Members of the House, and I urge support for this en bloc package.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, as we prepare to vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act I am extremely concerned about the lack of discussion and debate on the issue of Russia.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have heard from the leaders of our military and there is no question about the threat Russia poses to our national security.

It is alarming to me that a number of amendments, which purpose was to gain better situational awareness on various Russian activities, were not debated on the floor this week.

Despite the fact that Russia has continuously attacked and interfered with our country’s democratic process, while continuing to threaten the democracy and sovereignty of other states, this body has decided to avoid a robust discussion on the concerning actions of Russia.

Mr. Chair, it is obvious that we have not adequately addressed the threat Russia poses to our nation.

Reasonable amendments like mine that would have assessed Russia’s disinformation and propaganda activities along with its support for separatist activities were not made in order. Mr. Chair, why would we not want more information on these concerning activities?

My amendment would have also assessed the suppressive democratic conditions in Russia. Is this body no longer concerned about human rights?

I believe it is the responsibility of Congress to fully understand and assess the threats other countries pose on our national security.

I have no doubt that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will agree with me that Russia has demonstrated to be a threat to the security of our nation. As such why aren't we doing more to address this threat?

Mr. Chair, this Congress needs to have a discussion on how we can most effectively combat the aggressive actions of Russia, and it is disappointing that we were unable to do this during the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to cut waste and strengthen our military installations.

This amendment would require the Department of Defense to ensure that there is not unused space available on a military installation before entering into expensive leases or purchasing additional property.

To put this into context, you wouldn't lease space in a parking lot if you already had room in your own garage to park your car.

This amendment is needed because, while asking for another round of base realignments and closures, the Department of Defense leased more than 6,000 buildings in fiscal year 2015 instead of using available space that it already owns.

That sounds like a waste to me.

My Congressional district is home to the Rock Island Arsenal, and we're proud to have it as part of our community.

It houses the Army's only remaining foundry and employs more than 6,000 hardworking people.

But like many of our military installations, it has room for more.

We should be using facilities like the Arsenal to its full potential, especially when it means we can reduce overall costs.

That's why I'm offering this amendment today.

I want to thank my bipartisan co-sponsors, Congressmen PAUL GOSAR, DAVE LOEBSACK and WALTER JONES for their support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORN-BERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT No. 122 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in House Report 115–217.

Ms. TENNEY. 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 subtitle C of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 880A. ADDITION OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE TO THE BERRY AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) Stainless steel flatware.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2533a(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into after the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.
The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, my constituents are discouraged. They are fed up with political elites who have failed to represent them, and with special interest groups who, too often, put impractical goals before practical policy.

In the Rust Belt region I represent in upstate New York, the impact of this has been devastating: devastating job losses, stagnation, and the massive out-migration of people and jobs, the largest in the Nation.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, decline has bred despair, which has spurred a host of other problems. In light of all this, I was elected to Congress with a strong mission to reverse the tide and to revitalizing our upstate communities to the greatness and innovation they once experienced.

I am the voice for my constituents who have been left behind, and I am fighting for the path toward individual prosperity and economic revival.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment uniquely achieves both. There is nothing new or groundbreaking about my amendment. It restates the domestic sourcing requirement for stainless steel flatware that was in law for 30 years without issue. My amendment adds stainless steel flatware back into the Berry amendment.

For 30 years, American-made flatware was covered under Berry. However, the provision was removed in 2006 after Oneida Limited, the only Berry-compliant manufacturer, ceased domestic operations.

In the void left by Oneida’s departure came Sherrill Manufacturing, a company in my district that, since 2008, has produced 100 percent American-made flatware. And since 2008, Sherrill has been among the top providers of flatware to the Department of Defense and GSA, fulfilling more than $6.8 million in Federal contracts over an 8-year period.

All these products are being produced in the newly closed factory using re-furbished Oneida Limited equipment, and also providing jobs for many of the same employees who lost their jobs from Oneida’s closure after decades of service to that same closed factory. In fact, GSA has repeatedly found Sherrill’s flatware to be offered at fair and reasonable prices, which is why the agency already purchases flatware from Sherrill, independent of any domestic sourcing requirement.

Some domestic sourcing requirements may raise costs. No evidence has been submitted to support the claim that my amendment will do that. This alone should allay any concerns that taxpayers would be on the hook for overly expensive flatware, should my amendment be adopted. But if it isn’t enough, then there is this:

My amendment retains all existing waivers under Berry, which means that, if Sherrill’s flatware becomes too expensive or is of poor quality or insufficient quality, the DOD can find other sources.

Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, whenever we can create domestic sourcing opportunities that reduce our military’s dependence on imported goods and strengthen domestic supply chains without significantly raising procurement costs, we should. And this is what my amendment does.

Reinstating the Berry amendment’s domestic sourcing requirement represents a clear continuity in Federal procurement policy, not a stark divergence. As I said, this provision was in effect for 30 years.

Thus far, there is one Berry-compliant manufacturer that happens to be in my district and there should not be a problem with that, as we hope many more producers return to the United States, where their businesses were founded to provide robust competition.

I also support this amendment for the simple fact that it is good policy. It gives a leg up to a robust domestic supply chain that spans five States while reducing our military’s logistical dependence on imports.

Moreover, for the 30-year history of the Berry amendment, Sherrill’s flatware provison, there was only ever one domestic producer. Under the Berry amendment, this is all that is required. And in Sherrill’s case, we know it is a producer that has a track record of offering flatware at market rates.

Mr. Chairman, in districts like mine across the country that have rusted-out factories that line the landscapes of far too many of my communities, today we have an opportunity to fix this problem and restore the once great Empire State and our Nation to the manufacturing strength it once enjoyed. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may grant. Mr. LIPINSKI, my colleague, will make a strong case for this amendment. We cannot go down the road of micromanagement of industries and companies, I think, starts to get us into the wrong sort of regulations, about how we have, about regulations, about how we have, in this country, become less competitive, internationally than we should.

Now, the gentlewoman mentioned GSA is buying some spoons and knives from this one company, I think, starts to get us into the wrong sort of regulations, about how we have, about regulations, about how we have, in this country, become less competitive, internationally than we should.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may grant. Mr. LIPINSKI, my colleague, will make a strong case for this amendment. We cannot go down the road of micromanagement of industries and companies, I think, starts to get us into the wrong sort of regulations, about how we have, about regulations, about how we have, in this country, become less competitive, internationally than we should.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I want to make one thing perfectly clear. American taxpayers want their tax dollars to go to supporting Americans. This amendment means buy American and hire American. So I just want everyone to be clear. We hear a lot about Buy American, Hire American. This is what this amendment would do, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect and admiration for the gentlewoman from New York and her efforts to represent her district, her people, and try to make life better. It kind of relates to some of the conversations Mr. SMITH and I were just having about tax policy, about industrial policy, about regulations, about how we have, in this country, become less competitive, internationally than we should.

Now, I must oppose this amendment because the bottom line is that it is not a matter of national security where the DOD buys its knives, forks, and spoons.
now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115–217 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. Frank of Arizona.

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. Lamborn of Colorado.

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. Byrne of Alabama.

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. Hunter of California.

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

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote was ordered.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 217, not voting 8, as follows:

[Table of votes not shown]

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Table of votes not shown]
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, vacated by voice vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, vacated by voice vote.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[A14 No. 375] AYES—244

Bilirakis (FL)   Clyburn (SC)   Cicilline (RI)   Conyers (GA)   Cooper (NY)

NOT VOTING—9

Bilirakis (FL)   Cleaver (FL)   Cummings (NY)   DelSanto (NY)   Desch (WA)
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

☐ 1105

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—a yeses 243, noes 190, not voting 9, as follows:

(1) 1105

NOT VOTING—9

Mr. PELOSI changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

(3) 1206

AYES—424

(3) 1206

AYE—234
So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COTLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 440, he reported the bill, as amended by House Resolution 431, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered to be taken.

Is the amendment agreed to?

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The motion to recommit was lost.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee chose to fully fund military healthcare, raise the pay of military personnel, and improve our Nation’s cybersecurity.

They agreed that President Trump’s ongoing effort to build a wall is wasteful and has absolutely nothing to do with advancing U.S. national security interests.

I want to emphasize that this amendment incorporated both Democratic and Republican ideas, and passed unanimously in a bipartisan manner. But late Tuesday night, House Republican leadership stripped Congressman GALLEGOS’ amendment from the NDAA with the use of a glaringly undemocratic, procedural gimmick to help Trump fulfill his campaign promise.

Republican leaders’ actions to unilaterally open the door for funding the wall through the use of this defense bill is an insult to every single member of the Armed Services Committee, to our democratic principles, and to the spirit of bipartisanship.

They chose to undermine the unanimous judgment of the Armed Services Committee without the courage to test their proposal with a vote or even a debate on the floor.

You may hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle claim that prohibiting the construction of the wall doesn’t fall within the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. However, I am not sure why the 8 members of the Armed Services Committee have not passed Congress 56 years in a row, and that is a testament to the collaborative, bipartisan work the Armed Services Committee has done to support our troops who put themselves in harm’s way every single day to defend our country.

This year, the House Armed Services Committee adopted an amendment introduced by Congressman GALLEGOS to ensure that none of the funds meant to support our troops and safeguard our Nation’s security can be used for building President Trump’s border wall.

The amendment was amended, and ultimately adopted without objection by every single member of the Armed Services Committee.

If you ask the people who know the border the best, whether it is companies, lawmakers, border communities, trade groups, economists, or law enforcement officials—all Republicans and Democrats—most agree that building a wall is unnecessary, impractical, ineffective, and, frankly, a complete waste of time and taxpayer money.

Furthermore, the United States already maintains approximately 650 miles of border fence in areas that most effectively stop the unauthorized entry of people, vehicles, drugs, arms, and other illicit items.

Instead of a costly border wall between the U.S. and Mexico, the Armed Services Committee chose to fully fund military healthcare, raise the pay of military personnel, and improve our Nation’s cybersecurity.

House Republican leadership stripped Congressman GALLEGOS’ amendment from the NDAA with the use of a glaringly undemocratic, procedural gimmick to help Trump fulfill his campaign promise.

Republican leaders’ actions to unilaterally open the door for funding the wall through the use of this defense bill is an insult to every single member of the Armed Services Committee, to our democratic principles, and to the spirit of bipartisanship.

They chose to undermine the unanimous judgment of the Armed Services Committee without the courage to test their proposal with a vote or even a debate on the floor.

You may hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle claim that prohibiting the construction of the wall doesn’t fall within the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. However, I am not sure why the 8 members of the Armed Services Committee have not passed Congress 56 years in a row, and that is a testament to the collaborative, bipartisan work the Armed Services Committee has done to support our troops who put themselves in harm’s way every single day to defend our country.

This year, the House Armed Services Committee adopted an amendment introduced by Congressman GALLEGOS to ensure that none of the funds meant to support our troops and safeguard our Nation’s security can be used for building President Trump’s border wall.

The amendment was adopted, and ultimately adopted without objection by every single member of the Armed Services Committee.

If you ask the people who know the border the best, whether it is companies, lawmakers, border communities, trade groups, economists, or law enforcement officials—all Republicans and Democrats—most agree that building a wall is unnecessary, impractical, ineffective, and, frankly, a complete waste of time and taxpayer money.

Furthermore, the United States already maintains approximately 650 miles of border fence in areas that most effectively stop the unauthorized entry of people, vehicles, drugs, arms, and other illicit items.

Instead of a costly border wall between the U.S. and Mexico, the Armed Services Committee chose to fully fund military healthcare, raise the pay of military personnel, and improve our Nation’s cybersecurity.

They agreed that President Trump’s ongoing effort to build a wall is wasteful and has absolutely nothing to do with advancing U.S. national security interests.

I want to emphasize that this amendment incorporated both Democratic and Republican ideas, and passed unanimously in a bipartisan manner. But late Tuesday night, House Republican leadership stripped Congressman GALLEGOS’ amendment from the NDAA with the use of a glaringly undemocratic, procedural gimmick to help Trump fulfill his campaign promise.

Republican leaders’ actions to unilaterally open the door for funding the wall through the use of this defense bill is an insult to every single member of the Armed Services Committee, to our democratic principles, and to the spirit of bipartisanship.

They chose to undermine the unanimous judgment of the Armed Services Committee without the courage to test their proposal with a vote or even a debate on the floor.

You may hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle claim that prohibiting the construction of the wall doesn’t fall within the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. However, I am not sure why the 8 members of the Armed Services Committee have not passed Congress 56 years in a row, and that is a testament to the collaborative, bipartisan work the Armed Services Committee has done to support our troops who put themselves in harm’s way every single day to defend our country.

This year, the House Armed Services Committee adopted an amendment introduced by Congressman GALLEGOS to ensure that none of the funds meant to support our troops and safeguard our Nation’s security can be used for building President Trump’s border wall.

The amendment was adopte...
Further, I am not sure why the Rules Committee thought that a discriminatory amendment preventing the Department of Defense from providing medically necessary healthcare services to transgendered military personnel is appropriate for debate than preventing Trump from usurping funds intended for our troops.

You may also hear that my Republican colleagues claim that President Trump can’t use any funds in the NDA to construct the wall anyway. But that is not true. Under title 10, the Secretary of Defense could transfer funding for that purpose this afternoon if he wanted, all without approval of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the only way this body can guarantee that Trump cannot use Department of Defense funds to construct the border wall is to put that prohibition in the bill explicitly. The only way we can do that is by passing my motion to recommit to restore Congressman GALLÉGO’s bipartisan amendment in the bill and ensure that our troops are not robbed to pay for a border wall.

But I want to be clear; the adoption of this amendment will not preclude passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

We all have an opportunity to stand united to support our Nation’s service-members and to protect hard-earned taxpayer dollars from the President’s political pipe dream.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my final amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, this is a procedural motion that, in my view, could be condensed.

We could spend all day and night arguing provisions that prohibit what is not in the bill. There is nothing in this bill that authorizes a border wall. The focus of the bill is the men and women who serve our Nation in the military and the national security of the United States. And that is what I want to take a moment to talk about.

I would suggest that all of us think back just to the events of the last 10 days. North Korea launched what most observers believe is an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching parts of the United States. And we know they already have nuclear weapons.

On July 4, the Iraqi Prime Minister al-Abadi went into Mosul to celebrate the ousting of ISIS with U.S. advisors, U.S. airpower, and U.S. intelligence.

Also, this week, the Chinese navy conducted drills in the Mediterranean on their way to conduct joint exercises with the Russians in the Balkans.

This is just a taste of the world we live in, and there are provisions in this bill that address every one of these incidents, from more missile defense to getting more ships in the water faster and cheaper, to supporting our efforts against ISIS, al-Qaeda, and terrorist groups.

But there is another event this week that I hope we all keep in mind. On Monday, July 10, a KC-130 crashed on its way across the country, resulting in the death of 15 marines and one sailor.

We do not know what caused this crash, but the early evidence indicates that there was catastrophic failure when it was cruising at altitude.

It will be fully investigated. But in the meantime, I think we always have to remember that, even on routine training missions, even on routine deployments, the men and women who serve are risking their lives for us. We owe them the best equipment, in the best shape, with the best training that our Nation can provide. Unfortunately, that is not what they have been getting.

This year, our committee has heard testimony that, under the budget caps, the Army is outranged, outgunned, and outdated. More than half the Navy aircraft cannot fly. More than half the planes in the Air Force qualify for an antique license in the State of Virginia. More than half the planes the Navy has can’t fly. Unfortunately, accident rates are going up.

Sometimes I have heard the argument that Well, why are we not going to give them any more money until they can pass an audit or they can do this and that or the other thing.

But as everybody rushes out to get on their airplanes, just think about this: What if the board of directors of your airline decided that they are not going to spend any more money repairing planes until there is a bookkeeping problem solved in headquarters?

Yet that is exactly what we have been doing on our Navy. We have not been giving them the planes and other equipment in good repair.

Every year for 55 straight years, Congresses and Presidents of both parties have passed into law a National Defense Authorization Act. There is a lot of credit to go around, including the Members on both sides of this aisle who have contributed to this product. I am very grateful for what they have done. But what I am really grateful for are the men and women who serve and inspire us, x men and women who are counting on us.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, whatever our differences on other issues, which we will have time to debate in another time and place, whatever our differences about what is in or not in this bill, we need to put those differences aside and continue to support the men and women who serve and defend us. Let’s not let them down.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.
The result of the vote was announced as follows on H.R. 23:

“Yea” on rollcall 351 On Motion to Recommit with Instructions: Gaining Responsibility on Water Act
“Yea” on rollcall 352 On Passage: Gaining Responsibility on Water Act
“Yea” on rollcall 353 Motion to Adjourn “Yea” on rollcall 354 On Ordering the Previous Question
“Yea” on rollcall 355 On Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 440

For H.R. 2810 Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

“Yea” on rollcall 356 Conaway Amendment 2 “Yea” on rollcall 357 Polis, Lee Amendment “Yea” on rollcall 358 Jayapal/Pocan Amendment 5
“Yea” on rollcall 359 Nadler Amendment 6 “Yea” on rollcall 360 Blumenauer Amendment 8
“Yea” on rollcall 361 Aguilar Amendment 10 “No” on rollcall 362 Rogers (AL) Amendment 88
“Yea” on rollcall 363 Garamendi Amendment 12 “Yea” on rollcall 364 Blumenauer Amendment 13
“Yea” on rollcall 365 McClintock Amendment 14

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. THORNBERY. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 81, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—344
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ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on July 12 through 14, 2017. I regrettably had to attend and preside over the funeral of a good friend and civic leader in Kansas City.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee issued announcements outlining the amendment process for three measures that likely will be before the Rules Committee next week.

An amendment deadline has been set for Tuesday, July 18, at 10 a.m., for H.R. 218, the King Cove Road Land Exchange Act; H.R. 2910, the Promoting Intergency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act; and H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

The text of these measures is available on the Rules Committee website. Feel free to contact me or a member of the Rules Committee if you have any questions.

Mr. THORNBERY. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 81, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]
Bilirakis, Gus
Bilirakis, Bill
Bilirakis, Michael
Bilirakis, Stefan
Bilirakis, Ted
Bilirakis, Rob
Bilirakis, John
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. F.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
Bilirakis, J. C.
Bilirakis, J. B.
Bilirakis, J. A.
Bilirakis, J. W.
Bilirakis, J. T.
Bilirakis, J. H.
Bilirakis, J. E.
Bilirakis, J. D.
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