United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2014 No. 77

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 21, 2014.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

CELEBRATING MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, next Monday is Memorial Day, one of the most solemn holidays in America. We remember those who gave their lives in ultimate sacrifice to our country, those who were wounded, those who are veterans, and those who are still serving our country in dangerous occupations around the world to defend our freedoms.

This is a day that should be solemnly celebrated, and it will be in many places. It could be better solemnly celebrated if the United States Congress would exert a little more oversight and get a little more funding to the VA, so that we don't have veterans dying on waiting lists. We have got to get to the bottom of that scandal, and we have got to adequately fund that agency and give them permanent funding.

Beyond that, there is another group in America who have a very special Memorial Day celebration every year, and that is the United States oil industry. They are, of course, very patriotic. They don't pay much in taxes in the U.S. They have over $100 billion stashed overseas because they don't want to pay U.S. taxes, even though they pay a higher rate many places overseas.

They are very patriotic, and so every year, they have a special celebration where they run up the price.

Now, the oil companies and their handmaidens on the Republican side of the aisle will say: It is all about shortage. All we need is to drill in sensitive areas offshore. All we need to do is build the XL pipeline, and your prices will come down.

Well, that is pretty amazing except, of course, it is a huge lie. Today, the United States of America will export more than 450,000 barrels of gasoline, while they are running the price up on Americans, saying: Hey, don't you know there is a shortage?

Funny thing, I haven't seen any little red flags or yellow flags like they used to have at gas stations saying they have got no gas. No, they have got gas, but they have got it at an exorbitant price, so this is the annual celebration.

Now, ExxonMobil, last year, they were hurting. They only made $32.6 billion. Their last CEO, when he retired, they gave him a $500 million bonus. They are hurting. He went out and bought oil fields with it in Africa. That is pretty cute.

There is a shortage, and that is why you are paying over four bucks a gallon in many places, particularly in my district and in the Western United States, over four bucks a gallon because of this extraordinary shortage.

So here we are, it is Memorial Day. Wouldn't it be nice if we reined in the oil companies? Wouldn't it be nice if we stopped subsidizing them with tax breaks?

Well, not on the Republican side of aisle, they think that is patriotic to subsidize the oil companies' tax rates because they need them because there is a shortage. Well, no, there isn't a shortage, but, hey, they still need and want those tax breaks, and they want to price gouge people at the pump.

So I, for one, will celebrate Memorial Day appropriately, remembering those who have served our country, but for one Member of Congress, I would like to do something about what is going on with oil and gas prices.

I would like to take away their subsidies. I would like to get the speculators on Wall Street out of the oil and gas business. They are driving up the price.

Even according to ExxonMobil, 75 cents a gallon you pay at the pump today, 75 cents of that dollar—$4—that is going to Wall Street speculators, something that didn't use be to be allowed and a bill that I voted against which deregulated that commodities markets, which was supposed to be re-regulated under Dodd-Frank, but the Republicans are opposing any and every effort to re-regulate the commodities market.

Unfortunately, there are few on my side of the aisle who are in the pockets of the oil industry, too, so we could do better. We could do better for our veterans, and we could do better for the American consumers. Let's do it.

Printed on recycled paper.

RECOGNIZING CHANCELLOR MARK A. NORDENBERG, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Mark A. Nordenberg, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, which includes regional campuses in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, in Bradford, McKean County, Pennsylvania, and Titusville, Crawford County, Pennsylvania.

This August, Chancellor Nordenberg will step down after 19 years as chancellor, but will remain at the university that he has served for over 37 years.

During Chancellor Nordenberg's tenure, the university experienced tremendous growth. Annual applications for admission climbed from 7,825 to 27,626. Overall enrollments have steadily increased. Average SAT scores for incoming students are now 185 points higher, and the university continues to expand and to modernize.

Today, the University of Pittsburgh is ranked nationally and competing for the best students in the region, the country, and the world.

Chancellor Nordenberg joined the faculty of Pitt's School of Law in 1977, eventually serving as dean and interim provost of the university. In 1995, he was elected interim chancellor by the university's board of trustees, and in 1996, he was elected chancellor.

Through Chancellor Nordenberg's vision and leadership, the University of Pittsburgh now has an outstanding foundation for success which will last for years to come.

Tomorrow, Chancellor Nordenberg will receive Pitt-Bradford's highest honor, the Presidential Medal of Distinction, which recognizes individuals who have demonstrated outstanding long-term service to the university.

It is my honor to join Dr. Alexander, president of Pitt-Bradford, and the entire University of Pittsburgh team, in offering my congratulations on receiving this important distinction.

Mr. Speaker, we thank Chancellor Nordenberg for his commitment to educational excellence, for his drive and passion to build the University of Pittsburgh into a renowned institution of higher learning.

FREE AMIR HEKMATI

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week, I and many others were in Lafayette Park joining the family of Amir Hekmati, my constituent, to commemorate a very sad anniversary.

For 1,000 days, Amir Hekmati, a young man born in the United States, grew up in my hometown of Flint, Michigan. His parents emigrated to the United States long before Amir was born, in the late 1970s, from Iran. Amir Hekmati has been sitting in a prison—in Evin Prison in Tehran, for 1,000 days.

He traveled to Iran for the first time in August of 2011 because, like many other young men and young women, he wanted to explore his own roots. He had served in the United States Marine Corps, came home; and, before enrolling in school, he wanted to go visit family that he had never met and, in fact, wanted to meet his grandmother whom he had never seen before.

He was there for about 2 weeks before he was arrested. For months, nobody knew where he was, and then soon it was revealed that he had been arrested, tried, and convicted of espionage. Because he was an American who had served in the Marine Corps, he was convicted of espionage.

That death sentence that was initially executed on him was set aside, and that death sentence was suspended. Apparently, there had been a new trial, and he is now, according to a New York Times report, serving a 10-year sentence.

This is a young man who simply went to visit his family, traveled with permission, in a transparent fashion, and is now caught up in the geopolitical struggle as Iran, apparently, seeks to rejoin the international community.

One thousand days in prison—holidays have passed; we experience every one of these days, the changing of seasons. For all of us, we take these moments, these passages for granted.

For Amir Hekmati, every day is the same. Every day, he is in a cell, for many, many months, in a 3 by 3 cell, unable to even sit down for all but 10 minutes of every day.

If Iran truly seeks to rejoin the international community—of course, there are the P5+1 negotiations taking place right now. If Iran seeks to join the global community, and if this Congress is to take any agreement that might be struck seriously, Iran must now free Amir Hekmati. If they expect to be taken seriously, they cannot hold political prisoners.

Now, for most of us, we don't think there is much that we can do about this, but I think every American citizen, every Member of Congress—especially those who have joined me in a bipartisan fashion in calling upon Iran to release Amir Hekmati—can do something. We all can.

For those of you that use Twitter, #FreeAmir. Believe me, it sends a message. It sends a message across the globe. It sends a message to the Iranian people, to the Iranian Government. It sends a message to the friends and the family of Amir Hekmati that our country stands with him.

During those 1,000 days, Amir Hekmati's father has fallen ill. He has brain cancer. It is time, even if for just humanitarian purposes, it is time, long past time, for Iran to do what is right and to release Amir Hekmati, so he can come home and be with his family.

SUPPORT OUR AIR NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today's congressional business is to deal with the defense authorization legislation. This is a critical bill, a real opportunity to balance our needs for a strong defense and care for our men and women in uniform, with the hard budget realities and unsustainable trend lines that we are seeing across the budget categories.

But because we are ducking the hard tradeoffs in this Defense Authorization, tradeoffs that at least the administration—to its credit—and the Pentagon laid before Congress with their recommendations. We are going to have to resort to an amendment process on the floor to use these areas of opportunity to make longer-term savings and to use part of that money to address key priorities that are shortchanged.

□ 1015

Now, I have an amendment that would help support our Air National Guard. The Guard and Ready Reserves are a cost-effective way to provide support for our military establishments. They have proven their worth time and time again overseas, like in Iraq and Afghanistan, and here at home as they help us deal with natural disasters.

The Air National Guard also operates a fleet of 130 F–15 fighter jets in installations across America, but more than half these planes rely on an outmoded, limited radar technology from the 1970s. That means that for many of our pilots, their radar is older than they are. It went out of production in 1986. It limits their capacity, and it breaks down more frequently. It is less reliable. That is why my amendment will actually save money over the next 10 years.

Soon we will be voting on whether or not we will do the right thing to support this vital work of the Air National Guard. Now, during the debate last night, the opponents couldn't argue against the wisdom of making the Air Guard more effective by upgrading this outmoded radar technology that is unreliable and limits their capacity. In fact, they admitted that the little bit that the budget will do to upgrade some of them actually was helpful. They had no good reason to continue to shortchange the Guard.

Instead, during the debate, they tried to make this modest proposal into a larger debate about the one-half to two-thirds of $1 trillion we will be spending over the next 10 years for our whole nuclear weapons program. Now, that is a debate I will welcome on the floor of the House.

In fact, I have legislation that would save $100 billion over the next 10 years and would start us on a much different path to rein in the bloated, expensive, unnecessary, and redundant nuclear deterrent that is many times more than we can afford or that we need. How many times do we have to completely destroy a country from how many different platforms in order to meet our objective of deterrence? We are spending more in inflation-adjusted terms than we spent at the height of the cold war with the Soviet Union. Not only is the program more than we need, but the costs are out of control.

I am pleased that later today we will debate an amendment that the Rules Committee made in order to make last year's Congressional Budget Office report on the reliability of the weapons costs an annual event. That is important because the first report that was issued in December showed that there is a $150 billion underestimation from the administration's current program projections, and that is before the committee added more money and changed the timelines.

By all means, let's have that debate on the floor of the House, on how many of these weapons we need. We have never used these weapons in 69 years and are too expensive and actually, in and of themselves, are dangerous. Let's have the debate sooner rather than later so that we can set our priorities. In the meantime, let's not confuse the tiny reallocation under my amendment with a larger question that is 1,000 times greater.

What it does show is that the money is there to help the Air Guard do their job right. It would be a shame if we let them down and did not approve the Blumenauer amendment.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House. Keep them aware of Your presence as they face the tasks of this day, that no burden be too heavy, no duty too difficult, and no work too wearisome.

Help them and, indeed, help us all to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive, eager to work, and ready to serve You, our great Nation, and all our fellow brothers and sisters.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day to honor and remember the fallen heroes who paid the ultimate price while serving in the Armed Forces, it is vital for Congress to ensure appropriate funding for our troops.

With crises around the world and constant threats to our national defense, we ask a lot of those who wear the uniform. They shouldn't have to ask for anything in return.

In November 2009, an Islamic extremist opened fire on troops at Fort Hood, killing 14 and injuring dozens of others. The victims and survivors have been denied the benefits and honors granted to injured troops in combat zones because the President considers the massacre workplace violence, rather than a terrorist attack.

Nobody in America, but this administration, believes this was workplace violence. The men and women dressed in Army fatigues that day were targets simply because they were American soldiers.

H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act, brings the victims of the Fort Hood shooting one step closer to receiving the Purple Heart medal, giving them the benefits they earned and the recognition they deserve.

They were victims of terrorism, and it is time for them to be recognized as such. I urge every Member to vote in favor of our troops. Vote for H.R. 4435.

In God we trust.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is just wrong. It is wrong that we have 2.8 million hardworking Americans who have lost their jobs and are looking every day for their next job.

They stand to lose everything that they have worked for, and this Congress has within its power the ability to act to save them from losing decades of hard work, losing their house, losing their car, losing the roof over their head; but this Congress fails to bring up a bill that has passed the Senate, that the President would sign, that would extend unemployment benefits to 2.8 million Americans who work hard every day.

There is one reason that this Congress has failed to act, and it is because the Speaker and the Republican leadership will not bring this bill to the floor.

This bill would not increase the deficit. It is paid for, but it would end the misery and the suffering of so many hardworking people who get up every day, wondering if today is the day that the foreclosure notice will come, if today is the day that the car will be repossessed.

We are all Americans. We have always stood together. We have always helped one another when times are tough. For 2.8 million people, times are tough.

Congress needs to act. I call on this House to bring up H.R. 4415. Let's do this now.

REVITALIZING THE CITY OF MORAINE, OHIO

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, during the depths of the recession, a former General Motors plant closed in the city of Moraine, Ohio. The plant was set for demolition, which would have ended any hope of jobs returning to the site.

Moraine Mayor Elaine Allison, City Manager David Hicks, and Economic Director Michael Davis all worked very diligently to preserve this resource and make certain this plant was not a parking lot. Their tireless efforts paid off.

Last Thursday, the city of Moraine officially welcomed Fuyao, a thriving auto parts manufacturer, back to the

former GM facility, creating hundreds of new jobs throughout the region.

I want to congratulate the mayor, city council and city manager and economic director of Moraine for this great accomplishment and teamwork. They rallied the community behind this resource.

Congratulations to the leadership in Moraine. It was great working with you on this project.

ACCOUNTABILITY IS NEEDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the need for accountability and action in the Department of Veterans Affairs. I urge my colleagues to sign on to a letter I have written the Secretary that follows up my call on May 6 for a nationwide audit of all veteran medical facilities.

While the VA has stated that an audit is currently under way, I am very concerned about testimony in last week's Senate Veterans Affairs hearing. In that hearing, it was suggested that the audit under way may not be as thorough and comprehensive as what I called for.

I do not believe that a thorough, in-depth examination of patient scheduling in every VA facility can be accomplished in just a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, if we are dealing with a serious, systemic problem, then this audit is critical. We need a thorough and comprehensive review of scheduling practices at every VA medical facility. Anything less would be a disservice to our veterans who deserve a health care system they can trust.

CONGRATULATING THE RUN NOW RELAY TEAM OF CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Run Now Relay team of Cleveland, Tennessee. Run Now Relay ran more than 1,000 miles—from Cleveland to Boston—to support and raise money for the victims of the Boston bombings.

These extraordinary men and women ran nonstop through eight States in just over a week. Together, they surpassed their goal of $50,000, raising more than $63,000 for those impacted by the tragedy in Boston last year.

The Run Now Relay team pledged 100 percent of the funds to the One Step Ahead Foundation, which aids the children who underwent amputation because of the bombing; and Dream Big, a nonprofit dedicated to helping underprivileged girls through sports.

The team stopped in Washington last week, and my office had the pleasure of meeting with these remarkable folks. Thank you for sharing your mission with us.

Run Now Relay truly exemplifies the great volunteer tradition that defines the State of Tennessee, and I commend the group on their spirit and commitment to honor the victims of the Boston bombings.

They certainly illustrate the best of our great country. We are one Nation.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to remind my Republican colleagues that there are over 2.8 million Americans who have been cut off from unemployment insurance benefits since December 28, 2013.

We are back here in session for 2 weeks, the Senate has worked and passed a measure to renew unemployment insurance, yet Speaker BOEHNER refuses to bring up a bill.

Why, Mr. Speaker?

One of those 2.8 million Americans is Mitch from Nevada. He is 55 and lost his job of 8 years in March of 2013. Since his unemployment insurance ended, he has sold many of his belongings just to stay in his house and to feed his family.

Mitch is a Republican, but more importantly, he is an American, and he is pleading for congressional leaders to not turn their backs on him.

For all struggling Nevadans, I want you to know that we have not forgotten about you.

Mr. Speaker, schedule a vote to extend unemployment insurance benefits to the 2.8 million Americans, the 37,000 Nevadans.

My time may have expired, but it is more important that the unemployment insurance benefits that has expired be extended.

IMPRISONMENT OF SONIA GARRO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out for Sonia Garro, a member of the pro-democracy group, Las Damas de Blanco—the Ladies in White—who has languished in one of Castro's prisons for over 2 years.

Her case is one of many that demonstrates the dismal condition of human rights under the Castro tyranny in my native homeland of Cuba.

In 2012, Sonia and the Ladies in White sought an audience with the Pope, but, unfortunately, were imprisoned in the wave of repression leading up to the visit of His Holiness.

I, along with many of our congressional colleagues, have asked Amnesty International to designate Sonia as a prisoner of conscience. The Castros cannot tolerate dissent and use violence to silence calls for democracy by beating and imprisoning dissenting voices.

The Cuban people are courageous, Mr. Speaker, and they will continue to fight for liberty, for human rights; and we must help them in their struggle for freedom.

21ST CENTURY BUY AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, I will introduce the 21st Century Buy America Act with Senator CHRIS MURPHY, to modernize decades-old Buy American standards and help create new manufacturing jobs in the United States.

Congress should make sure that American taxpayer dollars are used to buy goods manufactured here at home, not overseas, whenever we can.

Our bill will strengthen existing Buy America standards and make a number of important changes to support our domestic manufacturing base. For example, it will make manufacturers of items in short supply here at home eligible for resources to help them compete against foreign manufacturers for U.S. government contracts.

In addition, this bill increases transparency requirements for agencies that provide waivers, and it increases the domestic content percentage requirement so that, to qualify as American-made, you have to prove that a majority of the materials are actually made right here in America.

Most importantly, this legislation will help grow our manufacturing sector and create new jobs by providing an increased demand for American-made products by the Federal Government.

It is time to bring manufacturing back to America and to support existing manufacturing, and the United States Government should lead by example.

VETERANS DESERVE BETTER FROM THE VA

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not only as a Member of Congress, but as a veteran and former prisoner of war, demanding answers on behalf of my fellow veterans.

Recently, reports surfaced that regional VA employees had secret lists to hide the lengthy wait times for patients, which may have resulted in the loss of lives of some of our veterans. This is unacceptable.

Our men and women in uniform serve their country admirably, risking their lives to keep us safe and protect our

freedoms. They deserve the highest standards of medical care available.

Last week, I urged the VA inspector general to investigate alleged misconduct at three VA clinics in Texas. We need answers and accountability for any wrongdoing.

A fellow POW in Vietnam etched the following on a prison cell. He said:

> Freedom has a taste to those who fight and almost die that the protected will never know.

Veterans know that. That is why we owe them our deepest gratitude and the best possible care.

□ 1215

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION ANNIVERSARY: MENDEZ V. WESTMINSTER

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 60th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education and the incredible impact it had on our Nation.

The ruling of Brown v. Board of Education ended segregation in schools across the United States, and it declared the doctrine ''separate but equal'' unconstitutional. It is truly something to be proud of, as Americans.

But as we celebrate, let us not forget the precedent case to that; and that was about a young Mexican American student who, along with her family and others in their community, truly set the stage in the fight to end segregation in all of our schools. This happened in my county, in my district, in my home. The case was Mendez v. Westminster.

In 1945, when Sylvia Mendez was not allowed to go to an all-white school in Orange County, California, her parents, Gonzalo and Felicitas Mendez, fought for integration. And guess what. They won. Segregation in Orange County ended, and the rest of our State followed, and 7 years later the entire country followed.

So as we commemorate the grand case of Brown v. Board of Education, let us also remember Mendez v. Westminster, two historic achievements that opened the doors for a better education for all our children throughout this great Nation.

HOLDING VA EXECUTIVES ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, like many Montanans, I am outraged by reports that a number of VA clinics have failed to give our veterans the care and honor they deserve. These clinics deliberately covered up delays that may have led to the preventable deaths of at least 40 veterans, yet the VA executives at these troubled facilities are more likely to be given a bonus than face any sort of accountability. This is disgraceful, and I stand with the millions of Americans who are demanding accountability from the VA.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act will ensure the VA is able to remove career appointees who are failing to do their jobs. And this is common sense. If you fail to do your job and fail the men and women you serve, you shouldn't be getting bonuses. You should be held accountable. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NETJETS INC.

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today, NetJets Inc., a worldwide leader in aviation, is celebrating its 50th anniversary at its headquarters in Columbus, Ohio, in my congressional district. NetJets has made notable contributions to our community in central Ohio by providing transportation services during medical emergencies and natural disasters.

Through the generous efforts of the aircraft owners, the hardworking employees, and intuitive management, NetJets has become the industry standard, by having flown more hours than all other fractional aircraft companies combined. This organization has thrived in meeting the complex transportation needs of American business through safe, reliable jet service, while creating jobs and contributing to central Ohio's economy.

The legacy that NetJets continues to build will enrich the lives of generations to come and shape a bright future in aviation. I commend NetJets on its 50th anniversary.

BOKO HARAM STRIKES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last month, over 200 Nigerian girls went to school and they never came home. They were stolen in the middle of the day by radical Islamic terrorists, the Boko Haram, and sold into sex slavery.

What is the Boko Haram? Mr. Speaker, this is a foreign terrorist organization, and it reigns terror over parts of Nigeria, primarily in the north. They get their funds by forcing people in areas they control to pay a tax to them, like a protection racket. They also get money from al Qaeda.

Boko Haram means ''western education is sinful.'' They kill, rape, and pillage in the name of radical religion. They are not only a threat to Nigeria, but the rest of us as well.

This al Qaeda-affiliated group is a bunch of thugs, bandits, and outlaws, but they are to be reckoned with. Remember the name ''Boko Haram.'' They are not going away. Boko Haram is determined to continue their terrorist lifestyle and steal little girls.

And that's just the way it is.

A TRIBUTE TO REVEREND FRANK McRAE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the city of Memphis lost one of its greatest sons and leaders, Reverend Frank McRae.

Reverend McRae was a Memphian who took urban ministry to a new position in the city of Memphis. Before Dr. King was assassinated April 4, 1968, he marched with the sanitation workers and Dr. King. After Dr. King was assassinated, he led a group of ministers to city hall to urge the mayor to settle the strife.

He knew that the church needed to do good deeds and help people in a changing South and a changing America, and he helped found Friends for Life that dealt with people with HIV and AIDS. He helped found the Memphis Interfaith Association that provided food and clothing to people in need. And he turned his church into a place where they had soup kitchens and pantries, rather than a church of the most blessed and most privileged. He was a great man who made Memphis the ''city of good abode,'' as it is well known.

He will be greatly missed. He leaves his wife, two children, and three stepchildren. I am fortunate to have known Frank McRae, and Memphis is fortunate he came our way.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague from Texas (Mr. POE) and also as a proud cosponsor of the Justice for Victims Trafficking Act, which this House has passed. I join the ever-growing number of Americans who are standing up to the abhorrent practice of human trafficking.

Worldwide awareness concerning the trade in persons has increased significantly in recent years, but awareness is not enough. With an estimated 27 million persons in slavery around the world and hundreds of thousands within our own Nation, now is the time for action.

By doing so, we join those who have already taken action against modern-day slavery, folks like my constituent Vicki Moore. Ten years ago, Vicki was alarmed to read about the commercial

sex trade in India. But she wasn't just alarmed; she decided to do something about it. She founded a nonprofit called Rahab's Rope. Her organization gives hope and opportunity to women and girls who are at risk or have been forced into the commercial sex trade in India.

Women helped by Rahab's Rope in India have the opportunity to produce items that are then sold at the organization's store in Gainesville. Proceeds from those sales go to help even more women and girls in India. The Rahab's Rope store also serves an important function of raising awareness of the sex trade in India and worldwide.

In addition to its work overseas, Rahab's Rope works with local organizations in Georgia to help women break out of the cycle of poverty through education, skills and training, job coaching, and more.

As a longtime supporter of Rahab's Rope, I commend Vicki and others who have been on the front lines of the battle, and I hope that everyone in this body will continue to not only raise awareness of sex trafficking, but will do something about it.

JUSTICE FOR OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I stand here disappointed and heartbroken today as an American and as a soldier because Congress has missed an opportunity to stand up and fight for our troops, especially those who have been victims and survivors of violent sexual crimes that have occurred within our ranks.

These are the less than 1 percent of people in our country who have voluntarily put their lives on the line for us, yet what are we doing for them? It is our responsibility to hear the voices coming from within the ranks of our uniformed services and to let them know that we have their back.

The House this week had a chance to finally take action on a bipartisan effort to remove the chain of command from the decisionmaking process to prosecute a violent sexual crime that occurs within our ranks, but this legislation was blocked from even getting an up-or-down vote on the House floor.

This fight for justice is far from over because we will keep pushing for meaningful change that best serves our men and women in uniform, ensuring them justice and honoring their selfless service to our country.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the human trafficking legislation that was passed by the House yesterday. These five bills will ensure justice for millions of victims and further the fight to end this vicious crime.

In the United States alone, human trafficking rakes in $9.8 billion for the use and abuse of victims, many of whom are children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that each year 100,000 children are falling victim to this vile industry within our own borders.

Human trafficking isn't something that is occurring in other countries or other continents; it is happening here in America. I will be holding a summit later this week in West Virginia, in my district to bring together stakeholders to discuss how we can protect our most vulnerable.

These bills are a call to action: to prosecute offenders, to protect victims, to prevent future cases, and to educate. By passing these important bills, the House stood up for those whose voices have been silenced and have said, ''No more.'' I urge the Senate to join us in passing these important bills.

THE ENLIST ACT

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the House Republican leadership for blocking the ENLIST Act.

The ENLIST Act is the type of legislation that should receive support from both parties, as it allows undocumented immigrants who enter the United States before they turned the age of 15 to join the military. After their service, they would become legal permanent residents and would be eligible to apply for citizenship. This legislation was introduced by a Republican Member and has 24 Republican cosponsors, including House Majority Whip MCCARTHY.

There are thousands of young people willing to serve and potentially die for our country, and the House Republican leadership has no desire to help them become citizens. This shows the depths of the dysfunction of the Republican Caucus. It must stop, and we must allow a path to citizenship to those who want to serve our country.

RECOGNIZING ABATE AND MOTORCYCLE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Motorcycle Awareness Month and Kane County's support of motorcycle safety initiatives and education. I also want to thank my great friends at ABATE, A Brotherhood Aimed Towards Education, for their efforts to promote motorcycle safety and education for the last 27 years. Their enthusiasm and dedication to the well-being of the citizens of Illinois deserves the attention and praise of Kane County, the 14th Congressional District, and surrounding areas.

Keeping my constituents and streets safe is one of my highest priorities. With more than 350,000 licensed motorcyclists in Illinois, practicing proper road safety will significantly reduce the risk of an accident. ABATE recognizes this need and has played an essential role in providing motorcycle awareness programs to more than 100,000 participants in Illinois over the last 5 years.

Let's keep up the good work and continue our joint efforts to make our roads safer and more efficient.

PORT OF PALM BEACH

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, an expansion of the Port of Palm Beach was included in the bipartisan Water Resources Reform and Development Act, due to it receiving a timely chief's report. This port shares the Lake Worth Inlet with a popular recreational area known as Peanut Island as well as the internationally renowned town of Palm Beach.

Due to this proximity and feared damage to the environment, marine life, and dramatic change in the character of the waterway, the expansion is mired in controversy and a threatened lawsuit.

So I want to make it unequivocal that my positive vote for WRRDA is because it moved many, many important infrastructure projects forward for Florida and should not be construed as advocating for the Port of Palm Beach expansion. And I will not support Federal funding unless and until there is a clear community consensus of approval.

A HEARTFELT THANK YOU

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I had an opportunity to tour the newly opened 9/11 Memorial Museum. It stands as a moving tribute to all those who lost their lives at the World Trade Center, in Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon.

The experience is a powerful one. The sights and sounds bring back memories, and tears, as well. But not just tears for the terrible losses, but also tears of pride for the numberless acts of courage, tears of gratitude for the acts of human compassion, and tears of pride for the way this country stood—this body stood—united and determined to rebuild.

We in this body do not say thank you to each other as often as we should. So

I rise to say thank you to all of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and across this country for all you did to support my incredible city during its darkest hour.

Thanks to each and every one of you most humbly from the bottom of my heart. Thank you.

A CALL FOR A VOTE REGARDING ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night in the Rules Committee, we witnessed the very definition of political cowardice. For the second time in 3 years, the Republican leadership of this House refused to make a thoughtful, germane, and bipartisan amendment on Afghanistan in order to the defense authorization bill.

The rule we will debate later today makes in order 162 amendments—162. There were amendments on everything from deferred retirement for military chaplains to charging admission to air shows and to ensuring public access to Rattlesnake Mountain.

But we can't have a debate and a vote on holding the administration accountable for ending the war in Afghanistan?

Because we are at war, Mr. Speaker. I know that we don't like to talk about it around here, and I know that some of my colleagues would rather bury their heads in the sand and hope it goes away, but our troops and their families deserve a debate, and Congress has the responsibility to give it to them.

But no. But no. I don't know what the Republican leadership is afraid of, but this is outrageous, and I am not going to stand for it.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 7, nays 381, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—7

Honda
Jones
Lee (CA)
Moore
Pingree (ME)
Velázquez
Waters

NAYS—381

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—43

Bass
Bridenstine
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Cooper
Denham
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Grimm
Higgins
Holt
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt
Johnson (GA)
Kingston
Labrador
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lewis
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
McIntyre
Meng
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Olson
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Perry
Ruppersberger
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Thompson (PA)
Wagner
Young (AK)

□ 1256

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, NUNES, Ms. LOFGREN, Messrs. CROWLEY, McNERNEY, RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. NADLER, CONYERS, ELLISON, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today and missed roll No. 223. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 223. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4031) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of the Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4031

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR PERFORMANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 713. Senior Executive Service: removal based on performance

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may remove any individual from the Senior Executive Service if the Secretary determines the performance of the individual warrants such removal. If the Secretary so removes such an individual, the Secretary may—

''(1) remove the individual from Federal service; or

''(2) transfer the individual to a General Schedule position at any grade of the General Schedule the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after removing an individual from the Senior Executive Service under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives notice in writing of such removal and the reason for such removal.

''(c) MANNER OF REMOVAL.—A removal under this section shall be done in the same manner as the removal of a professional staff member employed by a Member of Congress.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''713. Senior Executive Service: removal based on performance.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4031.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has uncovered, and continues to uncover, numerous instances of gross negligence and incompetence by senior VA officials that have led to delays in care, growing patient wait times, and lengthy backlogs of disability claims. Regrettably, some of these instances have resulted in lack of proper care for veterans and for preventable deaths.

Despite repeated promises of accountability and change, the committee has received nothing but disturbing silence from the White House and only one excuse after another from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the heartbreaking news or spoken personally to family after family coming forward, sharing their stories of how the VA has failed to fulfill their promise to our veterans. The time is past due for us, as the House of Representatives, to take action.

The troubling stories that have come out of Phoenix, Arizona, where whistleblowers allege that as many as 40 veterans died while waiting for care and alleged secret waiting lists are unconscionable if in fact proven true. We would not be doing our sworn duty if we sat idly by and allowed these preventable deaths of those who made sacrifices for this great country to become the status quo at the VA.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these incidents do not seem to be isolated. They are under the watch of not just one senior VA manager. Similar stories of mismanagement and negligence have arisen in Fort Collins, Colorado; San Antonio, Texas; Augusta, Georgia; Atlanta, Georgia; Memphis, Tennessee; Columbia, South Carolina; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Chicago, Illinois, with news stories being covered almost every single day.

Mr. Speaker, these stories were crystallized for me and other Members at a recent hearing that we had on patient wait times on April 9. Mr. Barry Coates, a veteran from Columbia, South Carolina, informed the committee that he waited almost a year to receive a colonoscopy at VA. When he finally received his appointment, it was revealed that he had stage IV colon cancer.

Mr. Coates testified: ''The gross negligence and crippling backlog epidemic of the VA health care system has not only handed me a death sentence, but ruined my quality of life.''

Mr. Speaker, the need for accountability to help veterans like Mr. Coates is the reason why H.R. 4031 is so critically important. The VA Management Accountability Act of 2014 would give the Secretary the authority to fire or to demote VA Senior Executive Service or equivalent employees based on performance at any time. The current system is so calcified in bureaucratic red tape that it is easier for someone to get a bonus than it is to be given some type of discipline at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Is this what our citizens want? Is this what our veterans deserve? I don't think so, and neither do the 150 bipartisan cosponsors of this piece of legislation or the leading VSOs that support it.

Now, the actions of these few senior executives do not tarnish the hard work of 300,000 frontline VA employees who come to work every day and by and large provide excellent care and services to our veterans. Too many of these employees have in fact been continually let down by poor-performing senior executives. It is time to restore their trust and America's trust in the leadership at VA.

Look, General Shinseki is a good man. He wants to hold others accountable, but he is being held back by a failed civil service that makes it nearly impossible to remove SES employees. If this bill becomes law, he and his successors will have no excuse. He will have every tool to hold managers accountable and restore faith in the VA.

I am truly grateful to the 150 sponsors from both sides of the aisle of this vital piece of legislation.

I also want to thank the following VSOs, veterans service organizations, who have tirelessly advocated on behalf of this bill, including the American Legion, Concerned Veterans for America, IAVA, AMVETS, the Reserve Officers, Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Military Officers Association of America.

Finally, I thank Leader CANTOR and Speaker BOEHNER for their help in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that VA's status quo is upended, which is why I believe this bill, the House's earlier action this year to suspend VA bonuses for 5 years, and my call on President Obama to establish a bipartisan VA medical care access commission is crucial to getting a resolution to this problem.

I believe the question presented before each Member here today is very clear: Do you stand with our veterans or do you stand with a bureaucratic-entrenched failing system?

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4031 and maintain our promises to our veterans and their families.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's veterans and in support of action that will fundamentally address the systematic failures that are clearly occurring across the Department of Veterans Affairs. I reluctantly support this legislation because I believe we owe it to the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much for our Nation to do everything in our power to ensure the VA is accountable for its performance.

I share with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), my good friend and colleague, fundamental goals of addressing shortcomings in VA leadership. I am proud of our bipartisan working relationship. Not only does our working together usually allow us to get more done, but I believe it makes our efforts better.

I am disappointed, however, that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was not given the opportunity to consider this bill. I believe that members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, could have improved this bill before it was brought to the floor. I believe this bill would be stronger and more reflective of the substantive reforms necessary in the Department if it had been allowed to go through the committee markup process.

H.R. 4031 has been put forth as an accountability bill, but it falls short of providing substantive beneficial changes in the VA's executive performance management system.

The Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs already has the authority to fire any employee, including executives who are not doing their job. This bill will simply turn approximately 400 senior executive civil service positions across the VA into essentially at-will positions, of which 165 are in the Veterans Health Administration.

More importantly, H.R. 4031 does not adequately address the performance metrics of VA executives. It doesn't provide any framework for ensuring problems and failures don't occur in the first place.

I introduced H.R. 4399, which the American Legion also supports, which establishes upfront organizational goals and expected outcomes for veterans that every single VA senior leader must deliver. It would require these goals and their outcomes to be the driving factor in performance assessment for these executives and the basis for any awards or bonuses.

This bill before us today does not address the senior physicians and dentists, known as title 38 employees, who receive executive-level pay and have organizational-level responsibility for veteran care and services. This is important because one of the executives implicated in manipulating the wait times in Phoenix was a title 38 employee, which this bill does not cover that we are voting on today. So the very individual responsible for the catastrophic failures that we have seen across the VA recently may not even be impacted by the current legislation that we are dealing with.

My bill, H.R. 4399, does address title 38 physicians and dentists, which covers approximately 80,000 employees within the VA, title 38 employees, mandating standardized, rigorous performance management tools that hold employees accountable and justifies any performance pay.

Finally, my bill would prohibit one of the most egregious examples of the failure of the current system as it applies to title 38 employees. A doctor was provided partial performance pay even though he had failed to maintain a current license. That is correct. He received partial performance pay even though he failed to maintain a current license, because maintaining a valid license was not one of his performance objectives. This bill that we are dealing with today does not address that issue.

Good policy, good legislation comes from conversation, collaboration, and compromise. I am supporting moving this bill forward today because I believe we need to begin this discussion as how to best ensure VA employees are held accountable when they fail to perform.

Let me be clear. We can and we must do more to ensure that our veterans get the quality services that they deserve and have earned. I am hopeful that we can have the necessary dialogue in conference to ensure that any bill that we send to the President is a more comprehensive reform measure that is well-considered and actually has the desired and needed impact of changing the VA and ensuring the best outcomes for our Nation's veterans.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. The best way to reform the VA is to get rid of the deadwood, and that is what this bill actually gives the Secretary the opportunity to do, and that is to fire the people that aren't doing their job, especially—especially—those that are at the senior level.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents and veterans who are alarmed at recent reports of preventable deaths, manipulated records, and secret waiting lists within the VA health care system. These allegations span the country and have recently arisen in Colorado at the Fort Collins VA clinic. If these allegations are found to be true, the responsible individuals must be held accountable. It is unacceptable for individuals who have presided over negligence and mismanagement to go unscathed.

Astonishingly, past instances of similar failures have not only seen responsible individuals remain employed by the VA, but they have even been rewarded for their leadership failures in the form of bonuses and positive performance reviews. This only promotes the continuation of poor management, negligence, and possible preventable deaths.

This bill would help ensure that these trends do not continue by giving the Secretary of the VA the authority to remove or transfer senior executives of the VA. I ask for support of this bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the issue here before us on this bill—and first let me say I am a proud cosponsor of this bill to replace and be able to fire people. The problem is the first person we need to fire is the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Shinseki himself. Now, we respect him; we respect his sacrifice for this country and everything else, but the buck stops at the top.

□ 1315

Here are the facts: 5,600 veterans are committing suicide every year. That is almost 20 every day under his watch—under his watch. In my own hospital in Atlanta, four of our soldiers committed suicide in the hospital, and the inspector general of the VA laid the blame directly at the foot of the VA administration for the lack of management of the death of these soldiers.

When Chairman MILLER and I went down and visited them, we asked: Is there one more, are there any more that have committed suicide? No, there have been no more. And they told a damn lie, because the very next day it was exposed there was another soldier that committed suicide and they covered it up.

This has been a pattern that has been going on ever since General Shinseki has been the chairman there. I respect a sacrifice, I respect what he did, but it is under his watch that we are in this situation in the hospital out in the western part of this country where The Washington Post has accurately reported that 40 of our soldiers lost their lives, died because they couldn't get service. Our veterans are the heart and soul of this country, they are precious, and we must not turn our back on them.

I listened to the President today, and I was very disappointed with President Obama today. There was no urgency. Mr. President, we need urgency. We need you to roll up our sleeves and get into these hospitals. We need you to set a pattern that if the VA hospitals can't handle it, let's give partnerships to some of the Republicans and the other public hospitals.

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

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. God bless you, because there are things I want to say.

Reports are out that the taxpayers are going to have to pay or have paid $1 billion for medical malpractice. A reputable news organization, Cox Media's WSB Television down in Atlanta, it went all over this country: $1 billion the taxpayer paying because the VA cut off the wrong arm, cut off the wrong leg, the wrong testicle, the wrong kidney.

Let me tell you all something, folks. Time—that is what I was just so disturbed about—we don't have time for any more investigations. The reports are in.

Jesus Christ himself said: There is no more greater sacrifice than to give your life for your friend. Our soldiers

have given their lives on the battlefield for them. We need to give our lives up here and give our veterans the respect that they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to refrain from using profanity in debate.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK, a former doctor within the Department of Veterans Affairs, somebody who serves his subcommittee as chairman of the Health Subcommittee very well.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in the real world, if you fail to do your job, you get fired. Not at the VA.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 4031, the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill because it simply allows the Secretary to fire senior VA executives when they fail to do their job.

I am sick and tired of hauling VA officials in front of the committee to hear tired excuses and explanations. President Obama has allowed the VA leadership to operate without accountability. Veterans are dying. The time for excuses has passed. The time for taking action to fix these problems is now.

This legislation is just the beginning. Severe mismanagement at the VA will not be tolerated by me or this Congress. We will overturn every rock and use every tool at our disposal in the pursuit of the truth of what is happening at the VA.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been on this committee for 21 years. I strongly support Secretary Shinseki and his leadership of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It is very important as we go into Memorial Day that we let the veterans know that we appreciate their service. We also need to let them know that we are going to do all we can to make sure they have the quality health care that they deserve.

The VA operates 1,700 sites of care and conducts 85 million appointments each year, which comes to 236,000 health care appointments each day.

The latest American Customer Satisfaction Index, an independent customer service survey, ranked VA customer satisfaction at 95 percent among VA patients, among the best in the Nation and equal to or better than any private sector hospital.

Since its peak in March of 2013, the VA has reduced the benefits claims backlog by 50 percent, on track to eliminate the backlog in 2015. VA also implemented an automatic electric claims processing system to better serve veterans into the future. In 2013, VA paid out $66 billion in compensation claims to 4.5 million eligible veterans. Under the leadership of the Secretary, we also expand access to earned benefits for veterans of all eras.

In addition, VA granted presumption of service connection for three Agent Orange-related conditions. Let me just say that for years the veterans in this category have been trying to get assistance from the VA and they were denied. This Secretary stepped up to the plate and let all of those veterans come in, millions of additional veterans.

Since 2009, VA has reduced the estimated number of homeless veterans. We have been trying to get them to do that since day one over 22 years ago, but this Secretary has reduced it by 24 percent. They have conducted over 6 million clinical visits with over 600,000 veterans who were homeless or at risk of homelessness, including the formerly homeless. In 2013 alone, VA served more than 240,000 veterans who were homeless.

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

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. In closing, the VA is like a big ship, one that I have been working on for 22 years—slow to turn. But under the leadership, the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership, we have funded the largest VA budget increase in the history of the United States. Like the first President said: We must make sure that the VA does what it can to serve those veterans and give them the service we demand. God bless America and continue to bless the veterans who have served America.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would add another statistic to those that my colleague from Florida just said. There have been 23—at least 23 preventable deaths within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), my friend, the chairman of the O&I Subcommittee.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4031 because I believe that systemic failures of the VA exist far beyond the issue of appointment wait times.

My subcommittee on VA Oversight and Investigations continues to uncover countless failures of leadership at the VA. This lack of leadership is the driving force behind the unacceptable delays and cost overruns in major VA construction projects, the tremendous backlog of veterans' disability claims, and the horrendous patient care practices that have resulted in preventable patient deaths.

The individuals with responsibility and authority in the VA are unable to lead and, as a result, our veterans have suffered.

It is time to usher in a new era of accountability at the VA, and I urge my colleagues to support the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand on this floor in the midst of Military Appreciation Month and be from a State that had the highest numbers of young men and women returning from Afghanistan and Iraq, comparing to States like California and certainly some others. We are grateful for all, in all States, who have gone and put on the uniform unselfishly and stood in the line of danger for us.

Let me thank the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this Congress. I have never seen a more bipartisan and dedicated group of men and women. If the committee was opened up to all of us, we would all stand up and serve.

Today, as a family in the United States Congress, we have a problem. We have a disease problem, whether it is a heart attack or stroke or cancer, or whether or not it is the terrible injuries of war, posttraumatic stress disorder, or those who have lost limbs, who have suffered traumatic brain injury. We have men and women who have worked, and our veterans have now come in their later years who suffer the illnesses of age.

All of us will take our fist and bang on this podium to be able to say that they are first and our priority. No one counters or accepts the death of those that may have died in Texas, died in Arizona, or places elsewhere.

If this is a measure to begin that healing, to give the Secretary the ability to be able to focus in on those beyond the surgeons that are in the operating rooms, the nurses that I visit with along the hallways when I go to the veterans hospital in my area, then we should go forward.

I stand with this legislation working toward making the system work. I want to make it work by curing the systemic and the problematic way that we have veterans wait on services. Let's cut it out, cut the red tape out. Embrace them this weekend, one of the most emotional days we serve with our veterans, and tell them we will not rest until we answer the concerns of families, until we pray over those who have lost their lives, until we cure this, not by one person or another. They may have to go, but let's fix the system that they will have no waiting time when they come with lung cancer or last stage, with their life to be extended if they just get in the door. I want all of them to be able to get in the door and to use those resources that we have expended, those large numbers that my colleague and friend from Florida, both from Florida, and from Maine, have spoken about, and we use those resources to break the barrier of confusion and red tape, and when they walk through those doors someone says: Come in, we are ready to serve.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from

Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a very capable member of the VA committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for his work to reform this mismanaged Department.

Our Nation's veterans and their families never hesitated to respond to the call to serve their country. Recent news reports of VA mismanagement across this country are disgusting and disgraceful. We know of dozens of wrongful deaths that were due to VA negligence, including 13 in my State of Indiana.

Senior executives who oversee this negligence are more likely to receive a bonus than to receive punishment. We cannot let this continue.

This bill would give the VA Secretary authority to fire senior employees responsible for failures within the Department.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill, and I will continue to do my part on the oversight and fighting for the Nation's 23 million veterans.

I also call on the Senate today to bring greater accountability and transparency to the VA by passing the numerous bipartisan bills that have left this House, including this one, that could be stalled in the Senate. Our veterans deserve nothing but the best.

□ 1330

Mr. MICHAUD. May I inquire from the Speaker how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY). He is the newest member on the VA Committee, somebody who just came to Congress, but who, as a staff member, had been an advocate for veterans prior to his arrival here.

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation, but also out of great concern for the shocking developments that we have learned of within the VA health care system. Perhaps more importantly today, after hearing the President's press conference, I rise out of concern over the complete failure of our President to address this issue.

The VA health care system is experiencing an historic crisis; yet, today, the President's solution seems to be business as usual bureaucracy. The President has done nothing to ensure that we, as a Nation, immediately address the systemic problems within the VA system or to address the threat to human life that has been created by incidents of bureaucratic incompetence.

Earlier today, the President spoke rhetorically about unacceptable wait times for veterans, but he did nothing to address the American people's wait time for this administration to solve this problem now. It has been 23 days, and there is no sense of urgency.

What we heard today was of more bureaucracy, more investigations, more studying of the issue, and ultimately, a continuation of business as usual until the President and his Secretary determine in due time when they will act.

He spoke of holding personnel accountable, but he never once spoke of terminating personnel. That is why I rise today to support this legislation.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and I urge my Members to vote against it. I don't know that they will, but I urge them to do so.

All of us in this body need to be for accountability. None of us in this body, however, ought to be for turning a civil service system into a patronage system. None of us ought to be for turning a civil service system—one of the best in the world, if not the best in the world—into a system which allows for no reason that needs to be articulated to turn senior executives into at-will employees.

I am disappointed that this bill has been brought to the floor with little notice and with no markup in committee. We talk about considered judgment. We talk about thoughtfulness. We talk about reading the bills. Then we bring them to the floor without hearings.

We must ensure that those who serve our veterans in the VA system do so with accountability and oversight. All of us are outraged at the allegations that have been made. Not one of us should step back and say we should not respond vigorously to the offenses that have allegedly taken place because, if the allegations are true, heads ought to roll, period; but that is not what this legislation is about.

This legislation is about a knee-jerk reaction to a bad situation, painted with a very broad brush, and undermining a system that can work, has worked, and has the mechanism to work.

I cannot support this bill as written, and I believe it opens the door to a slippery slope of undoing the careful civil service protections that have been in place for decades. This is about due process.

Now, due process is put under stress at critical times. Pursuing due process at times when there is no stress is not difficult. The test of a society is whether, at times of stress, it can follow due process and the law. This bill does not provide for that.

With regard to protections that have been put in place for decades to ensure that politically appointed managers cannot fire nonpolitical senior executives in Federal service without proper cause, neither party ought to be for that. The civil service reforms adopted decades ago were there for a purpose.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this premature and not-thought-out piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that Republicans brought this bill to the floor with little notice and no markup in committee.

We must ensure that those who serve our veterans in the VA system do so with accountability and oversight, especially in light of recent allegations of misconduct at certain VA offices.

However, I cannot support this bill as written, and I believe it opens the door to a slippery slope of undoing the careful civil service protections that have been in place for decades to ensure that politically appointed managers cannot fire non-political senior executives in federal service without proper cause.

Already, the Secretary has the power to remove employees who are not performing their jobs properly—and it is a power he employs whenever called for.

I will continue to stand up for our Nation's veterans and work to ensure they receive the benefits and care they have earned through their service.

I hope that the Congress and Administration can work together in a bipartisan way over the coming weeks to ensure the egregious behavior that has been reported is never repeated and that any VA officials proven to have acted inappropriately continue to be held accountable—without undermining the Civil Service System that has served us so well for so long.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have just been told that this is a knee-jerk reaction to a crisis. It is the only action to a crisis.

The President, for 3 weeks, has said nothing until today. He still said nothing today. The Secretary has not been involved. We have to take care of the veterans we have fighting for our freedoms every single day.

Nothing in this bill takes away the recruitment process through SES, and if the Secretary does fire somebody or demote somebody because of this law, he has to provide notice to Congress within 30 days. If you don't do your job, you get fired.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that, when I first got here, people said: KELLY, you expect the government to work as a business. I said: No, no, no, that is not true because there is no way any business can work as the government works.

This bill is a commonsense way of taking care of people who don't perform at a level that is expected. The taxpayers—the citizens of this country—should expect nothing less and to be constantly told that, gee, you can't touch these folks even if they perform so badly—and, instead of doing that, we give them a bonus—that doesn't make sense.

Accountability is absolutely needed at this time. We give people authority. We give people responsibility. When

they don't do their jobs, they need to be held accountable for it.

I represent not only the State of Pennsylvania, but over 1 million Pennsylvanians who are veterans. If we can't fix this now with a commonsense approach, then—my goodness—what are we doing on the floor of this great House?

This just makes sense. I thank the chairman for bringing it forward. It is long overdue, and it needs to be done now.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in supporting H.R. 4031, which brings sorely needed accountability to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The President said, today, that he would hold those accountable who are responsible for the wrongdoing at the VA, but we have heard that tune before. As a candidate, the President denounced delays and poor care at VA facilities.

He pledged to build a 21st century VA and to confront what he called the broken bureaucracy of the VA. We can hope to hear more than platitudes here in the near future, but I am a little skeptical.

The President has done very little to hold this VA staff accountable, and now, we have seen the deadly consequences of the broken VA system in Arizona. Like other administration staff who have violated the law, those responsible for these acts are simply on paid leave.

Unfortunately, the VA's problems are not unique to Arizona. With VA employees actually coming forward in helping us to expose these problems, we have learned of similar efforts to conceal huge problems at the Oakland VA regional office, including cooked books, hidden files, and a refusal to meet veterans' needs.

Some bureaucrats seem more interested in receiving bonuses than in serving our veterans. It is time for that to end. Mr. Speaker, we need to do this now. Pass H.R. 4031.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the 12th District of Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who has been very involved in issues as they relate to Pittsburgh.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, in having stepped forward to defend our country with their very lives, our veterans deserve a health care system and a claims process that are both of high quality and that are accountable. Unfortunately, the VA has failed veterans in Pittsburgh, Phoenix, and across the Nation.

William Nicklas, a World War II veteran from western Pennsylvania, survived Guam, Saipan, and Okinawa, but fell victim to Legionnaires' disease at the Pittsburgh VA. It has been 1½ years since Mr. Nicklas died, and the Nicklas family is still waiting for answers and accountability, so are the families of John Ciarolla, Clark Compston, John McChesney, Lloyd Wanstreet, and Frank ''Sonny'' Calcagno.

Unfortunately, the world now knows that these are not isolated incidents. Significant changes in accountability must be made at the VA to solve these problems. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act. This bill is an important step in that direction.

Thank you to Chairman MILLER for conducting the oversight necessary to bring these issues into the light.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, is the gentleman from Florida ready to close?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker I have been told is on his way, but he is not here at this point, so we are prepared to close.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank the chairman, but I will reiterate that the Secretary currently does have the authority to fire any Senior Executive Servicemember if he is not performing his job. This bill does not address the problem systemically within the VA. We are dealing with the Veterans Health Administration. This bill only covers 165 SES's who work in the Veterans Health Administration, but there are 400 throughout the VA.

The legislation that I would much prefer voting on today deals with not only the SES's, but also with the title 38 employees.

The reason it is important to deal with the title 38 employees—and it is important to note—is that one of the executives implicated in manipulating the wait times in Phoenix is a title 38 employee. This bill does not address that employee.

The bill also does not address some of the most egregious examples of failure in the system within the Department. As I mentioned earlier, a doctor was provided partial performance pay, even though he had let his license expire, because that was not part of the performance objective.

I will be supporting this legislation, so we can move it through the process and so we can go to conference to actually address some of these issues. I hope that we will be able to address these issues. They are very serious issues, and they are issues that are important to our veterans.

It is important for us on the committee that we deal with this, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will work together like we have in the past, but I am disappointed that this bill is before us, as we were not able to improve upon the bill.

I would also hope that the President would look very seriously at the performance evaluations within the Department of Veterans Affairs and that he would immediately issue an executive order, similar to the legislation that I have submitted, which will address a lot of the systemic problems within the Department of Veterans Affairs. This is unacceptable, and we must move forward to deal with this issue.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a request of the gentleman from Maine.

My speaker has now shown up. May I yield him 1 minute?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Gainesville, Florida, Dr. Yoho, who has a facility that, in fact, is in question at this point and from which several people have been put on administrative leave.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4031, the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014.

For far too long, problems of patient neglect have persisted at the VA. These problems will continue to persist until the employees there can be held accountable for their poor performances. In recent weeks, the full extent of staff incompetence has begun to be made clear.

Serious allegations have arisen that lengthy wait times and secret waiting lists at the three Phoenix VA medical centers have led to the deaths of 40 or more of our Nation's veterans. This is unacceptable. There are stories of secret waiting lists and of employee negligence at the VA that are popping up all over the news.

As these reports are investigated, it is necessary that we give the Secretary of the VA the power to not only reprimand, but to remove the negligent employees. If we do not, then the problem will persist.

□ 1345

For these reasons and more, I have cosponsored Chairman MILLER's bill, which will authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove or demote any senior executive employee whose performance has been found lacking.

Mr. Speaker, caring for our veterans is of paramount importance. I urge my colleagues to stand up for our veterans and vote to pass the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. First, I want to say thank you very much to the gentleman from Maine, who in fact has

been very bipartisan in the way that we have approached this. Our committee has in fact worked in a very bipartisan way in trying to get to the bottom of the issue that lays out there.

I would like to say that it has been said on the floor that there were no hearings on this bill. In fact, it has been heard in subcommittee. It has also been said that the Secretary has the tools that he needs in order to hold people accountable.

Folks, here is where we are.

Back in January, I went to Augusta, Georgia, and Columbia, South Carolina, at the request of Congressman JOE WILSON and Congressman JOHN BARROW. We know—and VA has said—that there were deaths that occurred. There were some 5,000 veterans that were on waiting lists for colonoscopies. I talked about one of those veterans who testified before our committee today.

Shortly after that, I wrote a letter to the Secretary and I asked him to please provide me the names of the people, what their positions were, and what type of accountability, what disciplinary actions have you taken.

We are now in the closing weeks of the month of May, and I have heard absolutely nothing out of the Department of Veterans Affairs. He may have the tools, but he won't use the tools that he has at his disposal to get rid of or to discipline the very people who are at the crux of the problem that we are talking about all across this Nation today.

Let me tell you something else.

The very director of the Phoenix hospital that is now on administrative leave, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs today, got an $8,500 bonus in April of this year, even though they knew that there was an open Office of Inspector General investigation ongoing at the time. He got a bonus while there was an ongoing investigation.

In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the director of the health care system up there knew that there was Legionella inside the water system that led to the death of at least six veterans—they knew it for a year—that person got a $63,000 Presidential bonus.

It is easier to get rewarded at VA than it is to be disciplined.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4031, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4031.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' McKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 590 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 590

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

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

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

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

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3361) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 27, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 590.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same act. House Resolution 590 waives all points of order against further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules.

Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426, that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night, a bipartisan group, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina; Congressman ADAM SMITH, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee from Washington State; Congressman GARAMENDI; and Congresswoman LEE from California; and I, offered an amendment to be able to have a debate on a vote on our policy in Afghanistan—the longest war in American history.

It seemed odd to me that a bill like the Department of Defense authorization bill would come to the floor without the ability for Members to have a vote on Afghanistan. We are at war, and you would never know it by the actions of this House.

I am ashamed of this House that a bill like this would come to the floor and the leadership would block any attempt to be able to have a debate and a vote on what our policy should be in Afghanistan.

The rule that we are going to debate later today makes in order 162 amendments. There are amendments on everything from deferred retirement for military chaplains to charging admission to air shows to public access to Rattlesnake Mountain. I am sure public access to Rattlesnake Mountain is a big deal, but it is not as big a deal as the war in Afghanistan, where we have brave men and women in harm's way because we put them there.

The question is whether or not our policies should remain the same or whether it should change.

The President of the United States has said that he wants to draw down American forces in 2014. I hope he does. But there are also reports that we may be there for a considerably longer period of time.

I don't know what the policy is going to be, but let me read to you what this amendment that the Republican leadership blocked says. This is basically what we are asking here. It says:

> In the event that the United States Armed Forces remained deployed in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, then no later than March 31, 2015, the President shall send to Congress a determination describing the purpose and expected duration of such deployment and the projected number of troops to be deployed.

Who could possibly object to that? Basically, it is having the White House inform us of what the policy is. Where is the problem?

The second part of it goes as follows:

> No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President's determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to improve the content of the President's determination.
>
> Should Congress vote against the President's determination, the President is directed to remove all troops not required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel in a safe, orderly, expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.

Does anybody really object to that? Does anybody object to doing what we are supposed to do—to have a say on issues like war? It astounds me that Members of Congress would want to hide behind the Rules Committee blocking bringing this to the floor as though it is a way to avoid a serious debate and a vote on this policy.

By the way, the sponsors of this amendment have different opinions on Afghanistan. Some of us believe we should get out of there right now. That is where I am. Some of those who cosponsored this amendment believe that we should be there and have at least a small force in Afghanistan beyond 2014.

So this is not about right now saying we want to get out of Afghanistan. What this is saying is that if the President decides to change his promise of keeping us there no later than December 2014, then we ought to have a vote. We ought to be informed of what is going on and we ought to have a vote. Who could object to that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I could not agree more. How in the world can the Congress of the United States, which has an obligation to declare war, continue to abdicate its right to debate our young men and women going to Afghanistan to die?

We have already spent over $1.5 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan. Iraq was an unnecessary war.

□ 1400

The previous administration intentionally manufactured the justification. It was absolutely unnecessary. And all we are asking—and that is why I will vote against the rule. There is much in this bill that I will vote for.

But as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, this is a bipartisan amendment.

I have signed over 11,000 letters to families and extended families who lost loved ones in Iraq and Afghanistan. This past weekend I signed four letters. I am not trying to single myself out, but I feel the pain of my mistake of giving the authority to the previous President to bypass Congress to send our young men and women to die in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN is right. If President Obama believes it is necessary in the next couple of years to increase the numbers, then let him come to Congress so that we can meet our constitutional responsibility and vote either ''yes'' or ''no,'' and then, with pride, know that we did what the Constitution required.

Next Wednesday, I will go to Walter Reed at Bethesda to see three marines who were severely injured in Afghanistan in the last month. I don't know how severely they are. It might be legs are gone. It might be brain injuries.

Yet, we, in Congress, continue to abdicate our constitutional responsibility to these young men and young women. I will tell you that the marines down at Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point, which is in my district, are sick and tired of this involvement in Afghanistan.

One last point. The former Commandant of the Marine Corps has been my adviser for the last 5 years on Afghanistan, and he has said: Why doesn't Congress understand history? You will never change Afghanistan. No matter how much blood or money you send to Afghanistan, you will never change it.

I am disappointed in the Rules Committee. So many, and every one of them, Republican and Democrat, I have the greatest respect for. But not to allow us to debate whether a young man or young woman from America should die or lose their legs, their arms, or their mind is a disappointment and a failure of this House of Representatives not to follow the Constitution.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

The question before the House is, Should the House now consider H. Res. 590?

While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any point of order.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that, while the two underlying bills contained in the rule would impose intergovernmental and private sector mandates as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, the mandates would fall well below the threshold in that act.

That said, I know my friend is using this point of order to debate a very important issue that he cares passionately about. I am glad he has had the opportunity to bring it forward because we tend to agree on a lot of what he has said, and he knows that. We have talked on numerous occasions.

But in order to allow this House to continue its scheduled business of the day, I urge our Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¾ minutes remaining.

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

I want my colleagues to understand one thing. The amendment that we are talking about is germane. I spent a great deal of time working with the Parliamentarian to make sure that the concerns that the Republican majority had about the germaneness of this amendment were addressed. It is a germane amendment. There is absolutely no reason at all for this not to be on the floor.

Let me just say that it doesn't take any courage to praise the troops and then hide from the vote. It is an act of cowardice, quite frankly. The fact that we are debating a Defense Department authorization bill, we are at war, and we are not allowed to be able to consider an amendment about what our policy should be in Afghanistan, well, what do you tell the troops? What do you tell their families? This war is on auto-pilot and we will just let it go?

I mean, we have a responsibility. This Chamber voted to send young men and women into harm's way. We have a

responsibility and we are not living up to it. There is no reason in the world why this amendment should not be made in order. It is germane. It complies with all the rules.

The only reason why it isn't made in order is because someone in the Republican leadership said, no, we are not going to have a debate; we are not going to have a vote. Maybe they are afraid they are going to lose. I heard last night that they don't want to embarrass the President.

Really?

I mean, select committees on Benghazi, 53 votes to overturn the Affordable Care Act. They don't want to embarrass the President? Well, with friends like you, the President doesn't need any enemies.

The bottom line is this an important issue, and how dare we come to the floor on the defense bill and be silent and indifferent when it comes to Afghanistan.

I am ashamed of this process. There is no reason in the world why we shouldn't be debating this issue. We owe it to those young men and women who are over there, those who have sacrificed their lives, those who are at Walter Reed Hospital.

How dare we bring a bill like this to the floor without addressing this most important issue. We are at war, and no one in this place seems to want to talk about it.

Well, it is our responsibility just as much as it is the President's responsibility. To do nothing means we are complicit in continuing this war. I have had enough, and I think Members of this Chamber who agree with us ought to stand with us and vote against this rule.

This process stinks. We played by the rules, we did everything right, and we got nothing—nothing on this issue.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, like I said before, I don't disagree with a lot of what my friend from Massachusetts said. As we voted last time, we are not going to have the opportunity to do that this time.

But I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of the rule, House Resolution 590.

Clause 9(c) of rule XXI of the rules of the House specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the earmark disclosure rule prescribed by paragraphs (a) or (b) of clause 9 of rule XXI. House Resolution 590 waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 3361.

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to clause 9(c) of rule XXI that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(c) of rule XXI.

Under clause 9(c) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Following that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: ''Will the House now consider the resolution?''

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

What I found interesting about the exchange that we have just had is that nobody can explain to me why we cannot have a vote on the bipartisan amendment that Mr. JONES and Mr. SMITH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE and myself have brought before the House. Nobody can give us a reason why, other than it is not in order because they have the power to not make it in order.

I want my colleagues to understand a few facts. 2,320 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan since 2001.

19,718 U.S. troops have been wounded in Afghanistan since 2001.

127 soldiers were killed in 2013.

1,687 have been killed since the surge of 2009.

An estimated 30,000 Afghan civilians have been killed since 2001.

The VA estimates that approximately 22 veterans will die by suicide every day. At least 30 percent of veterans have contemplated suicide.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a say in the future of America's longest war. We all know that there is no military solution in Afghanistan. The American public is sick and tired of war. American interests are not advanced by another decade of war.

And yet, what does this House of Representatives do when we consider the Department of Defense authorization bill? We do nothing. We do nothing. The only thing that happens is we bring germane amendments to the Rules Committee to be able to debate this issue so the Members will have a say when the President outlines his policy for Afghanistan beyond 2014.

But it seems that the leadership of this House is perfectly satisfied just sitting back and just being okay with whatever happens.

All we are asking for is that if we are going to stay beyond 2014, the President has to tell us what his plan is. That is not radical. That is not out there. He needs to tell us what his plan is, and we need to vote on it. That is our job. And if you don't want to take responsibility for issues like this, maybe you ought to think about retiring because it is an insult to the men and women who are serving our country for us to be silent and indifferent, to not do the proper oversight, to not debate these issues.

It is an insult to the American taxpayer that we are letting the most corrupt government in the world—that is how the Karzai government has been rated, the most corrupt government in the world—continue to steal our money.

We cut food stamps for poor people. We don't have enough money to take care of our veterans in the VA facilities. We are cutting back on moneys for roads and bridges. We can't extend Unemployment Compensation for people who have lost their jobs, and yet we just hand over millions and millions and millions of dollars.

Let me just tell you this, Mr. Speaker. Right now, we authorized in FY13 spending $87.2 billion for Afghanistan. We authorized in FY14 spending $85.2 billion. Proposed FY15 spending, $79.4 billion. Total since 2001, $778 billion. And when you add in the cost of the veterans care that will be needed and all the other associated costs, the total cost of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq are about $4- to $6 trillion. And we are not even paying for most of it. We are borrowing it. It is going on our credit card.

My friends wail about the deficit and the debt, but when it comes to just dumping money into this money pit called Afghanistan, they say nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

You know, it is kind of amazing that many of us on my side are considered conservatives. I hope that I am considered a conservative.

Pat Buchanan has written so many articles about the new war party. The new war party is the Republican Party. It is the Republican Party because of the reason that Mr. MCGOVERN is talking about today.

We sit here and we allow all these other spending issues involving our military, and much of it they deserve: pay increases, taking care of their families, doing the good things for our military.

But when it comes to sending our young men and women to give their life and limbs, we don't debate it. We just don't debate it.

I don't know if the military industrial complex that Eisenhower warned the Congress about—do they control Congress? I don't know. I haven't checked the campaign finance donations from the military industrial complexes.

But something has changed my party from understanding our constitutional responsibilities. Nothing is more important—nothing in the House of Representatives is more important than sending a young man or woman to die for this country. If this amendment allows us to have a debate on whether

that young man or young woman should give their life, then we owe it to the families of America.

□ 1415

This amendment that Mr. MCGOVERN and myself and Ms. LEE and Mr. SMITH and Mr. GARAMENDI offered is very simple. It just says that after 2014, if the President decides that he needs to increase the number of troops in Afghanistan, then we will vote on it.

Do you know how pathetic this is that we are asking for this?

A few years ago, President Obama proposed to the Afghan Government—President Karzai, who is a crook—that we will have an agreement, that we will stay there 10 more years, and that we will send them $2 billion or $3 billion a month just to take care of their needs in Afghanistan. This, when we are cutting food programs for children, senior citizens, and we can't even fix the potholes and can't fix the bridges in America.

And then you will not allow us to have a debate on our responsibility, based on the Constitution, that a young man or a young woman who would die for this country or lose a leg, an arm, or their mind, that we can't have a debate? What a pathetic time for the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 590?

While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order. All of the relevant committees have included earmark statements in their reports filed with the House, so there is no violation of the House earmark rule.

That said, I know my friend is using this point of order to debate an important issue—and I have said this earlier—that he passionately cares about. So I am glad that he has had that opportunity.

But in order to allow this House to continue with the scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, when Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of the House, he made a pledge that he would allow the House to work its will on major issues.

This is a major issue. This is a major issue. If my friends want to know why the majority of the American people think that this place is dysfunctional, this is the reason: we can't get a vote on an issue as important as the war in Afghanistan.

Now, there is really no excuse. It is germane. We spent a lot of time working with the Parliamentarian to make sure it is germane to satisfy the concerns of the majority. We did that. It is bipartisan. It is bipartisan. And of people who are cosponsors of the amendment, some want to end the war now and some believe that we need to keep troops there for a period beyond 2014. I mean, we have jumped through every hoop. What else can we possibly do?

And for some reason, somebody in the leadership here said, no, the House of Representatives will not be able to work its will when it comes to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article entitled ''CNN Poll: Afghanistan war arguably most unpopular in U.S. history.''

[From CNN Political Ticker]

CNN POLL: AFGHANISTAN WAR ARGUABLY MOST UNPOPULAR IN U.S. HISTORY

(Posted by CNN Political Unit)

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Support for the war in Afghanistan has dipped below 20%, according to a new national poll, making the country's longest military conflict arguably its most unpopular one as well. The CNN/ORC International survey released Monday also indicates that a majority of Americans would like to see U.S. troops pull out of Afghanistan before the December 2014 deadline.

Just 17% of those questioned say they support the 12-year-long war, down from 52% in December 2008. Opposition to the conflict now stands at 82%, up from 46% five years ago. ''Those numbers show the war in Afghanistan with far less support than other conflicts,'' CNN Polling Director Keating Holland said. ''Opposition to the Iraq war never got higher than 69% in CNN polling while U.S. troops were in that country, and while the Vietnam War was in progress, no more than six in 10 ever told Gallup's interviewers that war was a mistake.''

The U.S. timetable for Afghanistan calls for the removal of nearly all troops by roughly this time next year, and that can't come fast enough for the vast majority of Americans. Just over half would rather see U.S. troops withdrawn earlier than December 2014. Only a quarter say that America should still have boots on the ground in Afghanistan after that deadline.

Fifty-seven percent say the conflict is going badly for the U.S. and only a third say America is winning the war in Afghanistan.

''Independents have a much gloomier view of the war in Afghanistan than Republicans or Democrats,'' Holland said. ''That may be because a Republican president started the war and a Democratic president has continued it, so there may be some residual support among people who identify with either party.'' Some 2,300 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan since the war began in the autumn of 2001. The U.S. is quickly drawing down its forces in Afghanistan. If a bilateral security agreement that would keep up to 10,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan after the end of 2014 isn't signed in the near future, the U.S. could withdrawal all forces from Afghanistan at the end of next year.

The poll was conducted for CNN by ORC International between December 16 and 19, with 1,035 adults nationwide questioned by telephone. The survey's overall sampling error is plus or minus three percentage points.

The discontent evident in the CNN poll is also seen in two other national surveys conducted earlier this month.

Two-thirds of those questioned in an ABC News/Washington Post poll said the war has not been worth fighting, and an Associated Press/GfK. survey showed 57% saying the U.S. did the wrong thing in going to war in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The American people deserve better than what is on display here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal not just to Democrats but to Republicans. I want to appeal to the fairness of Members in this Chamber. I want to appeal to their sense of making sure that what we do here is right.

On this issue, we ought to have a vote, and the only way to get a vote is if you vote down the rule so we can go back to the Rules Committee and insert this amendment, that is totally germane, into the Department of Defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close by simply saying, it is moments like this where I feel a great sadness for this institution. Again, there are a lot of things in this Defense Department bill that we are going to debate that really, I think, one would fairly characterize as somewhat trivial, and I mentioned some of them earlier.

The fact that we are at war and we can't vote on this war—we are being told that we can't have a say on what the future of our policy is—that is shameful. I am ashamed of this place for running such a closed system on the war.

This is the defense bill. We are not talking about the education bill. We are not talking about the small business bill. This is the Department of Defense authorization bill. This is where we should have the debate. It is germane, and it should be made in order.

I will just finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we are approaching Memorial Day. We are all going to go home and give great speeches. When people ask, What are you doing for our troops in Afghanistan, what are you doing to try to get them home, you will be able to say, nothing, because that is exactly what we are going to do if we can't consider this amendment. Nothing. What a shame. What a tragedy. What an insult to those men and women who are serving. What an insult to their families. What an insult to the American people.

When you are in charge, you can do whatever you want, but I would urge my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to reject this rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said. As I said earlier, I agree with a lot of what has been said.

I will be honest with you, I am disappointed. I have sons that have been sent off to war for this Nation: two of them in Iraq at the same time and one in Afghanistan. They didn't ask to go. They went because, long before I got here, a majority of the Members here voted for it.

Now, you can have disagreements about whether or not we should have been involved in Iraq. I have some serious reservations. Or about what our

continued involvement in Afghanistan should be. I actually voted for an amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) put up last year in regards to getting out of Afghanistan.

Listen, what I say is not hallowed words. I have had blood and flesh of my own in those countries. And I agree, there is nothing we can do to change where Afghanistan is going to go in the future. You can't change history, as has been brought up here.

But I will tell you that if you don't vote for the underlying rule, then we won't have the opportunity to support our troops. We won't have an opportunity to override what the President is doing in regards to cutting the COLA for our troops and adding additional costs to our troops that they have to bear out of their own pockets.

So you want to make a statement. Let's not forget about what the NDAA is all about. It is about supporting our troops and giving our warfighters the equipment and the training and the compensation that they and their families richly deserve for what that 1 percent gives to this Nation, the freedom to stand down here and have a difference of opinion.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to allow this House to continue with its scheduled business for the day, I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 590 provides for House consideration of two separate pieces of legislation. The first of these bills, H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, will be considered for 1 hour under a closed rule. This legislation will prohibit the bulk collection of all tangible things, not just telephone records. It will end a practice that, in my sincere belief and in the belief of so many other Americans, violated our privacy and our constitutional rights. This isn't the end of the issue for me and, I suspect, for a lot of our Members as well.

And secondly, the reason I am proud to be here to sponsor this particular rule is because it provides further consideration of this year's National Defense Authorization Act. The NDAA passed for 52 consecutive years, and I am confident that this will be the 53rd consecutive year that it passes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the very definition of a bipartisan effort. This year's NDAA was reported out of the House Armed Services Committee with unanimous support, 61–0.

For all the infighting that exists in Congress, it is nice to know that we can unite around the common cause of supporting our troops and fulfilling our constitutional responsibility of providing for the common defense of our homeland.

Part of the reason this legislation received so much support is that so many Members have had input into the process, from the committee to the floor. The committee alone, this bill was amended 155 times in committee. And the rule will allow for the consideration of over 160 more amendments, with over 70 of those amendments coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Of course, no piece of legislation is perfect to each Member. Even as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I didn't get everything I wanted in this legislation. But I am extremely proud of the work that we have done and the product that we have put forward.

One of the things I would like to highlight in this bill is the 1.8 percent pay raise for our troops. It is definitely more modest than I had hoped, but it is still a good step. And I think we all know our brave men and women have earned it.

We have also rejected, for 4 years in a row now, the President's proposed benefit cuts to our warfighters and their families. In the President's FY12 budget request, he proposed cuts to TRICARE. In the NDAA that year, the committee fully restored those cuts. In the President's FY13 budget proposal, he proposed compensation cuts once again. And, once again, our NDAA restored much of the funding and required the President to find other sources for the remaining funds.

Fiscal year '14 was no different. This President proposed TRICARE cuts and actually reduced the military's pay raise from 1.8 to just 1 percent. Congress again rejected those TRICARE cuts and worked to restore the program with other resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to say the President's proposed cuts this year were the most sweeping to date. Those cuts would have included TRICARE, housing allowances, and commissary benefits. These cuts add costly out-of-pocket expenses to those military families, that 1 percent who protect our freedoms, and he was willing to cut that. Our warfighters deserve better, and the NDAA before us ensures that those damaging cuts will not happen.

This NDAA also rejects the administration's insistence on one or more rounds of base closure to conserve resources. It is our opinion that Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, is an ineffective way to produce true savings. Instead, they add large up-front costs. And so in this year's NDAA, we have prohibited another round of BRAC.

We have also expanded sexual assault prevention by reviewing the discharge status for victims who separate from the military. And this is so important to all of us. What we want to do is to ensure that no servicemembers were prosecuted for reporting a crime, and we want to make sure that we hold those responsible for the crime to the highest level that we can.

Finally, the underlying bill ensures the preservation of the National Guard. In every State and territory in this Union, guardsmen are exceptionally well trained and must retain equipment to respond to disasters in their States.

□ 1430

These brave men and women are critical to the operational Reserve of this country—ready to deploy to combat zones in defense of the entire Nation, as they have proudly done over the last 12 years. These are active members of our community who risk their own safety to come to our rescue when we are in need the most.

The Guard also provides for some of the most effective and efficient dollars spent, and that is why it is always frustrating to see proposals that could dramatically cut from their budget.

The NDAA recognizes the importance of the National Guard and the Reserves and preserves their capability to protect us here at home and abroad.

I support the rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree completely with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). How can we possibly be having a meaningful debate about our national defense policy when we are not even allowed to have a vote or a debate on the war that this country happens to be engaged in at this given time? It is a pretense for a discussion that while still important is omitting the single largest public policy issue that our constituents are interested in and that men and women are putting their lives at risk for related to defense.

There were 131 germane amendments, including the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JONES, relating to the war in Afghanistan, and 130 others that are rejected

under this rule—not even allowed a minute of discussion on the floor, no less a vote. What would it take to allow a full discussion of those issues? Well, 131 amendments, and customarily, even if we gave each 10 minutes, that is just 2 or 3 days of legislative time about our entire national defense policy. Isn't that what we owe this country as our Nation's deliberative body here, as Representatives of the United States Congress, to discuss for 2 or 3 days all the issues that Members on both sides of the aisle have brought forward relating to defense? I am including, first and foremost, the obvious issue of the war that we are currently engaged in and the demands from our constituents that whatever side prevails in that vote—and in the past, I have joined my colleagues, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JONES, on that issue—at least we should be able to debate and discuss whether an ongoing American presence in Afghanistan is in our national security interests.

The process under which these bills have come to the floor prevents open dialogue and debate, and, frankly, continues to undermine the reputation of this body, the United States Congress, as a deliberative and representative body. One need not wonder why congressional approval ratings are so low. Here we are having a debate for a day on national defense, and we are prohibited from debating and voting on the single largest issue relating to national defense.

In addition, this bill brings up a very weakened form of the USA FREEDOM Act. Not only was this bill weakened in the Judiciary Committee, but, in addition, it was weakened just 24 hours ago before the Rules Committee. Nonetheless, Members from both sides of the aisle submitted amendments to improve the bill, but, unfortunately, every single one of those 20 amendments are blocked under this rule. So we block 131 amendments by Members on both sides of the aisle from debate and from a vote, and we blocked 20 amendments for Members on both sides of the aisle with regard to the USA FREEDOM Act.

Look, this underlying rule also blocked amendments relating to military preparedness. It blocked a widely popular amendment that I think would have more than enough votes on the floor of the House, according to its chief sponsor, Mr. DENHAM, that would allow our aspiring Americans to enlist in the military to ensure that we have the very best and most capable aspiring men and women to defend our country. Absent that amendment, the military will have to essentially go to the next best person on their list, have a harder time meeting their recruitment goals, and have to accept something less than the very best to defend our country and protect our national security. The majority blocked this important bipartisan amendment that would allow aspiring Americans who seek to serve our country and know no other country and owe no other allegiance to any other country to earn their legal status through military service.

The majority also blocked an amendment by Mr. CASTRO that would have allowed aspiring Americans who are DACA-qualified to become eligible to attend, train, and serve at U.S. service academies. I have had the deep honor of having been appointed by then-Speaker and now-leader Pelosi to serve on the board of governors along with my colleague, Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado, of the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs.

Members from across the country undergo—like we do in our office—a selection process where we interview the very best and brightest young men and women from across our districts for appointment to that academy, and one of the greatest honors I have as a Representative is being able to make the phone calls to the talented young individuals that our panelists have chosen to say, yes, we are providing you an appointment to one of our officer universities, and you will be able to serve as an officer in the United States military, one of the U.S. service academies. However, again, as a result of the failure of this rule to allow for even a debate or a vote on the Castro amendment, once again, our military academies are being forced to accept the next best, the less prepared student, rather than the most prepared and the very best officer that we need in today's and tomorrow's military to keep our Nation's national security interests safe.

Both the Denham and Castro amendments would strengthen our service morale, our national defense, and our military preparedness. And those are an example of the 131 amendments to this bill that are blocked from discussion or votes under this restrictive rule.

In addition, this rule makes in order H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act. Now, this bill was supposed to rein in the NSA's illegal and far-reaching wiretapping programs. Though I have never in my time here supported the PATRIOT Act, even many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have believe that the interpretation of that act was overly broad, and therefore, it is desirable for Congress to assert itself on behalf of the American people and rein in some of the worst excesses. But I am dismayed to find that the final text on the floor was not only weakened in the committee process but was weakened just 24 hours ago behind closed doors with less than just about 24 hours for Members of this body to even read the new version of the weakened USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. Speaker, last year's revelations that the NSA had been collecting detailed information about our communication patterns have undermined the trust that my constituents and Americans across the country have in our government. It has created conflicts with our allies abroad, threatening jobs in our country by sullying the reputation of American companies and rifling our international trade waters. The NSA collection of metadata is a clear violation of our constitutional guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure, and it simply can't continue.

Now, while I am pleased that the Chamber is finally taking up legislation that is aimed at reining in the NSA's activities, however, while this bill does take baby steps towards restoring some of Americans' freedoms that are so inherently part of our constitutional system, I am very disappointed that it doesn't require the government to fully meet the standard, nor does it resolve this issue in any way, shape, or form to the American people.

The USA FREEDOM Act curtails the NSA's ability to monitor Americans' private communications under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. And the legislative intent is clear: to prohibit the collection of bulk data such as the type that was occurring under the secret program revealed by Edward Snowden. However, the language in the bill falls short of accomplishing that, and none of the amendments that were designed to improve this bill and make it work to secure our privacy rights were even allowed to be discussed under this rule here on the floor of the House, which is another reason that this rule simply must be brought down.

This legislation amended the definition of ''specific selection term,'' which is required to conduct surveillance under FISA in a way that creates the possibility that the NSA could misuse the bill. Now, again, a secret government agency that we have acknowledged has had oversight problems in the past, having overly broad discretion, has shown and demonstrated that it has been unable to provide the proper oversight.

So the bill's new definition of ''specific selection term'' can be read to create a loophole permitting intelligence agencies to use selection terms that could permit the collection of large segments of data associated with the particular email domain or IP address.

The American people have seen how broadly in the past the intelligence community has interpreted their authority under surveillance law. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. The new definitions provided in the underlying bill provide a potential loophole almost as wide as the initial loophole in the PATRIOT bill itself and fails to address the privacy concerns of the American people.

In addition, the new language eliminated provisions that strengthened and clarified the ban on reverse targeting in 702 and the minimization provisions for both the 215-based CDR program and the FISA pen register statute.

The language is a major departure from the bill that passed out of two committees. So you might hear Members on both sides of the aisle say, oh,

the bill passed by voice on committee. To be clear, this is not the bill that passed in committee. This bill was changed 24 hours ago and severely weakened. Were the proponents of these changes hesitant to bring these changes forward in committee because they knew they would engender bipartisan opposition? Perhaps. But let it not be said without refutation that these bills have passed committee by a voice vote unanimously. The bill has changed significantly since it passed committee.

Again, while I am encouraged that this Congress is finally taking up a bill designed with the intent of reining in the excesses of the NSA, this process is flawed. Twenty amendments were offered; none are allowed under this rule. If we can defeat this rule, Members from both sides of the aisle will be able to move forward to improve upon the USA FREEDOM Act to ensure that it can be examined and that Congress can engage in their proper oversight role with regard to this bill.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) whom I serve with on the Armed Services Committee, but he also serves on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, if you listen to some of the debate on this rule, you would not realize that both the underlying pieces of legislation here were enormously bipartisan.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee—Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Congressman NADLER, Congressman SCOTT, and Congressman SENSENBRENNER, the original author—for their hard work in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

The bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 32–0 and as amended passed the Intel Committee by a voice vote.

The underlying bill takes important steps toward reforming our Nation's intelligence-gathering programs by banning the bulk collection of data. The bill enhances civil liberty protections for all Americans while at the same time preserving our ability to protect the national security of this country.

National security and international terrorism investigation will now be conducted on a case-by-case basis, using specific selection terms and with permission from the FISA court, thereby ending the vacuuming up of data by the NSA.

Finally, the bill creates more transparency and provides more information to the American people. Companies will now be able to publicly report on the requests for information they receive from the government. The bill also requires new comprehensive reviews and extensive public disclosure.

The act includes legislation that I offered with my colleagues, the Intelligence Oversight and Accountability Act, which requires the government to provide to Congress, within 45 days, a copy of each FISA court decision, order, or opinion that includes a significant construction or interpretation of FISA.

The Federal Government has the responsibility to ensure that the intelligence community is taking appropriate action to root out threats to the security of the American people within the boundaries of the U.S. Constitution.

Today, we are striking this balance between safeguarding privacy and protecting Americans from terrorist threats in today's post-9/11 world.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have heard talk about the NDAA bill and amendments that weren't allowed. What you did not hear is that from 10 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 the next morning, the amendments were offered—over 155—and the chairman of that committee was so gracious he continued to ask, ''Are there any additional amendments?'' until there were none, when we finally passed on a bipartisan basis the NDAA bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that is a good bill that strengthens and supports our men and women in uniform. I hope that my colleagues will support the rule and support the underlying bills.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, rise in strong opposition to this rule, which fails to make in order the bipartisan McGovern-Jones-Smith-Garamendi-Lee amendment on Afghanistan, and I will include the text of my amendment following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a very straightforward amendment. We worked very hard to make it thoughtful, bipartisan, and germane. It reiterates the President's commitment to complete the transition of U.S. combat, military, and security operations to Afghan authorities by the end of this year.

□ 1445

It requires the President to send to Congress by the end of March next year a determination that describes the mission, duration, and level of troops of any post-2014 deployment of U.S. troops in Afghanistan, and the Congress then has 30 days to enact a joint resolution to approve the President's determination.

In the event that Congress votes against the President's determination, then the remaining U.S. troops in Afghanistan would be withdrawn in a safe, orderly, and expeditious manner, taking into consideration the security of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel.

Last year, 305 Members of this House voted in support of an amendment calling for just such a vote, but under this rule, those same Members will be denied the opportunity to make sure that the President presents clearly to Congress what he intends our troops to do in Afghanistan after the end of this year and for how long. Under this rule, Congress is denied the opportunity to vote on whether they approve the President's plan or not.

I don't know how a vote on our amendment would turn out, and I certainly have no idea how a vote next year on keeping our troops in Afghanistan would turn out, but here is what I do know: I know that the men and women who will be asked to serve and perhaps to die in Afghanistan deserve a debate and a vote. I know their families deserve a debate and a vote.

I know that the American people, who have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars on this war, deserve a debate and a vote; and I know that this Congress has not only the right but the responsibility to make our views known on this important issue.

We are at war, Mr. Speaker. I know that some of my colleagues would rather not think about that. They would rather the issue of Afghanistan just go away, but wishing and hoping doesn't make it so.

This is already the longest war in American history. The American people are tired of it. Our troops and their families have been stretched to their very limits. We have lost over 2,000 servicemembers and spent over $700 billion.

What in the world is the Republican leadership afraid of, Mr. Speaker?

Last night, some of my Republican colleagues told me that they were refusing to make this amendment in order because they didn't want to upset the President. Are you kidding me? Since when does this leadership care one iota about upsetting the President?

We can vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act over 50 times. We can have investigation after investigation after investigation about Benghazi, but we can't take 10 minutes to debate the war in Afghanistan? Give me a break.

Besides, this amendment doesn't upset any plans or negotiations the President is currently carrying out on Afghanistan—not a one. It doesn't interfere with funding for the war, and it doesn't interrupt the deployment of our troops.

I know, in their hearts, that many of my Republican colleagues agree with me, so I am going to give them one more chance to do the right thing. I urge you to support the McGovern-Jones-Smith-Garamendi-Lee amendment on Afghanistan.

Strike section 1217 and insert the following:

SEC. 1217. COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN; REQUIREMENTS TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.

(a) COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN.—In coordination with the Government of Afghanistan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and other allies in Afghanistan, the President shall—

(1) complete the accelerated transition of United States combat operations to the Government of Afghanistan by not later than December 31, 2014;

(2) complete the accelerated transition of United States military and security operations to the Government of Afghanistan and redeploy United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan (including operations involving military and security-related contractors) by not later than December 31, 2014; and

(3) pursue robust negotiations leading to a political settlement and reconciliation of the internal conflict in Afghanistan, to include the Government of Afghanistan, all interested parties within Afghanistan and with the observance and support of representatives of donor nations active in Afghanistan and regional governments and partners in order to secure a secure and independent Afghanistan and regional security and stability.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In the event that United States Armed Forces remain deployed in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, then no later than March 31, 2015, the President shall send to Congress a determination describing the purpose and expected duration of such deployment, and the projected number of troops to be deployed.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President's determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to approve the content of the President's determination. Should Congress vote against the President's determination, the President is directed to remove all troops not required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel in a safe, orderly and expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to include my amendment calling for a vote on keeping troops in Afghanistan after 2014, and that this amendment receive 10 minutes total debate like every other germane amendment made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has been yielded for the purpose of debate by the gentleman from Florida. Does the gentleman from Florida yield for this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 23, nays 361, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—23

Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Dingell
Fudge
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Honda
Israel
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
McGovern
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Velázquez

NAYS—361

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—47

Bachmann
Bass
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Brady (TX)
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Clay
Collins (GA)
Conaway
DelBene
Denham
Duffy
Engel
Frankel (FL)
Gingrey (GA)
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Johnson (GA)
Joyce
Kingston
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McDermott
Meng
Messer
Miller, Gary
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Simpson
Slaughter
Vargas
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Young (AK)

□ 1511

Mses. MCCOLLUM, BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. BARTON, STIVERS, GARCIA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. CHU and Mr. PALLONE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' McKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) has 16 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time to address the subject of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this House is considering a combined rule. It is a rule that addresses the NDAA and it is a rule that addresses the USA FREEDOM Act wrapped up together.

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate the point that we are addressing a combined rule between the National Defense Authorization Act and the USA FREEDOM Act.

The first component that I would like to address with the time that I have is an expression of appreciation to the Rules Committee for going through all the amendments of the NDAA, taking a look at that and coming down with a rule that recognizes that the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee is immigration policy, not Armed Services.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for the decision that they made on the NDAA. Even though there were dozens and dozens, actually scores of amendments to consider last year, there was an amendment that addressed the immigration issue that was made in order on the bill. That brought about a debate and a discussion here on the floor.

Instead, that debate took place this time in the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee declined to approve essentially amendment number 58 that dealt with the immigration issue. It is the proper jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. Additionally, it was bad policy.

So I rise to thank the Rules Committee for that decision and transition into a discussion about the USA FREEDOM Act, which I am troubled by; and that is the process of regular order in this Congress, and the idea that, as the Congress put together a bill that blocked the Federal Government from collecting metadata on telephone bills, there was a negotiation that took place over the weekend, a substitute amendment was delivered, announced at 12:35 p.m. on a Monday, we took up the bill I believe the next day quickly, no amendments were accepted, we didn't have an opportunity to have a serious discussion about the national defense, national security implications of a bill that addressed the civil liberties.

I support the underlying bill, I support the effort to protect the civil liberties of the American people.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The amendment that I offered, even though it was voted on, the debate really didn't consider this proposal that the head of an element of the intelligence community may enter into an agreement to compensate for retaining call detail records for a period of time.

What the underlying bill does in section 215 is it limits the amount of time that we can get a FISA warrant to do a query of existing records in the private hands of the telecommunications companies to the 18 months that is required by the FCC. We need to have the opportunity for this Commander in Chief, the intelligence community, or a subsequent Commander in Chief to be able to expand that period of time while still protecting that data within the possession of the private sector companies, which we have confidence in.

That is an issue that I would like to see before this Congress. It is not going to be voted on in this bill. I am troubled by the national security implications of it, which brings me to the floor. I will support this rule. I do thank the Rules Committee. But I wanted to make that point that when national security issues come up, somebody has got to put the marker down.

I urge all to consider the point I have made here today.

Mr. POLIS. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this rule does not even allow a discussion of the war that we are currently engaged in in Afghanistan. How can we have a discussion about our national defense when being prohibited from any amendments relating to the war in Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

First, the underlying National Defense Authorization Act continues wasteful spending at the Pentagon and won't allow, as Congressman POLIS said, a full debate on the longest war in American history.

This bill continues the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and it is a slush fund at a time when the administration still hasn't decided on how much the Afghanistan war is going to cost or how many troops will be there.

Yet the Republican leadership of this House has failed to allow the American people to have a say in the future of America's longest war, while maybe, quite frankly, some of these amendments probably would pass.

Finally, we would be reflecting the views of the majority of the American people.

For many years, we have known that there is simply no military solution in Afghanistan, and our constituents are sick and tired of war. This bill simply ignores 82 percent of the Americans who oppose the war and 74 percent favoring all U.S. troops out by 2014.

I want to just read the authorization that we are talking about today. The Authorization for Use of Military Force was passed sorrowfully. Let me tell you, after the horrific events of 9/11—some were not here during that period—it was passed September 14, and we had probably about maybe 1 hour of debate, maybe 1 hour of debate.

That resolution said—which is what we are talking about today, which is what we are insisting on a debate on—it said:

> That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. We are 13 years into this war without end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I authored H.R. 4608. I had an amendment to come here on this bill that would really get us back to the drawing board so that we could have this full debate to determine whether or not this resolution, the one of 9/14/2001, should still hold. Minimally, we should have a full debate on this.

I am really pleased though to see that the administration finally agreed to release a secret drones memo. That is a good thing. That is happening I think today. But we need to have a debate on this resolution, and we need to have it today.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), whom I have the honor of serving not only on the Rules Committee with, but also in Armed Services.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The underlying defense authorization bill is a good bill. This is a good rule with maybe one caveat that there are too many amendments that are in here.

Henry Clay, as the first Speaker of the House who went from the Senate over here and was elected Speaker on the first day and served as Speaker every day he served in the House, he is

given credit for starting the standing committee process where people with expertise discuss all these issues before they actually come to the floor. Some of these amendments we have had have not gone through that process and will be given 10 minutes of debate time on the floor, which is rather small when you compare it to the process of each subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee: having established their bill, going to the full committee, with a full day of debate on the bill before it comes here.

There is, for example, one amendment that is made in order, has a great sponsor, a wonderful Member of this body, but it has untold side consequences that probably need that experience of being explored. Let me give you a simple example. It starts with the words ''notwithstanding any other provision of law.'' That should be something that scares someone. It means this bill, except for section B, which it exempts, takes precedent over everything else that already exists in law, and not only for the military issue, but also in every element of Federal Government.

I am only going to talk about the military side because that is the only expertise I actually have. The one part that is not exempt deals with the concept known as ''inherent governmental functions.'' Unfortunately, the reference this makes is to title 31. Most of the military stuff, especially dealing with our depots, is in title X. There is a reason those are in different titles—because they have a different substance and a different purpose.

At the end of this reference, there is also the provision put in there—actually, it is in the first of this reference—that what is an inherent governmental function can be changed by any official of OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, which simply means, I assume, that is one of the reasons the Defense Department is opposed to this particular amendment, because it removes decisions from the Defense Department over to the President through OMB. That is not the way we wish to go.

When it deals with programs, weapons, and systems that we have, there is an acquisition side and a sustainment side. On the acquisition side, often competition is extremely important to driving down cost. When it comes to sustainment, the maintenance of those provisions, sometimes that saving has a detrimental effect that is an unintended consequence because the maintenance is directly tied to the readiness issue, which is why we define in title X what is a core workload, which would be overturned by the very first phrase in this particular piece of legislation, this particular amendment.

Core workload by law has to be brought into the depots for work once every 4 years, or at least at one time in the initial 4 years of operating capability. Prior to that time, maintenance is usually done by the contractor.

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

Mr. NUGENT. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. But after that, it goes into what is known as an endangered mission readiness that is determined by the military, and should be determined by the military.

What it simply means is we have military depots for a military reason. There is a direct extension, or these depots are a direct extension, of the soldier on the field. Civilian workers at these depots cannot go on strike, they cannot undertake a work stoppage. Sometimes, especially in times of war, Federal civilian employees have been ordered to work around-the-clock or do other kinds of dangers.

All of these things which have been worked out traditionally in title X are overturned by the first phrase in this amendment: A wonderful amendment in its purpose and goal, has a wonderful sponsor, but it has unintended consequences. As we go through this bill, as we go through these amendments, we should consider what those unintended consequences may or may not be. It is one of the reasons why the Committee process was so wisely established by Henry Clay back in the 1800s and should be respected today.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the rather elucidating discussion on the way in which the committee system is supposed to work.

Unfortunately, in the Armed Services Committee, the most expensive single project was never allowed to be discussed, and that is the war in Afghanistan—$79 billion in the NDAA for Afghanistan and not 1 second of discussion about the role of America in Afghanistan and about the ongoing war.

The committee structure did not work. Therefore it is to this floor, it is to the membership of this House to take up this critical issue of what is the role of America in Afghanistan. Are we to continue this war or not? If we are to continue it, how are we going to do that? That is our business. That is the business that we were elected to do, and we have been prevented by the actions of the majority in the committee and on this floor to even deal with this issue, to even discuss it for one moment, except in this issue of how the rule is to be written.

This is not right, it is not fair to those of us who want to have a legitimate debate on the role of America in Afghanistan, and it is not in the interest of this country that this House forsake and forgo its responsibilities.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good colleague for yielding.

I rise in support of the rule, as well as the underlying bill, the National Defense Authorization Act.

One of the provisions in there is the addition of a defense audit advisory panel. It comes as no shock to anyone in this room that the Department of Defense is unauditable, or their financial statements are unauditable. There are Herculean efforts going on across the river at the Pentagon and throughout the entire system to try to correct this issue. There are millions and millions of dollars being spent to try to make this happen and try to get to a point, in fact, where they can.

The current law requires that the Defense Department be auditable by the end of 2017 and that the fiscal 2018 books and records be audited and a report provided to Congress by 2018. There will be important decisions going on throughout that timeframe. We need a canary in the coal mine. We need an early warning system in this House that tracks that process, and this panel will do that. I was pleased that it was included in the underlying bill. It is important that Congress watch this process throughout.

The Department of Defense gives us a report every 6 months, but we need better insight, we need a line of sight into what is going on on a much more relevant basis quicker so that we don't wait until the end of 2017 and suddenly discover that the Department is not achieving that goal, or we don't get to the end of 2018 and can't, in fact, audit the books and records of the Department of Defense.

This is a stunningly difficult problem to fix. For decades, the Department of Defense has had an accounting system that was set up to meet its needs and the needs of providing the mission support. It was not set up to be audited. Consequently, in order to be able to audit something, they have got to go back and rebuild all these legacy systems that are out there. This is hard work and a lot of it.

The Department of Defense, as my colleague earlier said, this is one of the largest enterprises on the face of Earth. It is not easy, and it takes good hardworking people to get it done, and that is what has been going on.

□ 1530

Our Congress, though, needs to have the insight into that process to make sure that they get it right. This effort doesn't fall, really, within the structure of the committee or of the subcommittees, naturally, so this defense audit panel will correct that oversight, and it will allow us to see the progress in as real time a basis as we can get.

If we do need to take corrective actions and if we do need to do something to make that happen, then this will give us a quicker insight into that.

For this reason and for a whole lot of others, I support the underlying bill, and I support this rule. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and, when it comes time for the bill itself, to vote ''yes'' on the National Defense Authorization Act, which would be the Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is critical that this House reject this rule because it is impossible to have a discussion about meeting our national security needs and defense without this body's being able to issue any guidance or to even debate the ongoing war in which this Nation is engaged in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for two amendments I am submitting to the National Defense Authorization Act.

The first I am offering would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress no later than 30 days after the enactment of this law on the barriers to implementing audit reporting requirements and recommendations in order to ensure reporting deadlines are met. This would ensure that taxpayer money is being well spent.

The second, offered by me and Mr. COOK, would create a pilot program to take the California National Guard's Work for Warriors job placement program nationwide.

Since the State of California created the program in 2012, more than 2,500 Guard members have been placed in jobs and at only $500 per placement, far cheaper than any other employment programs, which can cost as much as $10,000 per placement.

Placing 2,500 California guardsmen in jobs is a great start, but I know that that number can multiply many times over if the Work for Warriors program is expanded nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there are few greater threats to the security of American families than those which could arise from the failure of the ongoing nuclear negotiations with Iran.

Parts of this bill seek to disrupt the administration's tough, persistent diplomacy. Some would even assign to Israel the job of starting what could become World War III. Even the Bush-Cheney administration rejected that approach.

Iranian Revolutionary Guard hard-liners may ultimately doom these negotiations. Our responsibility is to ensure that hard-liners here don't do the obstruction for them.

Our arsenal of democracy includes more than bombs. It includes tough negotiations and strong sanctions to reach a carefully monitored, verifiable agreement that will protect our families and our allies.

Given the high cost of failure, we certainly cannot afford to surrender to defeatists, who capitulate on the negotiations before they are even completed. It is too soon to wave the white flag and give up in favor of war.

The obstinate objections raised last year to the interim agreement were proven to be unjustified. The International Atomic Energy Agency has determined that Iran has taken verifiable actions to halt the progress of its nuclear program.

Let's give peace a chance.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield a minute and 15 seconds to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that there are many reasons to be concerned about the rule. I am certainly concerned that we are not able to debate a very important issue dealing with Afghanistan.

Having spent almost a decade-plus in dealing with provision 215 under the PATRIOT Act and in helping to construct the Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet Collection, and Online Monitoring Act, it is imperative that we move the USA FREEDOM Act forward.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013. Specifically, my bill would require the Attorney General to expose the FISA Court, allowing Americans to know the broad, illegal authority it had, even having an advocate for the American people in sections 402 and 604. This is in the bill.

In addition, I strongly support this act because section 301 of the bill continues the prohibition against reverse targeting, which is an amendment that I had in the RESTORE Act; then, of course, it goes forward with ensuring that this megadata—this bulk collection—does not occur.

I am grateful that the Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee amendment that deals with Boko Haram is in this national defense bill because we have to stop the tragedy that is going on, but more importantly, the devastation of Boko Haram.

Finally, I would have wanted the amendment that deals with the contracting out of our intelligence services. I believe it is too extensive. I believe that my amendment would have been effective in determining how much we use outside contractors. This is a rule that is, unfortunately, without a lot of point to it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 590, the rule governing debate on H.R. 3361, the "USA Freedom Act," and amendment to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Regarding H.R. 3361, I support the rule and am a co-sponsor of the the underlying bill, the USA Freedom Act, which stands for "Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act."

The USA Freedom Act is the House's unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013 regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative.

There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

In response, many Members of Congress, including the Ranking Member CONYERS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and myself, introduced legislation in response to the disclosures to ensure that the law and the practices of the executive branch reflect the intent of Congress in passing the USA Patriot Act and subsequent amendments.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the "FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013," bipartisan legislation, that much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or "FISA Court."

Specifically, my bill would require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT ACT and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

I am pleased that these requirements are incorporated in substantial part as Sections 402 and 604 of the USA Freedom Act, which requires the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA court that includes a significant construction or interpretation of law and to submit a report to Congress within 45 days.

Significantly, the USA Freedom Act contains an explicit prohibition on bulk collection of tangible things pursuant to Section 215 authority. Instead, the USA Freedom Act provides that Section 215 may only be used where a specific selection term is provided as the basis for the production of tangible things.

Finally, I strongly support the USA Freedom Act because Section 301 of the bill continues the prohibition against "reverse targeting," which became law when an earlier Jackson Lee Amendment was included in H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act of 2007.

"Reverse targeting" is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, codified in Section 301 of the USA Freedom Act, reduces even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by requiring the Administration to obtain a regular, individualized FISA warrant whenever the "real" target of the surveillance is a person in the United States.

I support the the USA Freedom Act because it will help keep us true to the Bill of Rights and strikes the proper balance between liberty and security.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying USA Freedom Act.

Finally, I am pleased that the rule also makes in order the Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee

Amendment to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2015.

This amendment makes three important contributions to the bill:

1. First, it strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the kidnapping of the more than 200 young schoolgirls kidnapped from the Chibok School by Boko Haram;

2. Second, it expresses support for the people of Nigeria who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic Nigeria; and

3. Third, it requires that not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment, the Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress on the nature and extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my serious concern about the USA FREEDOM Act.

First, it is important for all of the Members to know that what is being considered is not the bill that was marked up by the House Judiciary Committee. After it was reported out unanimously by the House Judiciary Committee, certain key elements of this bill were changed.

I think it is ironic that a bill that was intended to increase transparency was secretly changed between the committee markup and its floor consideration, and it was altered in worrisome ways.

The definition of ''selector,'' rather than being narrowed, has been defined in such a way that it would allow for the large-scale acquisition of data. This is a concern that has been expressed to me by both Republicans and Democrats.

The way the definition is lodged, you could get first the southern half of the United States, then the eastern half of the United States, then Missouri. Those could be the selectors.

I offered nine amendments. None were put in order. We should insist that we do better than this.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as Ms. LOFGREN said, the bill under consideration is not the bill that passed committee. It is a different bill that was changed 24 hours ago in secret, behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight my amendment, which will be considered later today, to improve TRICARE for our military moms and their families.

Doctors are now recommending that new moms exclusively breastfeed their babies, but we know that, despite their intentions, far too many women who want to breastfeed these infants find the cost of lactation supplies and support to be a barrier to that choice. While most women covered by private health insurance have access to these services, women with TRICARE do not.

That is why I introduced the TRICARE Moms Improvement Act, which will be on the floor today as an amendment. My amendment would end this discrepancy—this disparity—and would create a parity of access to health care for servicemembers, along with private civilians.

I urge my colleagues to join the many medical groups, women's organizations, and military family associations which support this effort.

Please vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule.

This legislation would authorize over $520 billion to the Department of Defense, not including over $79 billion in war funding, which I oppose; yet, for such a large bill, there are many amendments that my colleagues wanted to offer that will never see the House floor because of this very limited rule.

One issue that, I think, deserves discussion is the inclusion of an $800 million authorization for an unbudgeted 12th LPD–17 class ship. While we are still addressing the effects of the sequester, which I voted against, I have concerns about this provision.

In particular, I am concerned that the committee does not address the fact that there is a Navy shipbuilding agreement in place regarding the DDG–51s and the LPDs.

This agreement requires that the Navy obligate funding and support for another DDG–51 destroyer if another LPD is awarded. Under a different rule, we may have been able to have had an open discussion about this issue and about so many others.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

Here are the facts, Members: We have a crisis in the military when it comes to sexual assault cases. We have a 50 percent increase in the number of persons filing claims for sexual assault in the military as a result of the most recent study.

Here are the facts, Members: There are more than 200 Members in this House right now who support taking sexual assault cases out of the chain of command, and yet we do not have the ability to have a vote on the floor of this House on whether or not Members of this House support taking sexual assault cases out of the chain of command and putting them in the hands of a chief prosecutor, who has legal training.

Members, the elephant is in this room. It is time for us to have the guts to stand up and be counted on whether or not we want all members of the military to be safe or only those who do not file claims for sexual assault.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in support of Representative SPEIER's amendment.

I am unique in this Chamber. I have served as a military prosecutor, a military defense attorney, a staff judge advocate; and, indeed, before coming to Congress, I served as a commanding general. I understand the impact of sexual violence in the military.

Justice needs to be properly served to victims of sexual assault and to all members of our military. Decades ago, military defense attorneys were taken out of the chain of command. We must do the same with the prosecution. It is the only way that justice can be properly served, without influence, perceived or real.

My fellow colleagues, I urge you to join us in ending the appearance of undo influence in military prosecutions.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Mr. POLIS. I thought, perhaps, they had been holding their tongues all along, wanting to speak after ours. Very well then. I am prepared to close.

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

I am grateful that this rule does include several of the amendments that I have had the opportunity to work on.

One is a bipartisan amendment with my colleagues Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. WHITFIELD, with regard to Rocky Flats in my district, which will help increase transparency to ensure that cold war nuclear workers will have their benefit applications reviewed expeditiously.

There are many survivors in my district who have been exposed to radiation and who are suffering from severe

health effects. If they had been on the military side, they would have been taken care of. They are on the civilian side, but have put their lives in harm's way, and they deserve to be taken care of for their service to our country.

I am also pleased with my amendment with Mr. BLUMENAUER, which would defund the midlife nuclear refueling and overhaul of the *George Washington* aircraft carrier, which would save $5 billion. The administration released a statement of administrative policy, expressing concern about this unneeded reoverhaul of an aircraft carrier that we do not need as we shrink our carrier fleet permanently to 10 vessels.

Finally, I am pleased with my amendment with Representative NADLER, which is to encourage the Department of Defense to ensure that our ground-based missile defense systems actually work and that there are operational, realistic tests before additional purchases are made of systems that do not keep Americans safe.

This will also be permitted on the floor of the House today.

□ 1545

However, 131 ideas—good, bad, and other—from my colleagues on both side of the aisle are not even allowed to be debated or voted on under this bill.

The single biggest issue, the pressing national issue of the ongoing war in which this Nation is engaged is not even able to have 10 minutes or 1 minute of floor debate, as it has that very same issue, the ongoing presence in Afghanistan. And I have my opinions; my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, has his; and folks on the other side and both sides of the aisle have theirs.

This is not a partisan issue. It is simply one that we as representatives of the American people deserve to be able to be their voice on: How long and in what capacity should we continue to send American men and women to Afghanistan?

The only way that we can ensure that this body is allowed to have their voice—Democrats, Republicans, people who want us to stay there, people who don't—is to bring down this rule and to bring forward a rule that allows a debate of the single most significant pressing national policy issue.

In addition, there are a number of amendments around military preparedness and making sure our military has the very best and brightest aspiring Americans to draw from to keep our country safe that is not even allowed to be discussed under the rules of the bill.

And finally, the USA FREEDOM Act, which is no longer the USA FREEDOM Act but a bill that has a loophole as wide as the Grand Canyon that was not in the original USA FREEDOM Act, passed on a bipartisan basis on a voice vote out of committee, and yet 20 amendments—again, good, bad, indifferent, some of which would have addressed the flaws—not even allowed 10 minutes, not allowed 1 minute, not allowed 30 seconds, not allowed 10 seconds, not allowed a vote.

Why are we scared of letting the Members of this body, Republican and Democrat, have a voice in addressing the very legitimate privacy concerns about the NSA?

If people think this bill will somehow address the concerns and they are gone, they are wrong.

I plan on voting against this stripped version, which is no longer the USA FREEDOM Act, to show that it no longer even comes remotely close to addressing the concerns that my constituents have about the NSA overreach with regard to their privacy.

We need to reject this rule to ensure that this body, representatives of the American people, Republican and Democratic, can bring forward the issues that pertain to national defense and our privacy.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, the rule today, before us today, continues the process of allowing Members to provide input on the NDAA. That process is important.

This rule makes in order 162 amendments to the NDAA. I know some of the other side don't think that is enough. Remember, in committee, we were there from 10 o'clock in the morning until after midnight, and we heard another 155 amendments from both sides of the aisle. And 155 amendments were considered in order and were voted on or added to the NDAA.

So it is not like there hasn't been any input. It is just the opposite. It has been impressive this year as compared to other years, and unprecedented.

It is also important to stress that both of these underlying pieces of legislation are bipartisan agreements. They include the input of Members on both sides of the aisle. Any time you get agreements like this, no one is going to get everything they want. I sure didn't. But it doesn't have to be all or nothing. That approach doesn't work, not for this body and not for the American people.

But what this rule allows is for debate on both of these issues. On the USA FREEDOM Act there will be a separate hour of debate to debate the merits of that particular piece of legislation, and we are going to have debate on the remaining amendments that have been made in order that we are bringing forward today as relate to the NDAA.

That is a lot of input. Is it ever enough? It probably could never be enough. But for this body, it is kind of unprecedented the amount of debate that we have had already on the NDAA.

I have only been here 3 years, but it is long enough to know that if you insist on all or nothing 99 percent of time, you know what you are going to get? You are going to get nothing. And that is not what we want.

We have an opportunity here to debate the USA FREEDOM Act and the merits of it or not, but we also have the ability to debate amendments to the NDAA that support our troops.

We need to recognize that when this happens, the American people win when this body works its will in committee. They are American people, and this body has a voice in regard to what occurs in the future.

We have made significant progress on issues central to American rights and freedoms. Trust me; I have been the biggest opponent of the massive collection of metadata that was going on in the United States. I thought it was unconstitutional and a violation of our privacy rights. I absolutely do.

What we have today is a vast improvement on what we have now. I wish we would come together more often and we wouldn't let our differences outweigh our common goals.

Like I said before, is the USA FREEDOM Act perfect? By no means. But it is certainly better than what we have today when this government has the right—and is doing it up to this moment—and is collecting an unprecedented amount of data, metadata, on all of us, which I believe is directly against the Constitution.

But I am particularly encouraged once again that we are united around our constitutional requirement as it relates to the NDAA on common defense. That is one of the responsibilities this body has is the common defense of this country, and nothing more. That is paramount. Because if we don't have common defense, we don't have anything that we enjoy today, whether it is back home or here in Washington, D.C. We don't have the ability to have freedom of speech. We don't have the ability to sit here and debate back and forth and have differing opinions. But at the end of the day, we move forward, and that is what makes America great. What has made America great is that 1 percent that protect us today.

Mr. Speaker, like I said, I have three sons. They all currently serve. They do it willingly and not just because Mom or Dad wanted them to. Probably just the opposite. Because when we had them deploy to Iraq and Afghanistan—and now our youngest just came back from a deployment to Africa—we would rather them not be in harm's way.

But they have made a decision that this country is worth it. Those that have led the way before them made that decision, and some have paid the ultimate sacrifice. We owe it to them to finish up the NDAA and move this rule forward so we can have a common debate, particularly as it relates to the USA FREEDOM Act.

I don't know how we can look our servicemen and -women in the eye. I hear this all the time. We have a debt we can never repay. They are looking at what we do today. They are looking at what we do on the NDAA, in how we are supporting them.

If you think back to the Armed Services Committee, it was 61–0 in support of this particular piece of legislation. That is pretty good coming out of this place that is dysfunctional, to say the least.

But we can unite on one singular cause, and we have. We have the ability to continue to support our troops. We have the ability to continue to support the families that support our troops.

Let me tell you, they listen and they watch. They wonder where we are in the whole process. Do we really support them or is it just lip service. Do we just give speeches and say how much we appreciate their service and sacrifice, or is it lip service?

I would suggest to you that the Armed Services Committee stepped up to the plate, and it is not lip service from them. They went above and beyond what the President requested to support our troops, our warfighters, and that is the right thing to do.

I would hope that we would do this now and in the future. We want to make sure that they have the best possible equipment and the best possible training.

When my kids were in Iraq and Afghanistan, the one thing that gave my wife, Wendy, and me solace was the fact that we knew they were the best equipped, best fighting force on the face of the Earth that give them the best opportunity to come home. And that is what we want. It is as simple as that. These are real people.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 567, 113th Congress, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi:

Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland;

Mr. SMITH, Washington;

Mr. SCHIFF, California;

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, California;

Ms. DUCKWORTH of Illinois

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' McKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 585 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. 4435.

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

□ 1702

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. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 20, 2014, amendment No. 7 printed in House report 113–455 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) had been disposed of.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 to the end that the amendment stand rejected by the earlier voice vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn, and the amendment, as modified, stands rejected in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–455 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. DAINES of Montana.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—192

Bachmann
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Cantor
Holt
Huelskamp
Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Slaughter

□ 1737

Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. WOLF and McINTYRE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JONES, CLEAVER, FATTAH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. McCOLLUM, Messrs. MURPHY of Florida, MICHAUD, CUELLAR, and RUIZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

AYES—194

Amash
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Cantor
Holt
Huelskamp
Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1744

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 196, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—196

Amash
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Cantor
Gingrey (GA)
Holt
Huelskamp
Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Rush
Schwartz
Slaughter
Stivers

□ 1749

Mrs. ELLMERS changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adopting House Resolution 590;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4031.

Each electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 590) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 190, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—231

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Cantor
Holt
Huelskamp
Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1758

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes on May 21, 2014: on rollcall vote 223, a motion to Adjourn, I would have voted "no;" on rollcall vote 224, a motion to Adjourn, I would have voted "no;" on rollcall vote 225, on agreeing to the Blumenauer Amendment to H.R. 4435, I would have voted "yes;" on rollcall vote 226, on agreeing to the Loretta Sanchez Amendment Number 3 to H.R. 4435, I would have voted "yes;" on rollcall vote 227, on agreeing to the Daines Amendment, I would have voted "no;" on rollcall vote 228, on passage of H. Res. 590, I would have voted "no."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4031) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 33, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

YEAS—390

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—33

Becerra
Brown (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Fudge
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Hoyer
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Lee (CA)
McDermott
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pocan
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sires
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman

NOT VOTING—8

Bass
Huelskamp
Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1808

Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1189

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1189, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4286

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4286.

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

There was no objection.

HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to House Resolution 590 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. 4435.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1811

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. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113–455 pursuant to House Resolution 585 offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 590, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113–460 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 590.

Each further amendment printed in part A of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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 B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 318. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT CERTAIN CLIMATE CHANGE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to implement the U.S. Global Change Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from spending money on climate change policies forced upon them by the Obama administration.

We shouldn't be diverting our financial resources away from the primary missions of our military and our national security in pursuit of an ideology.

For example, earlier this year, the President diverted crucial funding on rural sewer and water line grants to promote his climate change initiatives.

□ 1815

Let's make it clear. I acknowledge that climate change is occurring. The climate has always been changing. The question is whether or not, given the global unrest from these rogue nations and our war on terrorism, whether we

should be diverting our funds to support an ideology instead of maximizing our investments in national security.

Now, climate change alarmists contend that man-made CO_2 is the cause of climate change. Most people may not realize that 96 percent of all the CO_2 emissions occur naturally, and America's CO_2 emissions' contribution to the global community is actually less than 1 percent, Mr. Chairman. But even with these facts, decarbonizing America's economy is still a long-term goal of the climate alarmists. But to what end?

If America totally stopped burning coal—I mean this, Mr. Chairman. If every coal-fired powerhouse, factory, school, institution, if every institution in America stopped burning coal today, we would reduce the emissions of CO_2 in the globe around the world by 0.2 percent. Think about that, Mr. Chair, 0.2 percent. Within 5 years, the rest of the world's CO_2 emissions would make up the difference while our entire economy would have been turned upside down. We would have gained nothing in America at considerable cost to our country's economy.

Yesterday, Secretary of State John Kerry was quoted saying: ''If we make the necessary efforts to address climate change, and supposing we are wrong, what's the worst that can happen?''

''What's the worst that can happen?'' What about spending trillions of dollars, the loss of millions of jobs, more expensive electric bills, and making our economy less competitive?

People like this talk about these issues as if there is no downside or cost to what they are advocating. Mr. Chairman, you and I know that is not the case.

Germany is switching back to coal-fired power, and China and India are building coal-fired power plants every week. America is the only industrialized nation discouraging the use of coal and other fossil fuels.

Leadership expert John Maxwell once said: ''He who thinks he leads but has no followers is only taking a walk.''

The President should look around. He is alone on this issue. We shouldn't be putting our funds for the military and our defense at risk by diverting funds for an ideologically motivated agenda.

If this administration truly wishes to address the problem of CO_2 emissions, they should help the rest of the world tackle the deforestation of our tropical rain forests.

Al Gore and the Sierra Club acknowledge that deforestation in Africa and the Amazon is five to six times more of a polluter than the combination of every coal-fired powerhouse in America—five to six times worse. These tropical forests are being destroyed because developing nations don't have access to affordable electricity for heating and cooking and clean water.

Unfortunately, the debate on this issue has turned to name-calling. One of my colleagues today has called those of us who disagree with the President over this issue ''irresponsible,'' ''Republican science deniers,'' and ''members of the Flat Earth Society.'' Al Gore called people who question climate change policies ''immoral, unethical, and despicable.''

Mr. Chairman, you and I are old enough to know that bullying and name-calling are just childish tactics and don't have a place in this debate. Let's stop the name-calling. It is time for an adult conversation.

We should not sacrifice our economy and our national security by diverting funds in pursuit of an ideological crusade. This is not the time to divert our financial resources from our military for climate change purposes when we are confronting Syria, Iran, Russia, Libya, and other rogue nations around the world. In addition, we have Boko Haram, Hamas, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups promoting instability and threatening liberty and freedom around the world.

Consequently, this amendment will ensure we maximize our military might without diverting funds for a politically motivated agenda. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the McKinley amendment provides that the Department of Defense may not make decisions based on science. Imagine, the Department of Defense should not make decisions based on science. They should ignore that there may be a cost from climate change. This amendment waves a magic wand and decrees that climate change imposes no costs at all. Therefore, they would block the Defense Department from recognizing the damage caused by climate change.

This is incredible, because the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review called climate change ''an accelerant of instability or conflict'' that ''could have significant geopolitical impacts around the world, contributing to poverty, environmental degradation, and the further weakening of fragile governments.'' But the McKinley amendment tells the DOD to ignore these impacts.

Numerous national security experts with unimpeachable credentials—Democrats and Republicans alike—have warned that climate change threatens our national security. Just this month, a panel of retired three- and four-star generals and admirals released a report calling for action to address this problem.

It will be too late for action when they see some of their facilities being overwhelmed by the increase in rising seas or by storms that may destroy some of our defense installations. But according to this amendment, they can't look at that. They can't make decisions based on the science that may come from these governmental and other scientific agencies.

Well, I think that is science denial at its worst to say that the Defense Department cannot recognize damage caused by climate change. It looks like it is trying to overturn the laws of nature.

So we would tie the hands of the Defense Department and tell them that even though we might have exacerbated heat waves, droughts, wildfires, floods, water- and vector-borne diseases, diseases which will pose greater risk to human health and lives around the world, and wheat and corn yields are already experiencing the negative impact and we have a larger risk of food security globally and regionally, if scientists tell us that, we are not allowed to have our Defense Department pay any heed to it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to call anybody names, but I think this is a seriously flawed amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

And I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Catholic Church is still trying to live down condemning Galileo for suggesting that the Sun, instead of the Earth, was the center of the universe. But fortunately, our military and our President is on the right side of history and science.

Our military is listening to the facts and acting on the fact of climate change by ensuring that its assets are capable of withstanding more frequent and severe weather conditions, building resiliency in their command and control structures, planning military response contingencies that recognize the effects climate change is having on people, countries, and organizations around the world that may wish us harm. That is what this amendment would prevent the military from doing, because they are now reacting to the facts from these studies.

Climate change is a national security concern. It is a new form of stress on military readiness. The Navy, for example, just last week identified 128 naval installations that are going to be underwater in the near future if we don't take steps now to deal with it. It is a catalyst for instability and conflict around the world.

As my friend from California mentioned, the military's Quadrennial Defense Review states that ''the pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world.''

The results will be a higher demand for American troops abroad, even as we struggle to deal with the devastating impacts caused by flooding and extreme weather events at home. We have volatile regions around the world that are going to be driven to desperation and resort to terrorist activity in

response to the impacts of climate change and the resulting resource competition.

This is what the military is telling us. Climate change's ''effects are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad, such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions.'' It is a catalyst for conflict.

For the sake of our military, for the sake of our national security, we have got to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

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

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 590, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 2, 3, 5, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 32, 33, 60, 72, 82, 86, 100, 113, and 147 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 3___. OFF-INSTALLATION DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATURAL RESOURCES PROJECTS COMPLIANCE WITH INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Section 103A of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c–1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) COMPLIANCE WITH INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—In the case of a cooperative agreement or interagency agreement under subsection (a) for the maintenance and improvement of natural resources located off of a military installation or State-owned National Guard installation, funds referred to in subsection (b) may be used only pursuant to an approved integrated natural resources management plan.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

At the end of subtitle B of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 3___. RECOMMENDATION ON AIR FORCE ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES.

Congress recommends that the Secretary of the Air Force take action on identified energy conservation measures in a comprehensive and timely manner using an array of available funding mechanisms.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 5___. REVISED REGULATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) REVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSTRUCTION 1300.17.—

(1) REVISION REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue a revised instruction to replace Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17.

(2) PURPOSE.—The revision of Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17 shall address the Congressional intent and content of section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1727; 10 U.S.C. prec. 1030 note), as amended by section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 759), to ensure that verbal and written expressions of an individual's religious beliefs are protected by the Department of Defense as an essential part of a the free exercise of religion by a member of the Armed Forces.

(b) REVISION OF AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 1-1.—

(1) REVISION REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall issue a revised instruction to replace Air Force Instruction 1-1.

(2) PURPOSE.—The revision of Air Force Instruction 1-1 shall reflect the protections for religious expressions contained in—

(A) section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1727; 10 U.S.C. prec. 1030 note), as amended by section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 759); and

(B) the revised Department of Defense instruction referenced in subsection (a) if revision of that instruction is completed before the revision of Air Force Instruction 1-1.

(3) TERMINATION.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force issues a revised instruction to replace Air Force Instruction 1-1 and such revision is consistent with the purpose specified in paragraph (2), the requirement imposed by paragraph (1) shall no longer apply.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER OF MISSOURI

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

Subtitle H—World War I Memorials

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''World War I Memorial Act of 2014''.

SEC. 1092. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MUSEUM AND MEMORIAL IN KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, is hereby designated as the ''National World War I Museum and Memorial''.

(b) CEREMONIES.—The World War I Centennial Commission (in this subtitle referred to as the ''Commission'') may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies to recognize the designation of the Liberty Memorial of Kansas City as the National World War I Museum and Memorial.

SEC. 1093. REDESIGNATION OF PERSHING PARK IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS THE NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL AND ENHANCEMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—Pershing Park in the District of Columbia is hereby redesignated as the ''National World War I Memorial''.

(b) CEREMONIES.—The Commission may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies for the rededication of Pershing Park, as it approaches its 50th anniversary, as the National World War I Memorial and for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work as authorized by subsection (c).

(c) AUTHORITY TO ENHANCE COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may enhance the General Pershing Commemorative Work by constructing on the land designated by subsection (a) as the National World War I Memorial appropriate sculptural and other commemorative elements, including landscaping, to further honor the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I.

(2) GENERAL PERSHING COMMEMORATIVE WORK DEFINED.—The term ''General Pershing Commemorative Work'' means the memorial to the late John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States, who commanded the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, and to the officers and men under his command, as authorized by Public Law 89–786 (80 Stat. 1377).

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, applies to the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under subsection (c).

(2) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) SITE SELECTION FOR MEMORIAL.—Section 8905 of such title does not apply with respect to the selection of the site for the National World War I Memorial.

(B) CERTAIN CONDITIONS.—Section 8908(b) of such title does not apply to this subtitle.

(e) NO INFRINGEMENT UPON EXISTING MEMORIAL.—The National World War I Memorial may not interfere with or encroach on the District of Columbia War Memorial.

(f) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(1) USE FOR OTHER WORLD WAR I COMMEMORATIVE ACTIVITIES.—If, upon payment of all expenses for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under subsection (c) (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for such purpose, the Commission may use the amount of the balance for other commemorative activities authorized under the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2448).

(2) USE FOR OTHER COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—If the authority for enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work and the authority of the Commission to plan and conduct commemorative activities under the World War I Centennial Commission Act have expired and there remains a balance of funds received for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work, the Commission shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(3) of such title, except that funds in such account may only be obligated subject to appropriation.

(g) AUTHORIZATION TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION AFTER TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—Section 8 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112–272) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''The Centennial Commission'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (c), the Centennial Commission''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMPLETION OF NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL.—The Centennial Commission may perform such work as is necessary to complete the rededication of the National World War I Memorial and enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under section 1093 of the

World War I Memorial Act of 2014, subject to section 8903 of title 40, United States Code.''.

SEC. 1094. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT.

(a) EX OFFICIO AND OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.—Section 4 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2449) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) EX OFFICIO AND OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.—

''(1) POWERS.—The individuals listed in paragraphs (2) and (3), or their designated representative, shall serve on the Centennial Commission solely to provide advice and information to the members of the Centennial Commission appointed pursuant to subsection (b)(1), and shall not be considered members for purposes of any other provision of this Act.

''(2) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The following individuals shall serve as ex officio members:

''(A) The Archivist of the United States.

''(B) The Librarian of Congress.

''(C) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

''(D) The Secretary of Education.

''(E) The Secretary of State.

''(F) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(G) The Administrator of General Services.

''(3) OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.—The following individuals shall serve as other advisory members:

''(A) Four members appointed by the Secretary of Defense in the following manner: One from the Navy, one from the Marine Corps, one from the Army, and one from the Air Force.

''(B) Two members appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security in the following manner: One from the Coast Guard and one from the United States Secret Service.

''(C) Two members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, including one from the National Parks Service.

''(4) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in a member position under paragraph (3) shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.''.

(b) PAYABLE RATE OF STAFF.—Section 7(c)(2) of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2451) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''level IV'' and inserting ''level II''.

(c) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) LIMITATION.—Section 9 of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2453) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 9. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

''No Federal funds may be obligated or expended for the designation, establishment, or enhancement of a memorial or commemorative work by the World War I Centennial Commission.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(f) of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2452) is repealed.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 9 in the table of contents of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2448) is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 9. Limitation on obligation of Federal funds.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1107. PAY PARITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED AT JOINT BASES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''joint military installation'' means 2 or more military installations reorganized or otherwise associated and operated as a single military installation;

(2) the term ''locality'' or ''pay locality'' has the meaning given that term by section 5302(5) of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) the term ''locality pay'' refers to any amount payable under section 5304 or 5304a of title 5, United States Code.

(b) PAY PARITY AT JOINT BASES.—Whenever 2 or more military installations are reorganized or otherwise associated as a single joint military installation, but the constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality, all Department of Defense employees of the respective installations constituting the joint installation (who are otherwise entitled to locality pay) shall receive locality pay at a uniform percentage equal to the percentage which is payable with respect to the locality which includes the constituent installation then receiving the highest locality pay (expressed as a percentage).

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall be effective with respect to pay periods beginning on or after such date (not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section) as the Secretary of Defense shall determine in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any joint military installation created as a result of the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission in the 2005 base closure round.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the appropriate place in subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUTURE OF NATO AND ENLARGEMENT INITIATIVES.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress declares that—

(1) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and around the world for over 65 years;

(2) the incorporation of the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Albania, and Croatia has been essential to the success of NATO in this modern era;

(3) these countries have over time added to and strengthened the list of key European allies of the United States;

(4) since joining NATO, these member states have remained committed to the collective defense of the Alliance and have demonstrated their will and ability to contribute to transatlantic solidarity and assume increasingly more responsibility for international peace and security;

(5) since joining the alliance, these NATO members states have contributed to numerous NATO-led peace, security, and stability operations, including participation in the International Security Assistance Force's (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan;

(6) these NATO member states have become reliable partners and supporters of aspiring members and the United States recognizes their continued efforts to aid in further enlargement initiatives; and

(7) the commitment by these NATO member states to Alliance principles and active participation in Alliance initiatives shows the success of NATO's Open-Door Policy.

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

(1) at the September 2014 NATO Summit in Wales and beyond, the United States should—

(A) continue to work with aspirant countries to prepare such countries for entry into NATO;

(B) seek NATO membership for Montenegro;

(C) continue supporting a Membership Action Plan (MAP) for Georgia;

(D) encourage the leaders of Macedonia and Greece to find a mutually agreeable solution to the name dispute between the two countries;

(E) seek a Dayton II agreement to resolve the constitutional issues of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(F) work with the Republic of Kosovo to prepare the country for entrance into the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program;

(G) take a leading role in working with NATO member states to identify, through consensus, the current and future security threats facing the Alliance; and

(H) take a leading role to work with NATO allies to ensure the alliance maintains the required capabilities, including the gains in interoperability from combat in Afghanistan, necessary to meet the security threats to the Alliance.

(2) NATO member states should review defense spending to ensure sufficient funding is obligated to meet NATO responsibilities; and

(3) the United States should remain committed to maintaining a military presence in Europe as a means of promoting allied interoperability and providing visible assurance to NATO allies in the region.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. __. REPORT, DETERMINATION, AND STRATEGY REGARDING THE TERRORISTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ATTACK AGAINST UNITED STATES PERSONNEL IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA, AND OTHER REGIONAL THREATS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On September 11, 2012, United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya were attacked by an organized group of armed terrorists, killing United States Ambassador Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Glen Doherty, and Tyrone Woods.

(2) On September 14, 2012, President Obama stated that: ''We will bring to justice those who took them from us. . .making it clear that justice will come to those who harm Americans.''.

(3) On May 1, 2014, White House spokesman Jay Carney stated that: ''I can assure you that the President's direction is that those who killed four Americans will be pursued by the United States until they are brought to justice. And if anyone doubts that, they should ask...friends and family members of Osama bin Laden.''.

(4) In testimony before Congress in October 2013, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, asserted that the President lacks the authority to use military force to find and kill the Benghazi attackers.

(5) Since the Benghazi attacks, the President has not requested authority from Congress to use military force against the Benghazi attackers.

(6) No terrorist responsible for the Benghazi attacks has been brought to justice.

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

(1) the persons and organizations who carried out the attacks on United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya on September 11 and 12, 2012, pose a continuing threat to the national security of the United States;

(2) the failure to hold any individual responsible for these terrorist attacks is a travesty of justice, and undermines the national security of the United States; and

(3) the uncertainty surrounding the authority of the President to use force against the terrorists responsible for the attack against United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya, undermines the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(c) REPORT AND DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress—

(A) a report that contains—

(i) the identity and location of those persons and organizations that planned, authorized, or committed the attacks against the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya that occurred on September 11 and 12, 2012; and

(ii) a detailed and specific description of all actions that have been taken to kill or capture any of the persons described in clause (i); and

(B) a determination regarding whether the President currently possesses the authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States against all persons and organizations described in subparagraph (A)(i).

(2) FORM.—The report and determination described in this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form to the maximum extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(d) STRATEGY TO COMBAT REGIONAL TERRORIST THREATS.—

(1) TIMING AND CONTENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive strategy to counter the growing threat posed by radical Islamist terrorist groups in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel, which shall include, among other things—

(A) a strategy to bring to justice those persons who planned, authorized, or committed the terrorist attacks against the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya that occurred on September 11 and 12, 2012;

(B) a description of the radical Islamist terrorist groups active in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel, including an assessment of their origins, strategic aims, tactical methods, funding sources, leadership, and relationships with other terrorist groups or state actors;

(C) a description of the key military, diplomatic, intelligence, and public diplomacy resources available to address these growing regional terrorist threats; and

(D) a strategy to maximize the coordination between, and the effectiveness of, United States military, diplomatic, intelligence, and public diplomacy resources to counter these growing regional terrorist threats.

(2) FORM.—The strategy described in this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form to the maximum extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(3) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 12__. WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1793, George Washington said, ''The constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.''.

(2) In a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1798, James Madison wrote: ''The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.''

(3) In 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution which states in section 2: ''The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.''.

(4) With respect to United States military intervention in Syria, President Obama said, ''But having made my decision as Commander-in-Chief based on what I am convinced is our national security interests, I'm also mindful that I'm the President of the world's oldest constitutional democracy. I've long believed that our power is rooted not just in our military might, but in our example as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And that's why I've made a second decision: I will seek authorization for the use of force from the American people's representatives in Congress.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any use of military force.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title XII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1266. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN NIGERIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the jihadist organization Boko Haram;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Nigeria who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic Nigeria; and

(3) calls on the President to support Nigerian and International Community efforts to ensure accountability for crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram against the people of Nigeria, particularly young girls kidnapped from educational institutions by Boko Haram.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of initiatives undertaken by the Department of Defense to assist the Government of Nigeria to develop its own capacity to deploy specialized police and army units rapidly to bring Boko Haram leader Abubakar Shekau to justice and to prevent and combat sectarian violence in cities and areas in Nigeria where there has been a history of sectarian violence.

(B) A description of violations of internationally recognized human rights and crimes against humanity perpetrated by Boko Haram in Nigeria, including a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such crimes and, where possible, the origins of the weapons.

(C) A description of efforts by the Department of Defense to ensure accountability for violations of internationally recognized human rights and crimes against humanity perpetrated against the people of Nigeria by Boko Haram and al-Qaeda affiliates and other jihadists in Nigeria, including—

(i) a description of initiatives that the United States has undertaken to train Nigerian investigators on how to document, investigate, and develop findings of crimes against humanity; and

(ii) an assessment of the impact of those initiatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES OF MONTANA

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

SEC. 1636. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR TRIAD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review stated—

(A) ''After considering a wide range of possible options for the U.S. strategic nuclear posture, including some that involved eliminating a leg of the Triad, the NPR concluded that for planned reductions under New START, the United States should retain a smaller Triad of SLBMs [submarine launched ballistic missiles], ICBMs [intercontinental ballistic missiles], and heavy bombers. Retaining all three Triad legs will best maintain strategic stability at reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems or vulnerabilities.'';

(B) ''ICBMs provide significant advantages to the U.S. nuclear force posture, including extremely secure command and control, high readiness rates, and relatively low operating costs.'';

(C) ''a survivable U.S. response force requires continuous at-sea deployments of SSBNs [ballistic missile submarines] in both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, as well as the ability to surge additional submarines in crisis.''; and

(D) nuclear-capable bombers—

(i) ''[provide] a rapid and effective hedge against technical challenges with another leg of the Triad, as well as geopolitical uncertainties''; and

(ii) ''are important to extended deterrence of potential attacks on U.S. allies and partners.''.

(2) In a letter to the Senate on February 2, 2011, regarding the New START Treaty, President Obama stated that ''I intend to modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems: a heavy bomber and air- launched cruise missile, an ICBM, and a nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) and SLBM.''.

(3) In the Resolution Of Advice And Consent To Ratification of the New START Treaty, the Senate stated that ''it is the sense of the Senate that United States deterrence and flexibility is assured by a robust

triad of strategic delivery vehicles. To this end, the United States is committed to accomplishing the modernization and replacement of its strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and to ensuring the continued flexibility of United States conventional and nuclear delivery systems.''.

(4) On June 19, 2013, the Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, stated, ''First, the U.S. will maintain a ready and credible deterrent. Second, we will retain a triad of bombers, ICBMs, and ballistic missile submarines. Third, we will make sure that our nuclear weapons remain safe, secure, ready and effective.''.

(5) Section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 495 note) states that—

(A) ''It is the policy of the United States to modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems''; and

(B) ''Congress supports the modernization or replacement of the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems consisting of a heavy bomber and air-launched cruise missile, an intercontinental ballistic missile, and a ballistic missile submarine and submarine launched ballistic missile''.

(6) On March 6, 2014, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that ''our recommendation is to remain firmly committed to the triad, the three legs of the nuclear capability, and that any further reduction should be done only through negotiations, not unilaterally, and that we should commit to modernizing the stockpile while we have it.''.

(7) On April 2, 2014, the Commander of United States Strategic Command, Admiral Cecil Haney, testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that ''First and foremost, I think it is important that we as a country realize just how important and foundational our strategic deterrent is today for us and well into the future. As you have mentioned, there is a need for modernization in a variety of areas. When you look at the credible strategic deterrent we have today, that includes everything from the indications and warning, to the command and control and communication structure that goes all the way from the President down to the units, and to what frequently we talk about as the triad involving the intercontinental ballistic missiles, the submarines, and the bombers—each providing its unique aspect of deterrence.''.

(8) In the June 2013 Report on Nuclear Employment Strategy of the United States required by section 491 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the President, stated that ''the United States will maintain a nuclear Triad, consisting of ICBMs, SLBMs, and nuclear-capable heavy bombers. Retaining all three Triad legs will best maintain strategic stability at reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems or vulnerabilities. These forces should be operated on a day-to-day basis in a manner that maintains strategic stability with Russia and China, deters potential regional adversaries, and assures U.S. Allies and partners.''.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems consisting of—

(A) heavy bombers equipped with nuclear gravity bombs and air-launched nuclear cruise missiles;

(B) land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads that are capable of carrying multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles; and

(C) ballistic missile submarines equipped with submarine launched ballistic missiles and multiple nuclear warheads.

(2) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace a capability to forward-deploy nuclear weapons and dual-capable fighter-bomber aircraft;

(3) to deter potential adversaries and assure allies and partners of the United States through strong and long-term commitment to the nuclear deterrent of the United States and the personnel, systems, and infrastructure that comprise such deterrent; and

(4) to ensure the members of the Armed Forces that operate the nuclear deterrent of the United States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL OF VIRGINIA

Page 53, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 318. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AT FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION, CHINCOTEAGUE, VIRGINIA.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECT.—Notwithstanding the administrative jurisdiction of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration over the Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia, the Secretary of Defense may undertake an environmental restoration project in a manner consistent with chapter 160 of title 10, United States Code, at the property constituting that facility in order to provide necessary response actions for contamination from a release of a hazardous substance or a pollutant or contaminant that is attributable to the activities of the Department of Defense at the time the property was under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy or used by the Navy pursuant to a permit or license issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the area formerly known as the Naval Air Station Chincoteague, Virginia. Any such project may be undertaken jointly or in conjunction with an environmental restoration project of the Administrator.

(b) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the Administrator may enter into an agreement or agreements to provide for the effective and efficient performance of environmental restoration projects for purposes of subsection (a). Notwithstanding section 2215 of title 10, United States Code, any such agreement may provide for environmental restoration projects conducted jointly or by one agency on behalf of the other or both agencies and for reimbursement of the agency conducting the project by the other agency for that portion of the project for which the reimbursing agency has authority to respond.

(c) SOURCE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS.—Pursuant to section 2703(c) of title 10, United States Code , the Secretary may use funds available in the Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, account of the Department of Defense for environmental restoration projects conducted for or by the Secretary under subsection (a) and for reimbursable agreements entered into under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

Page 66, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 342. LIMITATION ON FURLOUGH OF CERTAIN WORKING-CAPITAL FUND EMPLOYEES.

Section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(s) The Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the military department concerned, as appropriate, may not carry out a non-disciplinary furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5) of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense whose performance is charged to a working-capital fund unless the Secretary—

''(1) determines that failure to furlough the employee will result in a violation of subsection (f); and

''(2) submits to Congress, by not later than 45 days before initiating a furlough, notice of the furlough that includes a certification that, as a result of the proposed furlough, none of the work performed by any employee of the Government will be shifted to any Department of Defense civilian employee, contractor, or member of the Armed Forces.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Add at the end of title V the following new section:

SEC. 5___. AUTHORITY FOR REMOVAL FROM NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF REMAINS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO HAVE NO KNOWN NEXT OF KIN.

(a) REMOVAL AUTHORITY.—Section 1488 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) REMOVAL WHEN NO KNOWN NEXT OF KIN.—(1) The Secretary of the Army may authorize the removal of the remains of a member of the armed forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in an Army National Military Cemetery from the Army National Military Cemetery for transfer to any other cemetery.

''(2) The Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, may authorize the removal of the remains of a member of the armed forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in a cemetery of the National Cemetery System from that cemetery for transfer to any Army National Military Cemetery.

''(3) In this section, the term 'Army National Military Cemetery' means a cemetery specified in section 4721(b) of this title.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by inserting before ''If a cemetery'' the following:

''(a) REMOVAL UPON DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTALLATION CEMETERY.—'';

(2) by striking ''his jurisdiction'' and inserting ''the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned''; and

(3) by inserting before ''With respect to'' the following:

''(b) REMOVAL FROM TEMPORARY INTERMENT OR ABANDONED GRAVE OR CEMETERY.—''.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the appropriate place in title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7___. RESEARCH REGARDING BREAST CANCER.

In carrying out research, development, test, and evaluation activities with respect to breast cancer, the Secretary of Defense shall implement the recommendations of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee to prioritize prevention and increase the study of chemical and physical factors in breast cancer.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the appropriate place in title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8____. SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (m) of section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m))

is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(7) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women meeting the requirements of paragraph (2)(A) if—

''(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

''(B) the anticipated award price of the contract (including options) will not exceed—

''(i) $6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial code for manufacturing; or

''(ii) $4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

''(C) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.

''(8) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women that meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(E) and is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are substantially underrepresented (as determined by the Administrator) if—

''(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

''(B) the anticipated award price of the contract (including options) will not exceed—

''(i) $6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial code for manufacturing; or

''(ii) $4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

''(C) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.''.

(b) REPORTING ON GOALS FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—Clause (viii) of subsection 15(h)(2)(E) of such Act is amended—

(1) in subclause (IV), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subclause (V) as subclause (VIII); and

(3) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclauses:

''(V) through sole source contracts awarded using the authority under subsection 8(m)(7);

''(VI) through sole source contracts awarded using the authority under section 8(m)(8);

''(VII) by industry for contracts described in subclause (III), (IV), (V), or (VI); and''.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES ACCELERATED.—Paragraph (2) of section 29(o) of such Act is amended by striking ''5 years after the date of enactment'' and inserting ''2 years after the date of enactment''.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title IX, insert the following new section:

SEC. 924. PUBLIC RELEASE BY INSPECTORS GENERAL OF REPORTS OF MISCONDUCT.

(a) RELEASE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who is—

''(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

''(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(b) RELEASE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE ARMY ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 3020 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Inspector General of the Army shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who is—

''(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

''(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(c) RELEASE OF NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 5020 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Naval Inspector General shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Naval Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who is—

''(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

''(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(d) RELEASE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 8020 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Inspector General of the Air Force shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who is—

''(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

''(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

Section 1075 is amended by adding at the end the following:

(d) UAS TEST RANGE CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this section, the test range program authorized under section 332(c) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note) shall include test ranges selected by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and any additional test range not initially selected by the Administration if such range enters into a partnership or agreement with a selected test range.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 11___. RATE OF OVERTIME PAY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY EMPLOYEES PERFORMING WORK ABOARD OR DOCKSIDE IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER FORWARD DEPLOYED IN JAPAN.

Section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015''.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Page 519, line 23, insert ''operationally realistic'' before ''intercept flight test''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL), my friend and colleague, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend from California, Chairman MCKEON, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in 1793, George Washington said: ''The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.''

In a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1798, James Madison wrote: ''The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrate, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the legislature.''

That is why it is right for President Obama to announce in the Rose Garden that he would seek congressional authorization before taking any military action against Syria. He said: ''I've long believed that our power is rooted not just in our military might, but in our example as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And that's why I've made a second decision: I will seek authorization for the use of force from the American people's representatives in Congress.''

It is deeply encouraging tonight, Mr. Chairman, to see such strong bipartisan support for my amendment, which advances the just cause of ensuring that the Obama administration and future administrations adhere to the Constitution and the grave matter of engaging U.S. forces in hostilities.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment includes two provisions that I authored. The first provision ensures that Navy employees, like those in Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, can continue to earn the overtime pay that they deserve when working overseas.

This amendment supports our national security and ensures that we are standing up for our civilian workforce. It allowed nuclear engineers to earn the same amount of money when they work in Japan as they would when they work in the United States.

Without that authorization to pay overtime to the civilian personnel serving the mission, we will lose the ability to attract and retain qualified and experienced men and women to step up and serve in this capacity. The inclusion of this provision helps ensure our Navy's readiness and fairness to our civilian employees.

□ 1830

I am honored to have worked with Representative FORBES on this provision, but I would also like to thank Chairman ISSA for his cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, this package also includes a provision that is aimed at saving taxpayer money, improving military readiness, and preventing needless delays and cost overruns that could harm our servicemen and -women.

Simply put, working capital fund employees should not be furloughed due to a lack of appropriated funds. They are not dependent on direct appropriations from Congress. As a result, furloughing working capital fund employees would save no money. Furloughing working capital fund employees would delay critical maintenance, drive up costs, and delay the availability of ships, planes, and other necessary tools that are critical to our national defense.

I am honored to have worked with Representative COLE on this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues' support for this package and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), my friend and colleague and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, religious freedom and defending freedom should not be mutually exclusive. America was founded on religious liberty, and it is part of what makes our country so great. The men and women in uniform who have volunteered to keep our country safe and to protect our Constitution should not see their own liberties violated.

My amendment ensures that all servicemembers—no matter their religion or rank or leadership—are afforded their constitutional right to free exercise of religion.

One of the driving factors behind recent violations of religious freedom in the military is simply bad rules. My amendment requires the Pentagon to rewrite their rules on free exercise of religion, both for the whole Department of Defense, and particularly for the Air Force.

I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for supporting this amendment, as well as Mr. FORBES and Mr. FLEMING, who are cosponsors.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, before you is a picture, a contemporary picture of the World War I monument in Kansas City, Missouri, the tallest and most majestic of the World War I monuments. Today, we are here in an unprecedented show of bipartisanship on this amendment, the World War I Memorial Act. This is the product of both sides of the aisle working together to do what is right to honor the memory of veterans who served long ago.

I especially want to thank Congressman TED POE, Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the National Park Service, and the entire Missouri delegation for their work on this amendment.

As you know, this summer marks the 100th anniversary of the start of World War I. The United States formally joined the war in April of 1917. During that time, more than 4.7 million Americans served, and of those brave men and women, more than 116,000 soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice. It is our job as Members of Congress to honor their memory and show our appreciation to the veterans of that Great War.

This amendment would honor that service by redesignating Pershing Park here in Washington, D.C., as the National World War I Memorial and will designate the Liberty Memorial as America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. I want to thank you, Chairman MCKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, and the Armed Services Committee staff for your fine efforts in bringing this important measure to the floor for our military.

I also want to take a moment, and this opportunity, to highlight the importance of modeling and simulation and the role it plays in maintaining our military readiness while being, of course, most cost effective.

Last year, in fact, in the National Defense Authorization Act, we put in language, report language, that highlighted modeling and simulation as a cost-effective tool in maintaining a high level of readiness for our military. In response, our armed services have followed suit in utilizing modeling and simulation effectively and continue to do so in current and future programs.

While that report language does not appear in this bill, it is important that our military continue utilizing this most cost-effective tool for manpower training.

As our Nation faces future threats, it is also critical that we are able to meet those threats with a force that is more capable and more ready for the challenge. Modeling and simulation enables our Nation's fighting men and women to do so, while decreasing costs during a time of budget uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I would just like to ask that you join me in support of utilizing this vital tool that saves taxpayer dollars and assists our Nation's heroes in training for our defense.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. I want to assure my good friend from Florida that I look forward to working with you to ensure that modeling and simulation remains an essential part in maintaining our military readiness.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. SMITH, and staff. I look forward to working with the committee and you and others ensuring that modeling and simulation remains being utilized as a cost-effective tool for our military readiness.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you to the ranking member and to Chairman MCKEON for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to highlight three amendments that have been accepted en bloc. One is the public release of substantiated reports of misconduct. These reports that show substantiated misconduct by the highest-ranking officials in the Department of Defense are only released when there is a leak or there are tips to reporters. It is incumbent upon us to make sure that the public knows when the Department's highest level officials commit misconduct and shouldn't depend on leaks for accountability.

The second amendment is a significant amendment for women-owned businesses in this country. For 20 years now, we have set a governmentwide goal of 5 percent. For 20 years, we have not met that 5 percent. This particular amendment takes away the extra obstacle that is imposed on women-owned businesses and not on others when sole-source contracting is provided.

The third amendment provides for breast cancer research. The Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee has recommended prioritizing prevention and intensifying the study of chemical and physical factors. This amendment urges that implementation.

A 2009 study at Walter Reed Medical Center found that breast cancer rates among military women are significantly higher—in fact, 20 to 40 percent higher—than they are in women in similar age groups. This is also a problem at Camp Lejeune, where we found that 85 men also were impacted by breast cancer because of contaminated drinking water.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time as well.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for allowing me to come before you today to speak on the necessity of preserving Pope Airfield's 440th Airlift Wing.

I introduced this amendment because of the incredible support the 440th Airlift Wing provides to our military and the necessity of its mission in maintaining readiness. The Department of Defense repeatedly says that they need flexibility, certainty, and time to complete their missions and maintain readiness. The 440th provides all of these, yet the Pentagon is attempting to deactivate the very unit that provides these three crucial elements.

Fort Bragg is home to the airborne and special operation forces. The proposal to remove every C–130 from this base contradicts its important mission. And even our President, Mr. Chairman, noted that we will be shifting more of our focus to special operations.

I thank the chairman for his continued support to address this ongoing issue and look forward to working with the committee to address this very important issue.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentlelady for her passionate and well articulated arguments supporting the 440th Airlift Wing which provides airlift to our Nation's paratroopers, including the storied 82nd Airborne. The 1,200 men and women who comprise the 440th Airlift Wing do an incredible job each and every day providing the airlift necessary to do their complex and challenging missions.

This provision highlights the difficulty we face as the top line budget has decreased and sequestration remains the law of the land.

We have been forced to make choices as we consider the defense bill that were far from ideal, but attempted to balance competing interests and minimize risk to the greatest extent possible.

That being said, the budget simply doesn't provide sufficient funding to meet the requirements identified in our Nation's defense strategy. I will continue to work with Representative ELLMERS and others to preserve assets like the 440th Airlift Wing, and most critically, on the true cost of our problem, sequestration.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) to talk about her very important amendment dealing with Boko Haram, as we all know, a significant problem that needs to be addressed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank both the distinguished ranking member and the distinguished chairman for their courtesies and as well my fellow cosponsors of this amendment, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from California and Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON from Florida.

This is a crisis. A couple of weeks ago, as you well know, across America we were stating these words, to find the girls, bring the girls back, #bringthegirlsback. Now we come some weeks later and we recognize that Boko Haram has to be a priority for the world.

This amendment causes this issue to be a priority listed in the Defense Department to determine the extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria. But as you can see, this is a larger issue, and now we face the idea of where these girls might be. So, in essence, this amendment expands the opportunity for the United States to work with clean battalions and Rangers that we know are established in Nigeria but also other resources around to rescue the girls but to also deal with the emerging terrorism of Boko Haram.

This is a crucial issue. And if anyone knows many of the stories, one that I know of is where a little girl was placed between two dead bodies.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. A little girl that I met today tells her story all the way from Nigeria, where her father was killed refusing to deny his faith, the brother was killed because they thought he might become a pastor, and the little girl was placed between the two bodies.

The killing is going on, 300, 118—this amendment will focus our Nation and allow and continue the resources to collaborate with Nigeria and these other nations to bring the girls back to their families.

It is a crisis. It is a crisis for the United States as it is for this entire region because Boko Haram is a terrorist group, and they must be brought to justice. The girls must be found. My amendment establishes that priority today, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

I thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their work on this bill and their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces.

I also thank them for including in En Bloc Amendment No. 1 the Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee Amendment, which makes three important contributions to the bill:

1. First, it strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the kidnapping of the more than 200 young schoolgirls kidnapped from the Chibok School by Boko Haram;

2. Second, it expresses support for the people of Nigeria who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic Nigeria; and

3. Third, it requires that not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment, the Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress on the nature and extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

This is about religious oppression and killing innocent women, men and children.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram. Boko Haram kills because of religion and holds little girls as slaves.

The victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers. And schoolchildren.

I am confident that the international community working with the African Union will assist

the Government of Nigeria in bringing and end to Boko Haram's reign of terror and ensuring that its crimes against humanity are documented so its leaders can be held accountable.

The Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee Amendment affirms that the United States stands with the civilized world in solidarity with the people of Nigeria.

The Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee Amendment affirms that the United States is fully committed to the fundamental principle that women everywhere have a right to be free, to live without fear, and should not be forced to risk their lives to get the education they want and deserve.

The violent modern day slavery and killing must end.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for including this amendment in En Bloc Amendment #1 and all Members to support it.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to commend your decision to deploy American security experts and equipment in Nigeria to help locate and rescue the more than 200 Nigerian schoolgirls kidnapped by the terrorist group, Boko Haram. We support your action and we strongly urge you to work in concert with the Government of Nigeria and the African Union to achieve this objective and to bring Abubakar Shekau and other leaders of Boko Haram to justice.

Boko Haram, a militant group designated by the State Department in November 2013 as a Foreign Terrorist Organization, has been conducting a reign of terror against innocent Nigerian women, children, and men since 2009, when it killed hundreds of persons during a raid of a police station in Maiduguri. In the last four years, Boko Haram has carried out more than 480 violent attacks against a broad array of targets: Christian and Muslim communities, government installations, schools, hospitals and medical facilities, aid workers and journalists. Since the beginning of 2013, more than 4,400 innocent persons have been killed and thousands more left homeless.

According to media reports, the leader of Boko Haram has threatened to ransom or sell the girls into the human trafficking market for about twelve dollars each ($12.00 USD). This outrageous conduct cannot be tolerated or overlooked. Not only is it a violation of the girls' human rights, it is also contrary to United States policy supporting and promoting equal access to education and economic opportunity for women and girls.

We know that terrorist groups cannot operate effectively without reliable and steady funding to support its criminal acts. Therefore, we urge you to work with the international community to detect, disrupt, and dismantle the funding networks financing Boko Haram, which published reports indicate has received as much as $70 million from other Islamist groups, including Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsular (AQAP), the Al Muntada Trust Fund, and the Islamic World Society.

Additionally, we urge you to consider working with the Government of Nigeria to develop its own capacity to deploy specialized police and army units rapidly to rescue the schoolgirls and bring Boko Haram leader Abubakar Shekau to justice. Such units also can be deployed to prevent and combat sectarian violence in cities and around the country where there has been a history of sectarian violence. The creation of an elite highly-trained rapid response unit would appear to be a sound short-term strategy that the Government of Nigeria should employ in dealing with violent groups like Boko Haram. This approach was used to successful effect by the Indonesia Government in 2004 to neutralize the Laskar Jihad terrorist organization.

Finally, we call upon you to take appropriate action to help the Government of Nigeria establish a Victim's Fund to provide humanitarian relief and economic assistance to the victims of attacks by Boko Haram so that they can rebuild their lives and communities.

''People are the great issue of the 20th century,'' declared, then-Senator Hubert Humphrey in 1948. The well-being of people remains the great issue of the 21st century. And there is no better measure of any society than the way its treats its women and girls. Boko Haram understands that when Nigerian girls are educated, Nigerian women can succeed; and when Nigerian women succeed, Nigeria succeeds. And that is why it is so important that the United States help Nigeria ensure that Boko Haram fails.

Thank you for your leadership and your consideration of our recommendations. We stand ready to work with you to bring about the safe rescue of the kidnapped Nigerian schoolgirls and to reunite them with their families and loved ones.

Sincerely,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

Marcia L. Fudge, Karen E. Bass, Donald Payne, Jr., John Lewis, Yvette D. Clarke, Robin Kelly, Janice Hahn, Sheila Jackson Lee, Terri A. Sewell, Corrine Brown, Frederica Wilson, Gregory W. Meeks, Barbara Lee, Marc Veasey, Members of Congress.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), my friend and colleague.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, ''If America is going to approach adversaries with a dove of peace in one hand, we must have a sword in the other.''

That is what President Reagan wrote when he used U.S. military strength to hasten the demise of the Soviet Union.

The nuclear triad is our country's most lethal sword. It makes the world safer by deterring our rivals and reassuring our allies.

The commander coin of Montana's Malmstrom Air Force Base expresses why nuclear deterrence works. It says:

Scaring the hell out of America's enemies since 1962.

My amendment reaffirms support for the nuclear triad, the airmen, and the sailors who work this mission because there is no greater asset for peace than an unrivaled U.S. military.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including such an important amendment from Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Congresswoman WILSON, and myself. I want to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for her relentless effort—her relentless effort—to make sure that we put the United States on record expressing very strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram, and also in condemning these despicable—mind you, despicable—crimes against humanity in the strongest way.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram, and we join with the international community in saying bring our girls back.

Earlier this month, Congresswomen JACKSON LEE and WILSON, along with Congressman HONDA, I, and 150 Members—bipartisan, both sides of the aisle—wrote a letter calling for the United States to work with the U.N., the African Union, and the Government of Nigeria to find these girls and bring the perpetrators to justice.

This amendment would give Congress a clear understanding of the nature and extent of the crimes committed by this terrorist organization and help us bring an end to Boko Haram's reign of terror.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1845

Ms. LEE of California. Let me conclude by saying that the girls should be able to pursue their education and live free from the threats of slavery, kidnapping, and violence. This resolution, in no uncertain terms, says enough is enough.

So thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE and Congresswoman WILSON, for making sure that, once again, we come together in a bipartisan way to insist that this terrorist organization is brought to justice and insist that we do everything we can do to bring our girls home.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I encourage our colleagues to support the amendments en bloc.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 341 of subtitle E of title III of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to ensure that the C–17 aircraft stays in flight and provides our troops with the same reliability it has provided for the last 20 years.

Tonight, I join my friend, Mr. COURTNEY from Connecticut, in offering this amendment. We want to ensure that this program is sustained and will continue in the best possible way, and right now, I seek a colloquy with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, the F–117 engine has a history of successful performance through a performance-based contract, and I believe that it is important that we keep these successful tenets available as we move forward in the next phase of a sustainment contract.

While I support cost visibility in this performance-based contract, I believe it is important that we do no harm to the success of the program.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern. We agree that we must ensure the successful sustainment of this critical engine.

I look forward to working with the gentleman as we move forward to conference with the Senate on this bill to ensure that we achieve both improved visibility and cost-efficiency for the government, as well as keeping a successful model for engine sustainment.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the chairman for that.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Westmoreland amendment to the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. It strikes section 341 which would negatively impact the venerable and highly effective F117 engine that powers the Air Force workhorse personnel and cargo transport, the C–17 aircraft. The existing language requires disclosure of proprietary information which would hamper contract negotiations, having the potential of posing a detrimental impact to the readiness of the fleet.

Today, F117 engines are sustained through an award-winning performance-based logistics contract that minimizes life cycle costs with fixed fees based on flight cycles. This contract type requires comprehensive understanding and investment by the service provider along with the engineering design expertise to develop and implement improvements in response to actual mission experience. It is vital that we use every practical means of providing for the defense of this country and the protection of our warfighters, including the appropriate use of competition and any other contracting method.

In fact, the Air Force has already taken steps to ensure these outcomes are achieved on the C–17 sustainment contract. Just last year, the Air Force held an open and transparent bidding process for the F117 and there was only one bidder. Under the current structure, the F117 service provider is incentivized to reduce total maintenance cost by improving reliability, increasing time on wing, and controlling shop visit cost. All of these factors have been good for the Air Force by minimizing operational disruption and reducing maintenance crew requirements and logistics infrastructure.

Section 341 of this bill jeopardizes the efficiencies and success the F117 performance-based logistics contract has achieved. This language could be interpreted as requiring the Air Force to significantly change contract structure for maintenance instead of requesting a robust price reasonableness assessment as is already required by procurement regulations. Changes in the F117 maintenance structure could be less effective in supporting the C–17 and may result in higher sustainment costs and lower readiness. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 370, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 1082. NTIA RETENTION OF DNS RESPONSIBILITIES PENDING GAO REPORT.

(a) RETENTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—Until the Comptroller General of the United States submits the report required by subsection (b), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information may not relinquish or agree to any proposal relating to the relinquishment of the responsibility of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (in this section referred to as the ''NTIA'') over Internet domain name system functions, including responsibility with respect to the authoritative root zone file, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions, and related root zone management functions.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the NTIA receives a proposal relating to the relinquishment of the responsibility of the NTIA over Internet domain name system functions that was developed in a process convened by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers at the request of the NTIA, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to the Internet domain name system. Such report shall include—

(1) a discussion and analysis of—

(A) the advantages and disadvantages of relinquishment of the responsibility of the NTIA over Internet domain name system functions, including responsibility with respect to the authoritative root zone file, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions, and related root zone management functions;

(B) any principles or criteria that the NTIA sets for proposals for such relinquishment;

(C) each proposal received by the NTIA for such relinquishment;

(D) the processes used by the NTIA and any other Federal agencies for evaluating such proposals; and

(E) any national security concerns raised by such relinquishment; and

(2) a definition of the term ''multistakeholder model'', as used by the NTIA with respect to Internet policymaking and governance, and definitions of any other terms necessary to understand the matters covered by the report.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, for over two decades, U.S. oversight of the Internet's domain name system has kept the global Internet free and open.

Though dismissed by NTIA as merely a clerical role of assigning and matching domain names with IP addresses, U.S. stewardship of these basic functions has prevented authoritarian governments from censoring content or restricting access to Web sites beyond their borders.

That all could change, Mr. Chairman, if the administration's announced intention to relinquish our oversight role to an undefined multistakeholder community is not carefully considered.

This isn't a hypothetical concern. Russia and China have already tried to put domain name authority in the hands of the United Nations' International Telecommunication Union, the ITU; and while the administration says it won't accept a proposal that puts the Internet in the hands of another government or government-led entity, there is no guarantee that won't happen after the initial transfers takes place. One thing is for sure: once our authority is gone, it is gone for good.

Now, some of my friends across the aisle will tell you, in a few minutes, that this Chamber voted in support of a transition to a multistakeholder model in the past. I voted for that resolution because I didn't—and I still don't—have an objection to the concept of a multistakeholder Internet governance, but that structure must be insulated from government influence.

We know bad actors will certainly try to interfere with whatever overseer takes our place, so that is why I am offering this trust but verify amendment today.

My amendment will simply require the GAO to review the proposals NTIA receives to replace our oversight. What

is the harm, Mr. Chairman, in taking this slow, deliberate process and making sure that we get this right? I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlelady from Tennessee for allowing me to help write this important amendment.

The President's unilateral handoff of key Internet functions to a multistakeholder community, without the consent of Congress, lacks a clear plan for how and what that community would look like and what authority it would have.

Now, we can debate later about whether Congress would actually ever give such consent, but for now, we are offering this amendment because Americans deserve to know that due diligence has occurred and that a clear plan exists for such matters.

America has proven, throughout history, that we are the vanguards of freedom, and we have an obligation to protect the Internet. The Internet is an unsurpassed vehicle for the free exchange of ideas; but it is more than just freedom. It is also about American interests.

The Internet is the single greatest economic machine created in the last 50 years—and perhaps ever—and its full potential is yet to be realized. America's role in its success is a shining example of our American exceptionalism.

It is not in our national interest to relinquish control of such a resource, especially without a clear path that will protect Internet freedom and American interests, but against the interest of individuals in the world who can't appreciate such freedom and the blessing, really, that this technology is.

So pass this amendment, I urge my colleagues, so we can give this issue the due diligence it deserves. The self-professed ''most transparent administration ever'' should want nothing less when it comes to this important issue.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Shimkus amendment. The amendment is identical to H.R. 4342, the DOTCOM Act of 2014. It would arbitrarily delay the transition of the United States' role in the management of the global Internet domain name system to the multistakeholder community.

It really does represent a very drastic departure from the support Members of this body have expressed for the multistakeholder model of Internet governance. In fact, despite the House of Representatives already voting unanimously three times in the past 2 years calling on the Obama administration to commit to a global Internet free from government control, the Shimkus amendment sends the exact opposite message by raising doubts about the strength and credibility of the multistakeholder approach.

NTIA's recent transition announcement will complete our 16-year-long effort to move management of the domain name system away from governments and into the private sector.

This objective has been the linchpin of U.S. policy, bipartisan through the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administrations, and the entire rationale for having ICANN, a private U.S.-based nonprofit organization created in 1998 to assume key responsibilities for Internet functions on behalf of the Internet's multistakeholder community.

Some of my colleagues raise the specter of Russia or China taking over the Internet as a reason for supporting this amendment. These threats against Internet openness are real, but claiming this amendment does anything to address them is false.

In fact, by creating an artificial delay in the implementation of the consensus transition plan produced by ICANN, the Shimkus amendment suggests governmental meddling in the multistakeholder process is entirely appropriate.

The reverse is true. Authoritarian regimes are already using the U.S. Government's stewardship of technical Internet functions as evidence for a need to move these functions to another governmental or intergovernmental entity like the United Nations.

This amendment further plays into the hands of these antidemocratic nations by emboldening their efforts to seize control of the Internet.

So I would say to my colleagues to support this amendment or the DOTCOM Act, they either show a lack of understanding of what our government's role actually is or a lack of confidence in the multistakeholder model and its ability to resist governmental control. Both serve to weaken our role in the global stage, not strengthen it.

The best defense we have against a governmental takeover of the domain system is to empower our allies in the multistakeholder community. Our diplomats, who have fought hard to preserve an Internet free from governmental control in global forums, tell us that having this transition is a critical continuation of our efforts to build upon the success of the multistakeholder model.

Now is the time to continue our unwavering support of that model. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the Shimkus amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say, as I try to wait for a few more colleagues, I would ask my colleague to define multistakeholder. They can't. The Internet community says it is us. The international community, the Russias and the Chinas say it is us.

So all we are asking is for a Government Accountability Office, the IG, nonpartisan, to whatever the agreement comes from NTIA, to say look at it. Do some due diligence. Make sure that this is in our national interest.

This is the most curious debate I have ever seen. Go slow. ICANN and NTIA say they want to go slow. What is the harm of having additional eyes on this process?

So the real debate is define multistakeholder. No one can do that because they don't know what that is. The Internet community says it is us, and we are going to have control, and all our net folks are going to drive this, and it is going to be okay. While our friends—or not friends—Vladimir Putin and China say: this is a way in.

I would rather make sure that, when we relinquish this, we know what the agreement actually is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

You know, we are pretty proud of the Internet. We want to keep it free and nongovernmental control. Multistakeholder basically means all of the stakeholders who have a stake in the Internet are going to be at the table having a discussion about how we are going to resolve this situation.

There is an apprehension that I don't think is well-founded that is reflected in this amendment. It is really, essentially, about delaying the process of these ongoing negotiations that have to occur in a very complicated global system which is called the Internet.

So the House has voted on this three times before. It has indicated its support through the Clinton, the Bush, and the Obama administrations. Every one of those Presidents, I think, shares the concern that every one of us in this House have about maintaining a free and open Internet. We have got to get on with the job.

Our view is that the Shimkus amendment would create confusion and delay and impede our ability to get to an end result that will make the Internet more secure, more free, and more open.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, the Shimkus amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to look at this agreement, to make sure it is in our national interest.

The Shimkus amendment would ask the Government Accountability Office to look at this agreement to ensure that it is in our national interest. That is what this amendment does.

The world has significantly changed since our vote of last year, and for anyone to say it has not is not reading the paper. You have got Russia, you have got China, you have got Iran, you have got Turkey—all meddling and trying to usurp and get involved in the World Wide Web. We should not relinquish this unless it is in our national interest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

□ 1900

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1032 and 1033 and insert the following:

SEC. 1032. GUANTANAMO BAY DETENTION FACILITY CLOSURE ACT OF 2014.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility Closure Act of 2014''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to—

(1) construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment; and

(2) transfer, or assist in the transfer, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of any individual detained at Guantanamo;

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before transferring any individual detained at Guantanamo to the United States, its territories, or possessions, the President shall submit to Congress a report about such individual that includes—

(1) notice of the proposed transfer; and

(2) the assessment of the Secretary of Defense and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security 18 Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) of any risks to public safety that could arise in connection with the proposed transfer of the individual and a description of any steps taken to address such risks.

(d) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used after December 31, 2016, for the detention facility or detention operations at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(e) PERIODIC REVIEW BOARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each periodic review board established pursuant to Executive Order No. 13567 or section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1564; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is completed by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) PRESIDENTIAL PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan describing each of the following:

(1) The locations to which the President seeks to transfer individuals detained at Guantanamo who have been identified for continued detention or prosecution.

(2) The individuals detained at Guantanamo whom the President seeks to transfer to overseas locations, the overseas locations to which the President seeks to transfer such individuals, and the conditions under which the President would transfer such individuals to such locations.

(3) The proposal of the President for the detention and treatment of individuals captured overseas in the future who are suspected of being terrorists.

(4) The proposal of the President regarding the disposition of the individuals detained at the detention facility at Parwan, Afghanistan, who have been identified as enduring security threats to the United States.

(5) For any location in the United States to which the President seeks to transfer such an individual or an individual detained at Guantanamo, estimates of each of the following costs:

(A) The costs of constructing infrastructure to support detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(B) The costs of facility repair, sustainment, maintenance, and operation of all infrastructure supporting detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(C) The costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the detention operations or prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies or State or local governments.

(D) Any other costs associated with supporting the detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(6) The estimated security costs associated with trying such individuals in courts established under Article III of the Constitution or in military commissions conducted in the United States, including the costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies, or State or local governments.

(7) A plan developed by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the heads of other relevant departments and agencies, identifying a disposition, other than continued detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for each individual detained at Guantanamo as of the date of the enactment of this Act, who is designated for continued detention or prosecution. Such a disposition may include transfer to the United States for trial or detention pursuant to the law of war, transfer to a foreign country, or release.

(g) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(h) FUNDING.—

(1) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4601 for military construction, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, for a high value detainee facility at Guantanamo Bay is hereby reduced by $69,000,000.

(2) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4601 for military construction, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, for planning and design for the Missile Defense Agency is hereby increased by $20,000,000.

(3) REDUCTION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount specified in section 4601 for General Reductions, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by $49,000,000.

(4) REDUCTION IN AMOUNT FOR GUANTANAMO BAY.—In the item relating to Guantanamo Bay in the table in section 2101(b), strike ''$92,800,000'' and insert ''$23,800,000''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, this is the amendment that will enable us to eventually close the Guantanamo Bay prison. There are several compelling reasons to do this.

First of all, we have reached a point where we are now spending $2.7 million per inmate at Guantanamo Bay. To contrast that, an inmate at a supermax Federal prison facility here in the U.S. costs roughly $78,000 a year. This is only going to become more expensive as the temporary facility at Guantanamo Bay is forced to last longer and longer. So the cost alone is reason, I believe, to close it.

Also, we have the larger issue. President George W. Bush wanted to close Guantanamo Bay, as did Secretary Gates, as did Senator MCCAIN. Many very conservative Republicans came out in favor of closing Guantanamo back in 2008. Why? Because the military told them that it was harming our ability to effectively fight al Qaeda and affiliated forces, that the presence of Guantanamo Bay was recognized as an international eyesore that undermined U.S. credibility with our allies abroad as we tried to prosecute that fight. There is no need for Guantanamo. So argument number one is all of the problems with it.

Argument number two is that there is no need for it, because what we could do would be—154 inmates who are in Guantanamo Bay, first of all, some number of them, I think it is roughly half, have been deemed not to be a threat to the United States. We just don't have anyplace to send them. So we can do foreign transfers, which we are beginning to work on. The rest of them that are a threat can be housed in supermax facilities in the United States of America.

Now, we constantly hear the argument that we can't bring terrorists to the United States. The way that argument is stated, it is like we are bringing them here and setting them free. We are not. We are going to lock them up and hold them. In fact, there was a recent ruling of the courts that made it clear those inmates would not be freed in the United States under any set of circumstances.

In addition to that, we have the ability in the United States of America to hold dangerous people. I will submit to you that if we didn't have that ability, we would be in a whole lot of trouble regardless of the people at Guantanamo Bay.

We currently house over 300 terrorists here in the U.S., including Ramzi Yousef, The Blind Sheikh, and a number of others. We have been able to successfully hold terrorists in the United States. We also hold mass murderers and gang leaders and mobsters. We have the ability to safely hold these people in the United States of America. So there is no downside to doing this.

The upside is to finally do what President George W. Bush recognized back in 2007 and 2008 that we needed to do, to close down Guantanamo Bay because of the international perception that it goes against our values and because of the very fact that it does go against our values to have people locked away in a prison that was originally set up under the hopes that somehow we would be able to avoid habeas corpus. Well, the Supreme Court said no, Guantanamo Bay is effectively under U.S. control, so habeas corpus applies anyway, so same amount of rights, same everything. It is simply an international eyesore that we keep open for no good reason.

This bill has prohibitions on closing it. My amendment would put in place a plan to close Guantanamo Bay by the end of 2016 and enable the steps necessary to accomplish that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield myself 2 minutes at this time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The Guantanamo facility is safe and the most appropriate location for detainees to be held. Detainees at Guantanamo are held there because they were engaged in dangerous acts threatening the United States of America and its allies. Some orchestrated and celebrated the murders of thousands of innocent Americans.

As in previous conflicts, it is entirely appropriate to hold detainees until enemy forces are defeated. In this case, it is al Qaeda and their associates.

The Guantanamo facility is ideal for this purpose. It is secure. It is relatively distant from the United States. It is difficult to attack. I can promise you that the Cubans have no interest in freeing the prisoners there, but there are people in this world that want to do that. We saw it at Abu Ghraib prison last year where many members of al Qaeda were freed. That prison was attacked, and they were freed.

So the Guantanamo facility is ideal for this purpose. It is secure and it is safe. It also provides humane conditions for the detainees. They have access to health care, recreational activities, cultural and religious materials. Also, Members of the House of Representatives routinely visit Guantanamo, and they have seen the humane conditions in which dangerous detainees are held.

Based upon these facts and the nature of the character of those held at Guantanamo, the cost already incurred in accommodating them, there is no reason to move the Guantanamo detainees to facilities in the United States.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I want to also thank the chairman, the gentleman from California, for his leadership in bringing the NDAA bill to the floor. Again, I want to salute Chairman MCKEON on the tremendous work that he has displayed here and all that he has done in support of the men and women in uniform of our country. So I do rise today, Mr. Chairman, in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Mr. Chairman, regrettably, events of the past year have demonstrated that the forces that threaten America's national security, the stability of our allies, and seek to subject millions to a tyranny that violates the most basic of human rights are on the rise.

A desperate dictator in Syria has used chemical weapons, a strong man in Venezuela is consolidating power, and Iran is inching closer to nuclear weapons and funding terrorism. North Korea continues to threaten America and our Pacific allies, and Russia recently invaded Ukraine. Now is not the time for the United States to recede from the global arena. Now is the time to lead and to project the strength that has protected America's interests for over half a century.

An America that leads is an America with military power that cannot be matched, because at all times we must be prepared to meet and confront challenges so that our homeland is protected, our allies are defended, and our enemies are defeated.

On a congressional delegation I led to Asia last month, I saw firsthand just how important it is for America to be engaged on the world stage. While in Japan, we toured the aircraft carrier the USS George Washington. While aboard the ship, we met with its crew and heard directly from its Naval commanders that the U.S. needs to have a constant carrier presence in the region.

America provides our allies with much-needed security and stability to a region that is threatened by a madman in North Korea and has seen China become more provocative and aggressive with its neighbors, particularly in the South China Sea.

The presence of our aircraft carrier is a vital part of guaranteeing that security which, in turn, guarantees America's security. One of the admirals even stated: ''In the world we are going to be operating in, we simply must have the USS George Washington.'' That is why I am so pleased that this bill begins to fund the refuel of the USS George Washington. Failing to do so would leave our allies in the region and throughout the world feeling vulnerable and embolden our enemies.

In hundreds of other ways, today's bill will provide our military with the resources it needs to remain the greatest fighting force in the world and keep America as a leader on the world stage.

Since the time of the revolution, my home State of Virginia has been a leader in contributing to our Nation's security. In addition to the thousands of Virginians who wear the uniform and those members of the military stationed in Virginia, tens of thousands of Virginians work in industries directly tied to supporting our Armed Forces and our national defense. I am pleased that this bill recognizes their efforts.

So today, let us stand together, pass this bill in a bipartisan fashion, and show the world that we are committed to being an America that leads.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman BUCK MCKEON, for all of his hard work on this issue, along with his members of the Armed Services Committee.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this important bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we are told in opposition to this amendment that terrorists have no constitutional rights. That is like saying rapists or murderers have no constitutional rights. But accused rapists and accused murders do have rights until it is proven that they are guilty, and then their rights are taken away from them. The same must be true of accused terrorists.

Ever since Magna Carta, we have denied the government the power to imprison and punish people on mere accusation. That is tyranny. The government's labeling someone a terrorist

doesn't make him one. The government must prove the accusation in court. That was always a bedrock American value until we opened Guantanamo. Now we imprison people indefinitely without trial. This must stop.

Guantanamo should be closed, and its inmates should be tried or released. Our Federal courts work. They have repeatedly tried, convicted, and sentenced terrorists to long prison terms. Prosecuting and imprisoning terrorists on U.S. soil has proven to be safer, less expensive, and less harmful to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, end indefinite detention, and restore our national honor.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment as well.

Transferring detainees to our homeland would require expensive new construction or renovation of existing facilities in the U.S. Current facilities at Gitmo already accommodate the detainees, their guards, all associated medical, recreational, and legal needs. Estimates for constructing or renovating similar facilities in the U.S. have ranged from $300 million to $500 million.

Meanwhile, the dangers are also clear. Moving detainees to the U.S. would make the facility housing them a terrorist target. For example, in 2010, New York City estimated it would cost $200 million a year to provide security when it was proposed some Gitmo detainees be moved to New York for trial.

In conclusion, there are no advantages of moving detainees to the U.S.; there are clear disadvantages.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, how much time is left in the debate on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

□ 1915

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, Guantanamo is a rallying cry for extremists around the world. Until we transfer and try these detainees, it is hurting our national security, and Gitmo is expensive. We are spending about $2.7 million per detainee per year at Guantanamo compared to $34,000 per inmate at a high security prison in the United States. In fact, the Pentagon is going to spend $435 million this year in operations and personnel costs for this facility.

The reality is we have 300 individuals convicted of crimes related to international terrorism that are currently incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons with no escapes or attacks in attempts to free them.

When the Authorization for Use of Military Force in Afghanistan expires, we have no plans. What are we going to do with these prisoners of war?

The Smith amendment should be passed.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment merely required the President to come up with a plan that Congress and the American people could look at on exactly what he would do and how he would do it to close Guantanamo, including what the costs would be, where he would move them, what the cost of security wherever he would move them would be, I might support that.

The truth of the matter is in all the time since the President has been in office, he has not come up with a specific plan that has gotten the support of the American people or this Congress. Even when Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress, they were not able to pass any legislation to close Guantanamo.

So if he can put a plan together that gets the support of the Congress, support of the American people, I think that may be a step forward. But to say we are going to close it and, oh, by the way, along the way you can tell us what you are doing and how you are doing it, that is putting the cart before the horse.

The President needs to get the support of the American people. So far he has not done that. The American people have been clear: they are uncomfortable with those detainees coming here. Therefore, it is premature to close it, and this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I have heard Members from both sides of the aisle speak out against this very notion that they do not want these types of detainees coming to their State or territory.

I will remind them that, as in previous conflicts, it is entirely appropriate and lawful to hold detainees until our enemy forces are defeated. I have not seen that. If al Qaeda is on the run, I think it is toward us, as we have seen so many actions taken by them in recent times.

I ask for your support in defeating this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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 Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 294, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 1034. DISPOSITION OF COVERED PERSONS DETAINED IN THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Due Process and Military Detention Amendments Act''.

(b) DISPOSITION.—Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1562; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''The disposition'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (g), the disposition''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) DISPOSITION OF PERSONS DETAINED IN THE UNITED STATES.—

''(1) PERSONS DETAINED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE OR THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT.—In the case of a covered person who is detained in the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act, disposition under the law of war shall occur immediately upon the person coming into custody of the Federal Government and shall only mean the immediate transfer of the person for trial and proceedings by a court established under Article III of the Constitution of the United States or by an appropriate State court. Such trial and proceedings shall have all the due process as provided for under the Constitution of the United States.

''(2) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER TO MILITARY CUSTODY.—No person detained, captured, or arrested in the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, may be transferred to the custody of the Armed Forces for detention under the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to authorize the detention of a person within the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, under the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act.''.

(c) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY CUSTODY.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 is hereby repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1029(b) of such Act is amended by striking ''applies to'' and all that follows through ''any other person'' and inserting ''applies to any person''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment would eliminate indefinite detention in the United States and its territories. So basically anybody who we captured who we suspected of terrorist activity would no longer be subject to indefinite detention, as is now currently the law.

The basic reason for this is our Constitution works, and we ought to value it and we ought to let the Constitution work. We have gone through article III courts to try, convict, and incarcerate terrorists successfully for decades. Yet, because of the 2001 AUMF, we still have on the books a law that would allow the President, any President now or in the future, to indefinitely detain any person in the United States if they determine that that person is affiliated with al Qaeda or affiliated forces. If they are acting in support of those organizations, they would be subject to indefinite detention and would not be allowed to due process rights that are in our Constitution.

That is an enormous amount of power to give the Executive: to take someone and lock them up without due process. It is not necessary. This President has not used the authority. President George W. Bush did not use it after about 2002 and then only in a couple of instances. It is not necessary. It is an enormous amount of power to grant the Executive, and I believe places liberty and freedom at risk in this country.

We need to eliminate indefinite detention in the United States. This amendment would do that clearly and unequivocally, and I urge support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a great amount of respect for my colleague and friend, the ranking member, but I strongly oppose this amendment.

My friend talks a lot about how we shouldn't limit the President's options with regard to Guantanamo. I don't think that we should be limiting our options in dealing with terrorists, and I can't imagine anything more fundamental than taking away the option to question al Qaeda terrorists bent on killing American citizens in whatever is the most effective way possible, and consistent with the law, to stop future attacks.

In the fiscal year 2013 NDAA, we addressed any misconceptions about the detention authority provided by the Authorization for Use of Military Force. We included the following language in the conference report:

> Nothing in the Authorization for Use of Military Force or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 shall be construed to deny the availability of the writ of habeas corpus or to deny any constitutional rights in a court ordained or established by or under article III of the Constitution to any person inside the United States who would be entitled to the availability of such writ or to such rights in the absence of such laws.

The NDAA has changed nothing with regard to the laws of war, our values, or our traditions. Our Supreme Court has agreed that appropriate detention and interrogation of al Qaeda terrorists is entirely lawful. It is false to imply that this is not the case or to something not in line with our values.

In fact, our courts have gone well beyond the traditional attachment of rights to our enemies and has extended the constitutional right of habeas corpus to foreign detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

This amendment would be the first time we self-imposed such a sweeping change to the conduct of war and our ability to gather intelligence.

Despite what any of us may want, al Qaeda has not surrendered. Far from it. The threat is evolving, but unfortunately for all of us, it continues.

We must oppose this amendment and preserve every lawful option in our arsenal.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The language within the NDAA about preserving rights is very confusing. I think it is very clear that the President does have the power right now to indefinitely detain people. So arguing that rights are protected, they are not. Indefinite detention is the law of the land. The President has the power to do that. Habeas corpus is one right. It is not due process. This law currently allows for due process to be ignored and for the Executive to indefinitely detain people.

The other big problem with this is it goes on forever. We have at different points in our Nation's history suspended habeas corpus—during the Civil War and other times of extreme danger. But in this case, al Qaeda and terrorism have been with us for a while. They are going to be with us for a long time to come in some form or another.

So to grant the President the power to indefinitely detain people is a long, long-term issue. Again, it is not necessary. Our article III courts have arrested, tried, convicted, and incarcerated hundreds of terrorists. It works. We don't need to give the President the power to throw out portions of the Constitution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has previously been defeated in the House. Members have voted on it before, and I think it should be defeated again.

This is the underwear bomber case. A foreign terrorist flies into the U.S. in order to kill as many Americans as possible. The bomb malfunctions, the terrorist is captured, he is immediately given under the amendment American constitutional rights, including the right to remain silent.

Now, in fact, the underwear bomber was questioned for about 50 minutes before the FBI gave him his Miranda rights and he quit talking. But meanwhile, when he knows he has the right to remain silent, he quits talking, we have no idea how many more bombers there are, where they may be, or how we may be attacked again.

Actually, this amendment goes further than the Obama administration even wants to, because the administration has admitted that there are several dozen terrorists in Guantanamo that cannot be tried in article III courts and are too dangerous to release. So what happens to them under this amendment? If they can't be tried, they are released.

Especially if you put this amendment with the previous amendment, they come here to the United States, they can't be tried in article III courts because it reveals too much information, so what do you do with them? That is part of the problem. We need this flexibility for indefinite detention.

Secondly, the Supreme Court has held that this right of detention goes hand-in-hand with an authorization for the use of force. I believe probably constitutionally the President has that authority when he has the authority to use military force. So trying to take it away not only limits the options, it is impractical in this case.

It is, of course, true that everybody detained has that right of habeas corpus to contest their detention in front of an article III court, as the gentleman said, even those foreigners held in Guantanamo. But to say that everybody immediately goes into the court system I think would be compromising our security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

First of all, Guantanamo Bay would not apply in this case. None of the people being held at Guantanamo Bay were captured in the United States, so this would have nothing to do with that. That is a vexing and difficult question. This applies to people captured from this point forward in the United States. It would not apply to Guantanamo Bay inmates.

Second, I want to deal with this argument about intelligence. It is an argument that has been made repeatedly that does not make any sense. This notion that somehow under the normal judicial process, under the normal law enforcement model you cannot collect any intelligence. Well, that would be a surprise to the FBI. It would be a surprise to every law enforcement agency in the United States of America that has been giving suspects Miranda rights, investigating crimes, and gathering intelligence for decades. Just because you tell someone they have the right to remain silent doesn't mean that they will, first of all.

Second of all, even if you don't tell them, everybody is aware of the fact

that they don't have to talk. We have used Miranda successfully to gather intelligence in a variety of different ways repeatedly. You will not lose that ability if you go through article III courts using Miranda rights.

Again, I want to emphasize, the idea that when you capture a terrorist, it never occurs to them that they don't have to give up information until you give them Miranda rights makes no sense whatsoever, number one.

Number two, over and over and over again domestic law enforcement officials have been able to give Miranda rights and gather an enormous amount of intelligence. That is a red herring in this argument.

Again, we come back to what the law does. The law gives the President of the United States the power to indefinitely detain people without due process. The Republican Party is always talking about freedom from government intrusion. They are concerned about the health care law, they are concerned about all manner of different things. This is a law that gives the President the power to lock you up and take away your basic freedom without due process. It strikes me that nothing could be more fundamental to those basic freedoms from government intrusion that we always hear about from the other side of the aisle than this issue.

I urge Republicans and Democrats alike to support this amendment. Take away the President's ability to lock people up indefinitely without due process. That is a gross, gross violation and an individual right that none of us in this country should stand for any longer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, admittedly, there are some difficult issues involved in detention, particularly with this war against terrorists that we are involved in.

But you have got to look at the bigger picture, and part of what one needs to look at is how one is going to deal with these situations. We just debated an amendment where the argument was close Guantanamo. Now we have an amendment on the other hand that says everybody that is here, including the people presumably that we would bring back from Guantanamo when it was closed, automatically and immediately goes to article III courts.

It is not my argument that some of the people in Guantanamo cannot be tried in article III courts. That is what the administration tells us.

□ 1930

So how does this fit together?

It doesn't, not without releasing very dangerous people out into society or into the world.

Secondly, when it is clear that you have greater rights when you come to the United States, rather than if you attack us from some other place, the incentive is to come to the United States because that is where you are given the greater rights. That is the perverse incentive under this amendment. It would be a mistake.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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 Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. HECK of Washington. 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 X, add the following:

SEC. 1011. MILITARY COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish a Military Community Infrastructure Program under which the Secretary may provide grants to eligible entities for transportation infrastructure improvement projects in military communities.

(2) APPLICATION.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Grants awarded under the Program may be used for transportation infrastructure improvement projects, including—

(i) the construction of roads;

(ii) the construction of mass transit;

(iii) the construction of, or upgrades to, pedestrian access and bicycle access; and

(iv) upgrades to public transportation systems.

(B) LOCATION.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, a project described in subparagraph (A) shall be—

(i) related to improving access to a military installation, as determined by the Secretary; and

(ii) in a location that is—

(I) within or abutting an urbanized area (as designated by the Bureau of the Census); and

(II) designated as a growth community by the Office of Economic Adjustment.

(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In awarding grants under the Program, the Secretary shall give consideration to—

(A) the magnitude of the problem addressed by the project;

(B) the proportion of the problem addressed by the project that is caused by military installation growth since the year 2000;

(C) the number of service members affected by the problem addressed by the project;

(D) the size of the community affected by the problem addressed by the project;

(E) the ability of the relevant eligible entity to execute the project; and

(F) the extent to which the project resolves the transportation problem addressed.

(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out using grant amounts made available under the Program may not exceed 80 percent.

(b) TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall conduct a traffic impact study for any urbanized area (as designated by the Bureau of the Census) that expects a significant increase in traffic related to a military installation within or abutting the urbanized area.

(2) CONTENTS.—A traffic impact study under paragraph (1) shall determine any transportation improvements needed because of an increase in the number of military personnel, including study of commute sheds affected by installation-related traffic.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing a traffic impact study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation planning organization with jurisdiction over the urbanized area; and

(B) the commander of the appropriate military installation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means—

(A) a State or political subdivision thereof;

(B) an owner or operator of public transportation;

(C) a local governmental authority (as such term is defined in section 5302 of title 49, United States Code);

(D) a metropolitan planning organization; or

(E) a regional transportation planning organization.

(2) METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION.—The terms ''metropolitan planning organization'' and ''regional transportation planning organization'' have the meanings given those terms in section 134(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of the Office of Economic Adjustment.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated, to carry out this section, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2015.

(e) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, to carry out this section during fiscal year 2015—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, is hereby increased by $200,000,000, with the amount of the increase allocated to administrative and servicewide activities, as set forth in the table under section 4301, to carry out this section; and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, is hereby reduced by $200,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress for the

brandnew 10th Congressional District in Washington State, I have the privilege to represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord, which is the largest joint operating base in America.

In the vicinity of Joint Base Lewis-McChord is Interstate 5, which is the most heavily traveled north-south freight corridor in our State. Nearly 80 percent of the traffic to and from JBLM relies on that interstate freeway.

Local travelers in neighboring cities have absolutely no other option except to use I–5 as an arterial, and when incidents occur, trust me, it can take hours to recover.

Around the country, military installations like JBLM are still adapting to base realignment and short-term growth caused by troops passing through before being deployed. Installation growth has had a significant effect on regional transportation, particularly when an installation is located in or near an urban area.

Even acknowledging the potential for drawdowns on military bases, those reductions would not nearly come close to alleviating the problem—not nearly.

Surrounding roads play an important role in preserving military readiness. Our Armed Forces need to instantly deploy, and we need functional roads in order to do that. If military personnel are caught in a jam and if nobody moves, efficiency goes out the window.

The domino effect of delays due to congestion, therefore, literally impairs our national security. This leaves not only military activities on base stranded, but also commerce in the congested area, and when we don't have a reliable roadway, economic activity halts. Goods don't move, and companies can't make money.

It is a cascading inaction, which affects our productivity and balance sheets, and it puts a strain on businessowners.

To be clear, the military is not to blame for this. Bases have come up with innovative approaches to ease the pain, but the problem remains severe and unavoidable without more investment. It is a Band-Aid over a wound that needs stitches.

The only existing DOD program that provides funding for public highway improvements is the Defense Access Roads Program. However, the DAR Program is limited by outdated and restrictive eligibility criteria and was designed when bases were only expected to be located in relatively undeveloped areas, which is clearly no longer the case.

DAR needs to be replaced with a separate DOD program to fund the transit services necessary to meet military needs.

I know being stuck in traffic is not something unknown to most Americans. We are all too familiar with the horrible feeling of approaching an unexpected slow crawl on the road, but when this affects our military's ability to get to base, to do the job, and to be ready for anything, that is when we can't just sit and wait for it to get better. We can and should do more.

Mr. Chairman, I plan to withdraw my amendment, but I will soon introduce a bill that embodies its concept, entitled the ''COMMUTE Act,'' and it will address these issues.

I hope, beyond hope, that I can look forward to working with the members and my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee on this plan to meet this very important need.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just want to quickly agree with Congressman HECK.

I used to represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord. It is the worst traffic in the State of Washington. The base more than doubled over the course of 7 to 8 years. It is a significant quality of life issue for our men and women and their families who are serving on Joint Base Lewis-McChord, and I am sure this is a situation that is repeated around many bases across the country.

So I strongly support his efforts to try and deal with this. This is something that directly impacts our troops and their families. I thank him for his effort.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. I, likewise, would be interested in working with you on this.

In southern California, I know a major highway runs right through Camp Pendleton, and there is a lot of traffic. With Congressman SMITH, I was able to visit Lewis-McChord, and I think you would find that a lot of people on both sides of the aisle would be willing to work with you on this bill, and I hope to be able to.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you, sir.

As is characteristic to both of you, thank you for your graciousness and for your positive remarks.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that there are some estimates that the Interstate 5 corridor around Joint Base Lewis-McChord—remember, I–5 extends from Canada to Tijuana—is the most congested chokepoint.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. JENKINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Ms. JENKINS. 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 XI, add the following:

SEC. 1107. PROHIBITION ON CONVERTING THE PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS FROM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE TO PERFORMANCE BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided under subsection (b), no Federal department or agency may implement or carry out a guideline, regulation, circular, policy, or other instrument to enable a Federal department or agency to convert to performance by Federal employees any function that, before the date of the enactment of this Act, was performed by contractor employees.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.— The prohibition in this section shall not apply to a function that is an inherently governmental function as that term is defined in section 5 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–270; 31 U.S.C. 501 note).

(c) PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION REQUIRED.—Before any Federal department or agency may convert any function from performance by a contractor to performance by a civilian employee of the department or agency, the department or agency shall conduct a public-private competition similar to a public-private competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 that examines the cost of performance of the function by civilian employees and the cost of performance of the function by one or more contractors to demonstrate whether converting to performance by civilian employees will result in savings to the Government over the life of the contract. Upon completion of the competition, the Federal department or agency shall select the option that is determined pursuant to the competition to result in the most savings to the Government.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

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

In 2008, Congress passed legislation to suspend public-private competitions at the DOD through the OMB Circular A–76. That moratorium remains in place today. In 2009, the OMB issued a memorandum which regulated the move to insourcing at the DOD.

Today, nearly half of the Federal Government owns and operates thousands of activities that are commercial in nature. These functions are not inherent or unique to government; rather, they can be found in small and Main Street businesses across the Nation. Not only are these Federal agencies duplicating private business, but many engage in unfair government competition with the private sector.

My amendment seeks to place a moratorium on the insourcing of previously contracted activities within the DOD. Exceptions would be made, number one, if the activity were inherently governmental and, thereby, should never have been contracted out in the first place; or, number two, if the DOD would employ a reverse A–76 to itemize specific costs saved to the taxpayer, should the DOD be able to

perform the commercial activity more efficiently for the taxpayer.

According to the OMB, the act of conducting the A–76 competition alone can generate a savings of 10 to 40 percent on average. That is just the average savings generated from simply going through the process.

While the A–76 process is not perfect, it is the best opportunity we have for a cost comparison. As an accountant, I understand the importance of a cost comparison. This amendment is just the first step. Studies also show that utilizing the A–76 public-private cost comparisons can save up to $27 billion per year. Again, this is just by implementing the cost comparison tool.

In 2011, the Department of Defense completed a report in response to section 325 of the NDAA for fiscal year 2010, which concluded with two major recommendations to Congress, the first of which is to lift the suspension on A–76 competitions. This is the recommendation from the DOD.

This amendment will provide the DOD with the flexibility to use the private sector for commercial activities and save valuable taxpayer money. I encourage a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

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

I rise this evening in strong opposition to this amendment.

Put simply, this amendment would cost taxpayers. It would not be in the best interests of our military readiness, and it is not supported by the Department of Defense. This amendment is extreme in its intention.

It overrides every other law on the books in terms of the management of the national defense workload by prohibiting the transfer of the workload from the private sector to the public sector.

For years now, Congress and the DOD have established statutes, regulations, and policies for determining the correct mix of the workforce between military contractor and civilian.

As the cochair of the Depot and Arsenal Caucus, I am deeply concerned that this amendment would put back into place a severely flawed system that would do significant damage to our organic industrial base, including to our arsenals and depots, at a time when it is critical that we maintain these facilities' capabilities to equip our troops.

I proudly represent the Rock Island Arsenal, where thousands of highly skilled people work every day to equip our troops. Our organic industrial base has, time and again, shown its critical importance to our men and women in uniform.

When our troops on the ground needed improved armor on their vehicles, it was the Rock Island Arsenal that was able to rapidly produce and field that lifesaving armor to protect our troops; and as a military parent, I am personally thankful that the workforce at Rock Island Arsenal and organic industrial base facilities across our country are there to equip our men and women in uniform.

This amendment would starve our critical organic industrial base, sending it into a death spiral, undermining key elements of our national security infrastructure, and reducing our ability to meet our national security strategy.

In addition to the impact on military operations, this amendment would also not produce the best value for the Department of Defense and for our servicemen and servicewomen. Again, it is not wanted by our Nation's military leaders.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the amendment of my colleague's from Kansas.

Our military has three workforces. We have the uniformed, we have the civilian, and we have the contractor. All three are vital to the national security of this country. The defense workforce must be managed in what makes the most long-term sense for both the mission of national security and the taxpayer.

This amendment would prohibit the insourcing of contracted services, even when it would make sense for the taxpayer and would save money. By disrupting the Department of Defense's management practice, this amendment would impair military readiness. The Department did not ask for this proposed change, and it is against this amendment.

I believe that this amendment is bad for the long-term security of the Nation, and I would ask that you oppose it.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for my friends from Kansas. We usually agree, but in this case, we don't.

I represent Tinker Air Force Base, which has 15,000 Federal civilian defense employees, along with thousands of private employees, working in contract facilities on and around the base. Usually, they work together, but sometimes, they compete for work. When they do, that work should go to whomever can do the work better and cheaper.

This amendment overrides every other law in the book, in terms of managing the defense workload by prohibiting the transfer of the workload from the private to the public sector, even when the public sector can do it better and cheaper.

□ 1945

That, in my view is inefficient, it is counterproductive, and ultimately it is unfair. We should allow the work to flow to those best able to complete it, and we should rely on the services to actually make the decisions in this regard.

So I urge the rejection of the amendment.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, opponents may argue that this is a burden to place on the DOD when they are seeking to insource, but I believe that ensuring taxpayer dollars are well spent and that taxpayers are getting the best value for their money is hardly a burden.

A formal, documented process which shows the cost savings will make sure that this is fair for the small businesses who depend on these contracts to thrive.

The American Legion approves of this proposed amendment. They stated:

> The practice of converting functions and services that have been performed by contractors with government employees limits the amount of contracts that can go to the private sector to stimulate and grow the veteran small business industrial base. When the government takes a couple of positions away from a small business, they are essentially crippling the small business' ability to succeed in the private sector. These practices primarily affect small businesses, as large contractors are rarely affected by insourcing policy because of their size and number of employees.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this chart—for those with keen eyesight—kind of puts this in perspective.

The blue is what we spend on the civilian workforce. The green is what has been spent over the last decade on military personnel. The yellow is on contract services. And the white is the rest of it.

The premise of this amendment is that the blue is too big.

There are times when competition, especially on acquisition, is extremely helpful. There are also times where competition on sustainment or maintenance has a habit of unintentionally hurting our readiness, at least that was the result of the GAO study in 2010.

So the committee has wisely tried to strike a balance between those two, making sure that there is competition when it makes sense, all of which is defined in title X of our code, which demands a core workload be established

by the military of what our needs are and what is most cost-effective.

Unfortunately, the first line of the amendment which says that ''notwithstanding any other provision of law'' simply turns all of that on its head. This takes precedence over the entire code, which I am assuming is the reason DOD communicated the Defense Department does not want this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is also supported by the TRSA, MAPPS, the Business Coalition for Fair Competition, and the American Conservative Union.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit their statements in support for the RECORD.

SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD IN SUPPORT OF JENKINS AMENDMENT #135

Textile Rental Services Association (TRSA): In its 1996 examination of the issue, the Center for Naval Analyses likewise found benefits of competing work. The visibility and identification of alternate providers were beneficial aspects of the process identified by the Center. As a bottom line, the Center for Naval Analyses determined a 30% average savings resulted from this beneficial focus on competition, with savings persisting over time. A leaner, more efficient government is a worthy goal, and Rep. Jenkins (KS) Amendment #135 is a means to achieve this goal.

MAPPS: We have seen insourcing take place beyond 'inherently governmental' activities such as commercial activities like mapping and geospatial activities. The Jenkins Amendment is the fairest approach by helping defend business opportunities for the private sector, including small business.

Business Coalition for Fair Competition (BCFC): The Jenkins Amendment is the 'yellow pages test' personified. This amendment 1) prevents the outright conversion of ''commercial activities'' from private sector firms into DOD performance; 2) requires an official cost accounting be performed and documented to identify whether DOD performance is more cost effective than the private sector contractor; and 3) helps protect private sector firms, including small business, from losing contracts taken away unfairly by the Federal government.

American Conservative Union (ACU): The Jenkins Amendment is essential to stopping the government goliath from gobbling up jobs that belong in the private sector. Rather than wringing our hands over slow growth and the lack of good paying jobs, we should start by protecting existing private sector jobs from further 'insourcing' by this Administration. This amendment will help do that.

Ms. JENKINS. In closing, my amendment seeks to strike a balance. If the service is inherently governmental, it should be contracted out. If it is a commercial activity, the Federal Government owes it to the American taxpayer to get the best value, the most efficiency, and the best service available.

We owe this to our warfighters to ensure they are receiving the best possible services as they protect us. This cannot be assured without the use of a fair competitive processes. With a debt of more than $17 trillion, calls for reductions that will erode the end strength of our military and a stagnant private-sector job market, we must find ways to reduce spending and find efficiencies at DOD while boosting job creation in our communities.

This amendment is an opportunity to vote for small business, break up Federal monopolies, ensure more efficient services, empower the warfighter, and maintain funding for DOD.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chair, I submit the following statements in support of Jenkins Amendment #15 to H.R. 4435.

National Veteran Small Business Coalition (NVSBC): ''The National Veteran Small Business Coalition (NVSBC) has seen the negative effect of Insourcing on veteran and service disabled veteran small businesses over the last few years. Veterans who have fought for this government should not have to compete for business opportunities with the same government who ordered them in harm's way.

Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI): A leaner, more efficient government is a worthy goal. Competitive sourcing provides important, demonstrable benefits for our business workforce, our economy, and our government's efficiency. The Competitive Enterprise Institute supports Rep. Lynn Jenkins' insourcing-and-outsourcing-related amendment to achieve that goal.

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

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. __. LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW START TREATY.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used for implementation of the New START Treaty until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory;

(2) the Russian Federation is respecting the sovereignty of all Ukrainian territory;

(3) the Russian Federation is no longer taking actions that are inconsistent with the INF Treaty;

(4) the Russian Federation is in compliance with the CFE Treaty and has lifted its suspension of Russian observance of its treaty obligations; and

(5) there have been no inconsistencies by the Russian Federation with New START Treaty requirements.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' 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.

(2) CFE TREATY.—The term ''CFE Treaty'' means the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed at Paris November 19, 1990, and entered into force July 17, 1992.

(3) INF TREATY.—The term ''INF Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(4) NEW START TREATU.—The term ''New START Treaty'' means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to funds described in subsection (a) that are unobligated as of such date of enactment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. The United States should not be spending money to disarm ourselves—to dramatically cut our strategic nuclear deterrent under the New START Treaty—if the other party to the treaty is not trustworthy.

At the moment, the Russian Federation is clearly not trustworthy.

Let me remind us all of Russia's current record on observing treaties and agreements.

In 1994, Russia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and the United States signed the Budapest Memorandum. This agreement included a commitment to ''respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine.'' But this agreement did not keep Putin from invading Ukrainian territory.

Strike one.

In January, The New York Times revealed that the Russian Federation was cheating on another treaty—the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, or INF Treaty. According to the story, our State Department has been raising the INF cheating issue with the Russians for about a year now, with no response.

Strike two.

In 2007, President Putin announced that he was suspending Russian participation in the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, or CFE. This came after years of Russian violations of the CFE Treaty.

Strike three.

Is the Russian government trustworthy?

The answer is clearly no.

The question for us tonight under my amendment is whether it makes sense for us to spend money on reducing our nuclear deterrent when the other party to the New START Treaty is not trustworthy. If you trust Vladimir Putin and the Russian government, vote against this amendment. But if you, like me, don't want to put our national security in the hands of a serial treaty violator, please vote for this amendment.

We should not be spending money implementing the New START Treaty, which reduces our nuclear forces, unless and until Russia makes it clear that they are a responsible actor and will abide by the agreements they make.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, on the trust issue, you wouldn't have to negotiate with people that you trusted.

Unfortunately, regrettably, we have to negotiate with people all the time who are not entirely trustworthy. That is why Ronald Reagan always said, ''Trust but verify,'' which I think was wrong. Let's verify. Trust is a very difficult thing.

Obviously, Russia has proven itself untrustworthy, but they have consistently reduced their nuclear weapons arsenal as a result of treaties that were first negotiated by Ronald Reagan, and many others.

They have also worked cooperatively with us to contain nuclear material, which has been enormously important. They would be a huge terrorist threat if they were to ever get their hands on nuclear material. Outside of the United States, the former Soviet Union—and now Russia—is the number one place where you have that nuclear material.

So having some measure of cooperation with them to contain and reduce that material is enormously important. That is the goal of the START Treaty.

It is not a matter of whether or not you trust Putin or Russia. I don't trust many people, just in general, and I certainly don't trust them. The question is: is the START Treaty, an effort to reduce the number of nuclear weapons that Russia has and to contain and control the fissile material that they have, is that in our best interest?

It is. And we should negotiate that.

Certainly, what Putin is doing in the Ukraine is reprehensible and violates all manner of treaties. I support the President and the efforts of others to condemn and sanction them as a result.

But to walk away from an effort to contain nuclear weapons I don't believe is in the best interest of the U.S. It is not a matter of whether you trust Russia; it is a matter of what it is in our best interest. I believe it is in our best interest to try to contain the nuclear fissile material available out there in the world. START is one way to do that. Walking away from this just because we don't trust Putin—and we don't—is not sound policy.

I urge opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to my colleague by saying there is a flaw in the New START Treaty, in my opinion, in that it originally called for reductions in U.S. nuclear forces and allowed Russia to increase its nuclear forces.

So that right there I think is a problem. But when you have serial violations by the Russian Federation invading Ukraine, in violation of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, the INF Treaty, and the CFE Treaty, they are not a reliable partner in these treaties.

And so to reduce our forces, how can that be in our interest when the other party to the treaty is not someone who is performing on these other treaties? There could be questions on whether they are even fully complying with the New START Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I will enter into the RECORD an article from The New York Times dated January 29 of this year detailing some of their violations of the INF Treaty.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 2014]

U.S. SAYS RUSSIA TESTED MISSILE, DESPITE TREATY

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON.—The United States informed its NATO allies this month that Russia had tested a new ground-launched cruise missile, raising concerns about Moscow's compliance with a landmark arms control accord.

American officials believe Russia began conducting flight tests of the missile as early as 2008. Such tests are prohibited by the treaty banning medium-range missiles that was signed in 1987 by President Ronald Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader at the time, and that has long been viewed as one of the bedrock accords that brought an end to the Cold War.

Beginning in May, Rose Gottemoeller, the State Department's senior arms control official, has repeatedly raised the missile tests with Russian officials, who have responded that they investigated the matter and consider the case to be closed. But Obama administration officials are not yet ready to formally declare the tests of the missile, which has not been deployed, to be a violation of the 1987 treaty.

With President Obama pledging to seek deeper cuts in nuclear arms, the State Department has been trying to find a way to resolve the compliance issue, preserve the treaty and keep the door open to future arms control accords.

''The United States never hesitates to raise treaty compliance concerns with Russia, and this issue is no exception,'' Jen Psaki, the State Department spokeswoman, said. ''There's an ongoing review process, and we wouldn't want to speculate or prejudge the outcome.''

Other officials, who asked not to be identified because they were discussing internal deliberations, said there was no question the missile tests ran counter to the treaty and the administration had already shown considerable patience with the Russians. And some members of Congress, who have been briefed on the tests on a classified basis for well over a year, have been pressing the White House for a firmer response.

A public dispute over the tests could prove to be a major new irritant in the already difficult relationship between the United States and Russia. In recent months, that relationship has been strained by differences over how to end the fighting in Syria; the temporary asylum granted to Edward J. Snowden, the former National Security Agency contractor; and, most recently, the turmoil in Ukraine.

The treaty banning the testing, production and possession of medium-range missiles has long been regarded as a major step toward curbing the American and Russian arms race. ''The importance of this treaty transcends numbers,'' Mr. Reagan said during the treaty signing, adding that it underscored the value of ''greater openness in military programs and forces.''

But after President Vladimir V. Putin rose to power and the Russian military began to re-evaluate its strategy, the Kremlin developed second thoughts about the accord. During the administration of President George W. Bush, Sergei B. Ivanov, the Russian defense minister, proposed that the two sides drop the treaty.

Though the Cold War was over, he argued that Russia still faced threats from nations on its periphery, including China and potentially Pakistan. But the Bush administration was reluctant to terminate a treaty that NATO nations regarded as a cornerstone of arms control and whose abrogation would have enabled the Russians to increase missile forces directed at the United States' allies in Asia.

Since Mr. Obama has been in office, the Russians have insisted they want to keep the agreement. But in the view of American analysts, Russia has also mounted a determined effort to strengthen its nuclear abilities to compensate for the weakness of its conventional, nonnuclear forces.

At the same time, in his State of the Union address last year, Mr. Obama vowed to ''seek further reductions in our nuclear arsenals,'' a goal American officials at one point hoped might form part of Mr. Obama's legacy.

But administration officials and experts outside government say Congress is highly unlikely to approve an agreement mandating more cuts unless the question of Russian compliance with the medium-range treaty is resolved.

''If the Russian government has made a considered decision to field a prohibited system,'' Franklin C. Miller, a former defense official at the White House and the Pentagon, said, ''then it is the strongest indication to date that they are not interested in pursuing any arms control, at least through the remainder of President Obama's term.''

It took years for American intelligence to gather information on Russia's new missile system, but by the end of 2011, officials say it was clear that there was a compliance concern.

There have been repeated rumors over the last year that Russia may have violated some of the provisions of the 1987 treaty. But the nature of that violation has not previously been disclosed, and some news reports have focused on the wrong system: a new two-stage missile called the RS–26. The Russians have flight-tested it at medium range, according to intelligence assessments, and the prevailing view among Western officials is that it is intended to help fill the gap in Russia's medium-range missile capabilities that resulted from the 1987 treaty. The

treaty defines medium-range missiles as ground-launched ballistic or cruise missiles capable of flying 300 to 3,400 miles.

But because Russia has conducted a small number of tests of the RS–26 at intercontinental range, it technically qualifies as a long-range system and will be counted under the treaty known as New Start, which was negotiated by the Obama administration. So it is generally considered by Western officials to be a circumvention, but not a violation, of the 1987 treaty

One member of Congress who was said to have raised concerns that the suspected arms control violation might endanger future arms control efforts was John Kerry. As a senator and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he received a classified briefing on the matter in November 2012 that dealt with compliance concerns, according to a report in The Daily Beast.

As secretary of state, Mr. Kerry has not raised concerns over the cruise missile tests with his Russian counterpart, Sergey V. Lavrov, but he has emphasized the importance of complying with arms accords, a State Department official said.

Republican lawmakers, however, have urged the administration to be more aggressive.

''Briefings provided by your administration have agreed with our assessment that Russian actions are serious and troubling, but have failed to offer any assurance of any concrete action to address these Russian actions,'' Representative Howard McKeon, Republican of California and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and Representative Mike Rogers, the Michigan Republican who leads the Intelligence Committee, said in an April letter to Mr. Obama.

And Senator Jim Risch, Republican of Idaho, and 16 other Republican senators recently proposed legislation that would require the White House to report to Congress on what intelligence the United States has shared with NATO allies on suspected violations of the 1987 treaty.

Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have also cited the issue in holding up Ms. Gottemoeller's confirmation as under secretary of state for arms control and international security.

It was against this backdrop that the so-called deputies committee, an interagency panel led by Antony Blinken, Mr. Obama's deputy national security adviser, decided that Ms. Gottemoeller should inform NATO's 28 members about the compliance issue.

On Jan. 17, Ms. Gottemoeller discussed the missile tests in a closed-door meeting of NATO's Arms Control, Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Committee that she led in Brussels.

The Obama administration, she said, had not given up on diplomacy. There are precedents for working out disputes over arms control complaints, and Ms. Gottemoeller said American officials would continue to engage the Russians to try to resolve the controversy.

But even with the best of intentions, establishing what the Russians are doing may not be easy. The elaborate network of verification provisions created under the medium-range missile treaty is no longer in effect, since all the missiles that were believed to be covered by the agreement were long thought to have been destroyed by May 1991.

Mr. LAMBORN. At this point I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my colleague.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, again, I am pleased to join my friend from Colorado on this particular issue.

When you have a partner, which is Russia, who is already engaged in a cyberattack against Estonia, they have invaded and declared independent the two northern provinces of Georgia, and they also have done everything we know about in the Ukraine right now, and, in addition, have violated the existing INF Treaty—and we can talk about that classified material because it was quoted on the front page of The New York Times; they have violated that—it is in the best interest of the United States to wait until we have a more profitable, reliable partner before launching into another endeavor.

With that, I actually support this amendment. I think it is well-timed, well-placed.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

First of all, just for everybody's information, you cannot actually reveal classified information, even if it has showed up in the newspaper, because then you are confirming it. So you are not supposed to do that.

Second of all, if you don't like the START Treaty, that is one thing. We can have that debate. We had that debate in the Senate and a bipartisan group of senators confirmed the treaty and then passed it. That is a separate debate. If you are trying to still reopen that, that is something that the Senate has already determined.

Again, it is not a matter of Russia being trustworthy. I don't think of them as a partner. I think of them has a reality that we have to deal with.

In the one area where they have been fairly consistent, again, starting with the treaty negotiated under Ronald Reagan, is they have reduced their nuclear forces and worked with us to contain their fissile material after the breakup of the Soviet Union. This has reduced the amount of nuclear weapons in the world, which is a positive step.

So, again, yes, what they are doing in the Ukraine, we ought to oppose that. But when it comes to trying to contain nuclear material for the protection of both of our countries and the world, that is not something that I think we should walk away from.

I am sure there are other opportunities, other ways we can punish Russia for their misdeeds that would make a great deal more sense. This hurts us, it does not help us.

Again, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I can't see how it would be in our interest to keep complying with a treaty when the other party to that treaty is not in compliance with so many other things it is supposed to be doing.

This amendment merely calls for a halt in the spending until such time as they come into compliance with all of these other treaties.

We are talking about reducing our nuclear forces. That is a guarantee against the main and only existential threat against the United States: a devastating nuclear attack, God forbid. But why in the world would we want to give up further nuclear forces when the party that is supposed to be working with us on this is not reliable?

□ 2000

I do not understand that. I would ask adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I want to emphasize, the START Treaty, if you don't like the START Treaty, that is a separate debate. That is not the purpose of where we are at here in the House.

With regards to violating treaties, on this START Treaty, the Russians are in compliance with it. There has been no evidence brought forward that they are not. This is the treaty that we are talking about.

If they have violated other treaties, we can talk about that and deal with that.

I will also point out that they are not alone. The U.S. abrogated the anti-ballistic missile treaty that we had signed with the Soviet Union because we thought it was in our own interest, so there are different reasons for doing those things.

Again, let me just emphasize the point. If we have an agreement with Russia that enables us to better control nuclear weapons, I think that is a good thing.

Don't trust them. Don't think of them as a partner. Whatever evil things you want to say about Russia, that is fine, but let's not do things that are contrary to our own best interest.

There are other ways to punish Russia for the treaties that they have violated, for the horrible things that they are doing in Ukraine.

Walking away from the START Treaty undermines our interests. That is why, again, a bipartisan group of United States Senators voted for and put into the law the START Treaty because it is in the United States' best interest.

So, as much as I am opposed to what Russia is doing in many areas and agree with the gentleman on that, this amendment is the wrong way to go about dealing with those changes, and I urge opposition.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. __. SUNSET OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Authorization for Use of Military Force (50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107–40) is hereby repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, when Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force just days after 9/11, it provided the President with the broad authority to strike against those who ''planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored'' them.

That authorization no longer properly encompasses the scope of military action that we are taking in the ongoing fight against terrorism. While the AUMF was originally directed at a fairly narrow range of actors, it has been used to sanction targeted strikes against groups and militants with little relation to the individuals who actually planned, authorized, and perpetrated the attacks on 9/11.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution invests Congress with the power to declare war. It is our most awesome responsibility, and it is central to the success of our military efforts overseas. We owe it to the men and women we send into combat to properly define and authorize their mission.

This amendment would not immediately repeal the 2001 AUMF. Instead, it would sunset one year from the date of enactment, providing time for Congress and the administration to consider what authorities are needed to protect the Nation.

I think a more narrow authorization, constrained in focus and duration, may very well be necessary, but let's be clear. Even in the absence of an AUMF, the administration would retain the necessary authority to respond to threats from al Qaeda.

At a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning, Stephen Preston, General Counsel for the Department of Defense, testified:

The AUMF is not the only authority the President has to use force to keep us safe. The President has authority, under the Constitution, to use military force as needed to defend the Nation against armed attacks and imminent threat of armed attack.

Over the course of the last year, there has been a growing recognition of the outdated nature of the current AUMF. In Syria, for example, one of the most violent groups on the ground is the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, ISIL, which grew out of al Qaeda in Iraq.

Though originally part of the al Qaeda brand, ISIL has since been excommunicated from al Qaeda, and recent months have seen intense fighting between ISIL and the Nusra Front, al Qaeda's preferred jihadi group.

That raises the question of whether action against ISIL would be covered by the current AUMF, and if it is not, do we really want to be in a situation where Ayman al-Zawahiri is able to chose which groups are subject to the authorization for the use of force by the United States and which are not? That is not something I think we want to delegate to our enemies.

Last year, during consideration of the defense appropriations bill, I offered a similar amendment that gained the bipartisan support of 185 Members of the House, indicating strong support on both sides of the aisle, for bringing our actions into conformity with the law.

Since then, the legally precarious nature of our military actions under the AUMF has only become more pronounced. This amendment will force Congress and the administration to do something about it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Chair, as the gentleman indicates, he offered this amendment last year, and it failed, and I believe it should fail again.

As the gentleman knows, I believe very strongly that the AUMF should be updated. In fact, this House has voted twice to update it, but then the Senate failed to take any action whatsoever, and I don't think there is any reason to believe that there is any more likely prospect of the Senate acting now than before.

So what this amendment would do, it would be to repeal the AUMF against terrorists, without anything, anything at all to replace it and, frankly, without any prospect of having anything to replace it, at least in this Congress, so we would be left with no authority to take action against terrorists bent on killing Americans.

I can't help but note, Madam Chair, that they just opened the 9/11 museum in New York in the last few days. Have we forgotten so quickly about what this AUMF is all about?

One other factor, the President has made some comments about engaging Congress on this issue, but he has exercised absolutely no leadership whatsoever in doing so. What does the President propose, if he proposes an update to the AUMF?

We have no idea. Unfortunately, that lack of leadership is all too common for this administration.

Meanwhile, what is happening in the world? Well, terrorism is growing, and it is getting more dangerous. I note there was a New York Times story just 3 days ago, where the new director of the FBI says that, before he was sworn in and got access to the latest information, he underestimated the terrorist threat.

''I didn't have anywhere near the appreciation I got after I came into this job just how virulent those affiliates had become,'' Mr. Comey said. ''There are many more than I appreciated, and they are stronger than I appreciated.''

Yet the Obama administration, Madam Chairman, wants us to believe that terrorism is done; we have got them on the run. Everybody's going to live happily ever after. That sort of wishful thinking is not only unrealistic, it is dangerous.

As a matter of fact, Richard Haass, the president of the Council on Foreign Relations, has written within the last month that:

American foreign policy is in troubling disarray.

David Brooks wrote in The New York Times:

All around, the fabric of peace and order is fraying.

I would suggest that a substantial part of that disarray and fraying is the sort of wishful thinking that we can wish terrorism and other problems away and go along and the world is not going to bother us.

In other words, short-term political messaging is taking precedence over longer-term strategic interests; so repealing the current authority that helps the military protect us against terrorism, without something to take its place, is exactly that kind of wishful thinking.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, let me thank Congressman SCHIFF for offering this amendment.

As this body knows, I have been offering an amendment to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force for many, many years. Congressman SCHIFF, this is such an important—a very important amendment, which is critical to stopping this endless war.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee refused to allow my bipartisan amendment, taken from my bill, the War Authorization Review and Determination Act, to even be considered.

For those who were not here on that sorrowful day, just 3 days after 9/11, let me just read from that short sentence—one sentence, mind you—that

passed the House with just 1 hour of debate, with 420 ayes and one no.

The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.

I voted against this resolution. Of course, it was the most difficult vote of my career, but I knew then what I know now. It was too broad, and it is open-ended.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has allowed a mere—what is it—10 minutes now to debate this serious and dangerous authorization.

Supporting this amendment would be an important step to ensuring that the President does not have a blank check to conduct endless war.

Congress must exercise its constitutional authority.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I want to respond to a couple of the points that have been made in opposition, the first, that if the sunset goes into effect and nothing is enacted, subsequently, there will be no authority to take action against our enemies.

That ignores the President's authority under article II, or it is a very, very constrained view of the President's authority under article II as Commander in Chief, one not shared by this President, one certainly not shared by President Bush and, indeed, one not shared by any President, I think, in U.S. history.

This is not an effort to legislate away the threats that we face. That cannot be done, but it is an effort to compel Congress and the administration to bring our use of force into conformity with the laws passed by Congress and to restore our responsibility as the body with the power to declare war and to define the scope of any conflict.

Without a sunset, I am convinced that, a year from now, we will be exactly where we are today, continuing to rely on an increasingly legally unreliable AUMF, and I have confidence that, spurred on by the necessity of acting—and we are not requiring that we act tomorrow, we give a deadline of a year from an enactment—that should not be too much to ask of this Congress. Congress will step up to its responsibility.

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

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

Madam Chair, the gentleman argues that, oh, we don't really need these authorities, that there are other authorities.

Well, either they are important, or they are not. Either article I, section 1 makes a difference in what the President can do to defend the country, or it is all superfluous, and I don't know why we continue to have these debates and declare war.

Obviously, there are different views about how far a President's power under article II goes, but most people believe article I, section 8 means something and that for the Congress to authorize the use of military force means something.

I would say, parenthetically, the last thing we need is to get all balled up in court arguing about this after we have repealed the AUMF, but have nothing to take its place.

Secondly, the gentleman argues that: well, we are not going to do anything unless we make a deadline.

I hate to remind us all, but we have had deadlines before that we have not exactly met. Unfortunately, repealing something this serious without something to take its place is a dangerous game, I think, to play.

The evolution of al Qaeda is a very serious issue, Madam Chair. We should be having a conversation about how to update the Authorization for Use of Military Force, but we still have to protect the country while we are having that discussion.

Unfortunately, this puts the cart before the horse, deciding to repeal before we know what will be used to replace it.

This amendment is not about Afghanistan, Yemen, Mali, Somalia, or anywhere else. This amendment is about us. This is about protecting Americans, and when the President and the military have the authority that the Constitution allows us to give them to protect the country, we should not abandon that lightly.

The world is still dangerous. The terrorists are still coming for us. We need to keep this in place unless and until there is a more updated AUMF to replace it.

Madam Chairman, I oppose the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam 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 D of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1636. ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REVIEW OF COST ESTIMATES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Section 1041(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1931) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''ANNUAL'' before ''CBO''; and

(2) by inserting ''and annually thereafter,'' after ''this Act,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, we all agree that transparency and nonpartisan oversight strengthens our democracy and promotes greater efficiency and effectiveness in government, especially in monitoring government spending. This amendment provides every Member with an opportunity to promote this efficiency and effectiveness through increased transparency. The amendment would simply require the Congressional Budget Office to update, each year, their report on the projected costs of the United States' nuclear forces over the 10-year budget window.

This report initially was required in the last reauthorization as a one-time look at U.S. spending on our nuclear forces. It was released last December and has since proven to be incredibly valuable for Members, staff, and civil society organizations. I am sure it was referenced by many people on the committee as this bill before us was crafted.

The CBO's report provided an unbiased and more realistic forecast of spending. It found that the administration's own estimates for the costs of our nuclear weapons over the next decade were understated by nearly $150 billion. With tight budgets, we can't afford to rely on partial or inaccurate information, let alone such a significant disparity.

If the United States is likely committing—at some level—to refurbishing the nuclear triad, we all deserve to know the long-term costs to make the strategic, effective decisions and to appreciate any trade-offs that might be required.

Despite everyone's best intentions, these projects have a history of egregious cost overruns. No one is better suited to help Congress monitor these projected costs as they change and fluctuate than the Congressional Budget Office. The amendment provides Congress with the information that we need to make the difficult decisions.

We are scheduled to spend between one-half and two-thirds of a trillion dollars over the next 10 years for our nuclear forces and related programs. This spending, adjusted for inflation, is higher than we spent at the height of the cold war.

But we can and should debate the merits of that spending. There should be no objection from anyone about

knowing how much the projects will cost. It will be valuable if you want to increase the programs. It will be valuable if you want to decrease them. It will be valuable if you just want to fund the existing program.

This amendment focuses on increased transparency and oversight. I urge my colleagues to adopt it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to his amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, the Blumenauer amendment is a continuation of the gentleman's efforts to suggest that this Nation cannot afford its nuclear deterrence requirements, which are actually the Obama administration's requirements based on the President's personal promises.

The gentleman, notwithstanding the views of the Obama administration, the military leadership, and the senior civilian leadership, wants to unilaterally cut our nuclear forces. He has earlier offered a proposal to try to put Members of this body at odds with the National Guard in an attempt to cut nuclear weapons funding. He has offered the REIN-IN Act to gut the U.S. nuclear deterrent, which is relied upon by 31 American allies, despite the expanding nuclear weapons programs of Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and others.

It is as if the gentleman missed Vladimir Putin's massive and unplanned nuclear weapons exercise just over a week ago and his invasion of Ukraine and his violation of the INF Treaty and his questionable implementation of the New START Treaty.

Perhaps the gentleman should have heard Secretary Hagel's testimony before the Armed Services Committee this March when he said: ''Most everybody agrees that our ability to possess nuclear weapons and the capability that has brought us has probably done as much to deter aggression—nuclear deterrence and the start of World War III as any one thing.''

Or Chairman Dempsey's testimony when he was asked if, despite the disarmament echo chamber in this town, the debate about the U.S. nuclear posture and our strategic triad is over, he said: ''For the record, I can speak for myself and the Joint Chiefs, and you are correct.''

But here we are again today and again this year with a new effort to disarm this country's deterrent. It looks harmless: Let's ask for a CBO report.

Has the gentleman asked the CBO if it can do this annual report? I did. They don't have the resources to do such a report.

Is the gentleman aware of the current annual reports we receive? We have the Obama administration submit an annual report detailing these costs. It is called the section 1043 report. We get it every year. We then have the GAO audit that report each and every year.

These are hundreds and thousands of man-hours to produce and at great expense each and every year. Yet let's add a third report, the gentleman says. Why? Because maybe this report will tell us something different than the other two reports?

What have they all shown us? They have all shown us that, by any reasonable and informed estimate, we are spending less than 5 percent of the defense budget on our nuclear forces—less than 5 percent. It is a historical low.

We will spend approximately $6 trillion on defense spending over the next 10 years. We will spend over $30 trillion, including the whole Federal Government. How much on our nuclear forces? According to these reports, approximately $300 billion.

I am happy to debate the gentleman on the merits of our nuclear forces. What I am not prepared to accept is wasteful, unnecessary annual reports just so the nuclear disarmament crowd can throw another argument against the wall in hopes that maybe something will finally stick that supports its lonely position that we should be unilaterally reducing U.S. nuclear forces without regard to this Nation's security interests or those of our allies. I urge the defeat of this amendment and the return to common sense.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I am listening to my good friend from Alabama, and I don't know if he has actually read my amendment.

I, too, am happy to have a debate on the level of our nuclear spending. That is not what this amendment says. The amendment says that we ought to have a report every year from the CBO that shows what the accurate projections are going to be for the next 10 years.

The gentleman didn't dispute what I said, that the report that the committee requested last year showed that it is underestimated by $150 billion.

Why don't you want the American people to know good information every year? I am mystified by this.

If you want to increase nuclear spending, you should know the facts. If you want to decrease nuclear spending, you deserve to have the facts. If you just want to fund what we have got, you need to have the facts.

The CBO showed that the Obama administration's plan for maintaining and upgrading the nuclear arsenal is likely to cost some 66 percent more over the next decade than senior Pentagon officials have predicted. Virtually every major project under the National Nuclear Security Administration's oversight is behind schedule and over budget.

I am sorry if the facts are inconvenient for the gentleman, but he should know that if he supports the nuclear program, there will be a day of reckoning. There is no excuse not to have the best information available. This would simply make sure that we are requesting it from the CBO.

And when we are talking about sums on this order of magnitude, to pretend that the CBO can't do this analysis is silly. Of course they can, and there is no reason they shouldn't do it. And if we approve this amendment, it is more likely that we will have it.

I respectfully request that this amendment be approved, whether you want to cut nuclear weapons, reduce nuclear weapons, or just fund what we have got. I look forward to the day that we have a robust debate on the floor of the House about what course we should take, but in the meantime, there is no excuse not to have good information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 2, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 14, 25, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 68, 81, 97, 105, 122, 140, 143, 144, 146, 148, and 161 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 1082. IMPROVEMENT OF FINANCIAL LITERACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for each military department (including the Marine Corps) is hereby increased by $2,500,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(A) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, is hereby reduced by $5,000,000; and

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in division C for weapons activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for the B61 life extension program and the W76 life extension program are each hereby reduced by $2,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Page 520, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 1643. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR SPECIFIED FUZES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into contracts for the life-of-type procurement of covered parts of the intercontinental ballistic missile fuze.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 101 and available for Missile Procurement, Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4101, $4,500,000 shall be available for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under subsection (a).

(c) COVERED PARTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered parts'' means commercial off-the-shelf items as defined in section 104 of title 41, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 28___. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORMER AIR FORCE NORWALK DEFENSE FUEL SUPPLY POINT, NORWALK, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the City of Norwalk, California (in this section referred to as the ''City''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 15 acres at the former Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point for public purposes.

(b) APPLICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall affect the applicability of Federal, State, or local environmental laws and regulations, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), to the Department of the Air Force.

(c) PAYMENT OF COST OF CONVEYANCE—.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require the City to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation related to the conveyance, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the City in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—

(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance or, if the period of availability for obligations for that appropriation has expired, to the appropriations or fund that is currently available to the Secretary for the same purpose. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(B) Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) are subject to appropriations.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Add at the end of subtitle E of title I of division A the following:

SEC. 142. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE OCONUS BASING OF THE F-35A.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense has begun its process of permanently stationing the F-35 at installations in the Continental United States (in this section referred to as ''CONUS'') and forward-basing Outside the Continental United States (in this section referred to as ''OCONUS'').

(2) The Secretary of the Air Force is assessing operating bases for the F-35A to support Pacific Air Forces, which includes two United States candidate bases in Alaska and three foreign OCONUS candidate bases.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force, in the strategic basing process for the F-35A, should place emphasis on the benefits derived from sites that—

(1) are capable of hosting fighter-based bilateral and multilateral training opportunities with international partners;

(2) have sufficient airspace and range capabilities and capacity to meet the training requirements;

(3) have existing facilities to support personnel, operations, and logistics associated with the flying mission;

(4) have limited encroachment that would adversely impact training or operations; and

(5) minimize the overall construction and operational costs.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 47, after line 22, insert the following::

SEC. 302. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS.

(a) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Civil Military Programs, is hereby increased by $55,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense is hereby reduced by $55,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3___. AGREEMENTS WITH LOCAL CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS TO SUPPORT CONDUCTING A MILITARY AIR SHOW OR OPEN HOUSE.

(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—Chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2616. Military air show or open house: agreements with local civic organization; authority to charge nominal admission fee

''(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may enter into a contract or agreement with a non-Federal civic organization to conduct or support an air show or open house to feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of that Secretary.

''(b) NOMINAL FEES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may charge, or authorize a civic organization with which the Secretary has entered into a contract or agreement under subsection (a) to charge, the public a nominal admission fee (to be determined by the Secretary) to attend a military air show or open house.

''(c) TREATMENT OF FEES.—Amounts collected as admission fees under subsection (b) for an air show or open house may be retained to cover costs associated with the air show or open house, including costs associated with parking for the air show or open house or the provision of temporary shuttle-bus service for air show or open house visitors. If costs are incurred and covered in advance of the collection of the fees, amounts collected shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account. Any amounts so credited under this subsection shall be subject to the Appropriations process of the United States Congress.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2616. Military air show or open house: agreements with local civic organization; authority to charge nominal admission fee.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 72, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 354. GIFTS MADE FOR THE BENEFIT OF MILITARY MUSICAL UNITS.

Section 974(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''The Secretary concerned may'' and inserting ''The Secretary concerned shall''.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following new section

SEC. 5___. DEFERRED RETIREMENT OF CHAPLAINS.

Section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) DEFERRED RETIREMENT OF CHAPLAINS.—(1) The Secretary of the military department concerned may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), defer the retirement under subsection (a) of an officer who is appointed or designated as a chaplain if the Secretary determines that such deferral is in the best interest of the military department concerned.

''(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), a deferment under this subsection may not extend beyond the first day of the month following the month in which the officer becomes 68 years of age.

''(3) The Secretary of the military department concerned may extend a deferment under this subsection beyond the day referred to in paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that extension of the deferment is necessary for the needs of the military department concerned. Such an extension shall be made on a case-by-case basis and shall be for such period as the Secretary considers appropriate.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle A of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 514. COMPLIANCE WITH EFFICIENCIES DIRECTIVE.

By not later than December 31, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the number of flag officers and generals are reduced to comply with the Department of Defense efficiencies directive dated March 14, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

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

SEC. 5___. ELECTRONIC TRACKING OF CERTAIN RESERVE DUTY.

The Secretary of Defense shall establish an electronic means by which members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces can track their operational active-duty service performed after January 28, 2008, under section 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10, United States Code. The tour calculator shall specify early retirement credit authorized for each qualifying tour of active duty, as well as cumulative early reserve retirement credit authorized to date under section 12731(f) of such title.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 5___. NATIONAL GUARD CYBER PROTECTION TEAMS.

(a) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress made by the Army National Guard to establish 10 Cyber Protection Teams composed of members of the National Guard to perform duties relating to analysis and protection in support of programs to prepare for and respond to emergencies involving an attack or natural disaster impacting a computer, electronic, or cyber network.

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

(1) A timeframe of when stationing of the Cyber Protection Teams will be finalized.

(2) A timeframe of activation of the Cyber Protection Teams and whether the teams will be activated at the same time or staggered over time.

(3) A description of what manning and basing requirements have been established.

(4) The number and location of nominations received for a Cyber Protection Team and the activation date estimate provided in each nomination.

(5) An assessment of the range of stated cost projections included in the nominations.

(6) An assessment of any identified patterns regarding ease or difficulty of staffing individuals with required credentials within particular regions.

(7) Any additional information deemed relevant by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 5___. REVISION TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY ON RETENTION OF EVIDENCE IN A SEXUAL ASSAULT CASE TO ALLOW RETURN OF PERSONAL PROPERTY UPON COMPLETION OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS.

Section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1435; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) RETURN OF PERSONAL PROPERTY UPON COMPLETION OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c)(4)(A), personal property retained as evidence in connection with an incident of sexual assault involving a member of the Armed Forces may be returned to the rightful owner of such property after the conclusion of all legal, adverse action, and administrative proceedings related to such incident.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

Page 195, after line 7, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) mental health and substance use disorders, traumatic brain injury, and suicide are being experienced at alarming levels among members of the Armed Forces;

(2) members of the Armed Forces should have adequate access to the support and care they need;

(3) public-private mental health partnerships can provide the Department of Defense with an enhanced and unique capability to treat members of the Armed Forces;

(4) the Department of Defense should fully implement the pilot program authorized under section 706 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 10101 note; Public Law 112–239) for purposes of enhancing the efforts of the Department of Defense in research, treatment, education, and outreach on mental health and substance use disorders and traumatic brain injury in members of the National Guard and Reserves.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 827. DEBARMENT REQUIRED OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF FRAUDULENT USE OF "MADE IN AMERICA" LABELS.

(a) DEBARMENT REQUIRED.—Subsection (a) of section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Secretary shall'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''the person shall be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense unless the Secretary waives the debarment under subsection (b).''.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY AND NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 2410f of such title is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

''(b) WAIVER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.—The Secretary may waive a debarment required by subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that the exercise of such a waiver would be in the national security interests of the United States.

''(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees annually, not later than March 1 of each year, of any exercise of the waiver authority under subsection (b).''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 2410f of such title is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''DEBARMENT REQUIRED.—'' after ''(a)'' ; and

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated by subsection (b), by inserting ''DEFINITION.—'' before ''In this section''.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

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

SEC. 1065. BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS OF THE CREATION OF AN ACTIVE DUTY ASSOCIATION FOR THE 68TH AIR REFUELING WING.

(a) BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall conduct a business case analysis of the creation of a 4-PAA (Personnel-Only) KC-135R active association with the 168th Air Refueling Wing. Such analysis shall include consideration of—

(1) any efficiencies or cost savings achieved assuming the 168th Air Refueling Wing meets 100 percent of current air refueling requirements after the active association is in place;

(2) improvements to the mission requirements of the 168th Air Refueling Wing and Air Mobility Command; and

(3) effects on the operations of Air Mobility Command.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the business case analysis conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON CERTAIN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY AND CRITICAL NATIONAL SECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification of each instance in which the Secretary or the Director determine through analysis or reporting that an information technology or telecommunications component from a company suspected of being influenced by a foreign country, or a suspected affiliate of such a company, is competing for or has been awarded a contract to include the technology of such company or such affiliate into a covered network.

(b) TIME OF NOTIFICATION.—Each notification required under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary or the Director makes a determination described in such subsection.

(c) ELEMENTS OF NOTIFICATION.—Each notification submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the instance described in subsection (a), including an identification of the company of interest and the covered network affected;

(2) an analysis of the potential risks and the actions that can be taken to mitigate such risks; and

(3) a description of any follow up or other response actions to be taken.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) COVERED NETWORK.—The term ''covered network'' includes—

(A) information technology or telecommunications networks of the Department of Defense or the intelligence community; and

(B) information technology or telecommunications networks of network operators supporting systems in proximity to Department of Defense or intelligence community facilities.

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning

given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. PLAN TO REDUCE RUSSIAN FEDERATION NUCLEAR FORCE DEPENDENCIES ON UKRAINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Russian Federation relies on the Ukrainian defense industry for certain elements of its land-based nuclear ballistic missile force, the Russian Strategic Rocket Force.

(2) Press reports indicate that Ukraine's Yuzhnoye Design Bureau played a prominent role during the Soviet era in producing heavy silo-based Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

(3) These land-based missiles include the RS-20 ICBM, known by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Designator, SATAN.

(4) This missile has been reported to be deployed with as many as 10 independently targetable nuclear reentry vehicles.

(5) In a press conference on May 13, 2014, Russian Federation Deputy Prime Minster Dmitry Rogozin stated that his country would discontinue the sale of Russia-made rocket engines to the United States if they will be used for military purposes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should promptly enter into discussions with the Government of Ukraine to ensure a halt to the activities of the Yuzhnoye Design Bureau and any other Ukrainian industry that supports the military or military industrial base of the Russian Federation while Russia is violating its commitments under the Budapest Memorandum, illegally occupying Ukrainian territory and supporting groups that are inciting violence and fomenting secessionist movements in Ukraine.

(c) PLAN.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan on how the United States Government intends to work with the Government of Ukraine to accomplish the goals expressed in subsection (b) and any recommendations it has for how the United States and its allies could benefit from the capability of the Yuzhnoye Design Bureau.

AMENDMENT NO. 140 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. ___. SPACE PROTECTION STRATEGY.

Section 911(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) Fiscal years 2026 through 2030.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Page 516, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 1636. IMPROVEMENT TO BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT ON DELIVERY PLATFORMS FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THE NUCLEAR COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.

Section 492(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', and the ability to meet operational availability requirements for,'' after ''military effectiveness of''.

AMENDMENT NO. 144 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

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

SEC. 1636. REPORTS AND BRIEFINGS OF STRATEGIC ADVISORY GROUP.

Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress, under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, a budget for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees each report and briefing provided by the Strategic Advisory Group established pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), including any subgroup thereof and any successor advisory group, to the Commander during the one-year period preceding the date of such submission. The Commander may include with each such submission any additional views the Commander determines appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

Page 508, after line 9, add the following new section:

SEC. 1622. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ROLE OF NATIONAL GUARD IN DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES AGAINST CYBER ATTACKS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) members of the National Guard may possess knowledge of critical infrastructure in the States in which the members serve that may be of value for purposes of defending such infrastructure against cyber threats;

(2) traditional members of the National Guard and National Guard technicians may have experience in both the private and public sector that could benefit the readiness of the Department of Defense's cyber force and the development of cyber capabilities;

(3) the long-standing relationship the National Guard has with local and civil authorities may be beneficial for purposes of providing for a coordinated response to a cyber attack and defending against cyber threats;

(4) the States are already working to establish cyber partnerships with the National Guard; and

(5) the National Guard has a role in the defense of the United States against cyber threats and consideration should be given to how the National Guard might be integrated into a comprehensive national approach for cyber defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

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

SEC. 1643. PLAN TO COUNTER CERTAIN GROUND-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILES AND CRUISE MISSILES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 5, 2014, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that ''[w]e are concerned about Russian activity that appears to be inconsistent with the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. We've raised the issue with Russia. They provided an answer that was not satisfactory to us, and we will, we told them that the issue is not closed, and we will continue to raise this.'' Congress shares this concern regarding Russian behavior that is ''inconsistent with'' or in violation or circumvention of the INF Treaty.

(2) The Commander of the U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, stated on April 2, 2014, that ''a weapon capability that violates the INF, that is introduced into the greater European land mass is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with. . .I would not judge how the alliance will choose to react, but I would say they will have to consider what to do about it. . .It can't go unanswered.''.

(3) The Director of the Missile Defense Agency stated on March 25, 2014, that Aegis Ashore missile defense sites, including those to be deployed in the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Romania, could be reconfigured to deal with the threat of intermediate-range ground launched cruise missiles with modest changes to ''the software, [and] with a minor hardware addition.''.

(4) The ''Report on Conventional Prompt Global Strike Options if Exempt from the Restrictions of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics'' provided to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in September 2013 by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated, ''[i]n the absence of the INF Treaty, four types of weapons systems could assist in closing the existing JROC-validated capability gap: (1) Modifications to existing short range or tactical weapon systems to extend range; (2) Forward-based, ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs); (3) Forward-based, ground-launched intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs); and (4) Forward-based, ground-launched intermediate-range missiles with trajectory shaping vehicles (TSVs).''.

(5) The report further stated that, ''[b]ecause of INF restrictions, examination of prohibited concepts has not been performed by industry or the Services. Trade studies regarding capability, affordability, and development timelines would have to be completed prior to providing an accurate estimate of cost, technology risk, and timeline advantages that could be achieved with respect to these concepts. Extensive knowledge could be leveraged from past and current land- and sea-based systems to assist in potential development and deployment of these currently prohibited concepts.''.

(6) President Obama stated in Prague in April 2009 that ''Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something.''.

(7) The Nuclear Posture Review of 2010 stated, ''it is not enough to detect non-compliance; violators must know that they will face consequences when they are caught.''.

(8) The July 2010 Verifiability Assessment released by the Department of State on the New START Treaty, and as quoted in a hearing of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, stated: ''[t]he costs and risks of Russian cheating or breakout, on the other hand, would likely be very significant'' and that the Russian Federation would be unlikely to cheat because of the ''financial and international political costs of such an action.''.

(b) PLAN FOR TESTING OF AEGIS ASHORE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall develop a plan to test, by not later than December 31, 2015, the capability of the Aegis Ashore system, including pursuant to any appropriate modifications to the hardware or software of such system, to counter intermediate-range ground launched cruise missiles.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan under paragraph (1), including, if determined appropriate by the Director, whether the Director determines that such plan should be implemented.

(c) PLAN TO DEVELOP CERTAIN GROUND-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILES AND CRUISE MISSILES.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Russian Federation is not in complete and verifiable compliance

with its obligations under the INF Treaty, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) develop a plan for the research and development of intermediate range ballistic and cruise missiles, including through trade studies regarding capability, affordability, and development timelines, for which there are validated military requirements; and

(2) by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the congressional defense committees the plan developed under paragraph (1), including, if determined appropriate by the Secretary, whether the Secretary determines that such plan should be implemented.

(d) INF TREATY DEFINED.—The term ''INF Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 729. EVALUATION OF WOUNDED WARRIOR CARE AND TRANSITION PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that gaining new ideas and an objective perspective are critical to addressing issues regarding the treatment of wounded warriors.

(b) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a private organization to evaluate the wounded warrior care and transition program of the Department of Defense. Such evaluation shall identify deficiencies in the treatment of wounded warriors and offer recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and Congress to improve such treatment. The Secretary may not award a contract to a private organization to carry out such evaluation unless the private organization received less than 20 percent of the annual revenue of the organization during the previous five years from contracts with the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, is hereby increased by $20,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(A) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, is hereby reduced by $10,000,000; and

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in division C for weapons activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for the B61 life extension program and the W76 life extension program are each hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Chair, I rise to commend the Armed Services Committee for their hard work. There is a lot going on, and they deserve a lot of credit.

I just wanted to take the opportunity to highlight an aircraft that is a vital component of our national security, and particularly to our Navy. That is the E–2D Hawkeye, which is the Navy's carrier-based airborne early warning and battle management command and control system. It provides theater air and missile defense, synthesizing information from multiple onboard and offboard sensors, making complex tactical decisions, and disseminating actionable information to Joint Forces.

Our ability to take an aircraft carrier and move that anywhere in the world and then project power from there is critical to our national security, and the E–2D serves as the eyes of the fleet, protecting our assets and our forces. I just want to say that I think it is vitally important that our fleet is equipped with these.

There is no better person that I know of in this body to speak to the importance of the E–2D than my colleague from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE, who is also a lieutenant commander in the Navy Reserve and is a former E–2 pilot himself. So I will yield to my friend from Oklahoma to discuss the importance of this aircraft.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Well, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, who is championing a cause that is near and dear to my heart, a platform that I have spent many hours in. I flew combat off of an aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf and the north Arabian Sea. In the E–2 Hawkeye, I flew combat in Afghanistan, flew combat in Iraq.

□ 2030

I can tell you that the missions that we did, airborne battle space command and control, and control of the assets that provide close air support to our troops on the ground, was critically important to the mission in both theaters. I can tell you that we did air intercept control in order to have dominance of the skies. We provided airborne early warning.

It is not without reason that the E–2 Hawkeye is the first aircraft that comes off of the aircraft carrier when we launch a mission, and it is the last aircraft to come back. We are the first ones to the fight, and we are the last ones home.

It is also not without reason that when the E–2 gets airborne, when the rest of the air wing is on the deck and the ship is steaming across the ocean, the Hawkeye is always working because we are that airborne early warning asset that can provide threat recognition to the carrier battle group.

The Hawkeye is a critical node in America's force structure, and I would say that I was also involved in generating the requirements for the next generation Hawkeye, the E–2D. And Congress has recognized the value of the E–2D by providing the Navy with multiyear procurement authority. Multiyear procurement drives down costs by enabling block buys, improving supplier surety, and stabilizing production lines. As my friend from Florida knows, the Navy requested four E–2Ds for the fiscal year 15 budget request, which is one less anticipated.

I would just like to thank the chairman of the committee for being able to work with us on ensuring that we can get another E–2D Hawkeye.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to express support for strong Buy American provisions within the Department of Defense procurement policy. I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, and Ranking Member SWALWELL for engaging in this colloquy to discuss our shared goal to promote increased procurement of domestically manufactured solar devices for use by the Department of Defense.

The Buy American Act is especially important when it comes to supporting nascent American industries, and strong Buy American policies can assist development of domestic manufacturing capability with regard to renewable energy. Currently, the Department of Defense is required to comply with Buy American Act provisions for procurement of energy produced from solar panels if those panels are located on government property and the electricity produced by the panels is reserved exclusively for use by the Department.

Recently, we have witnessed the development of large-scale solar installations that are not located on government property, though the electricity produced is still exclusively used by the Department of Defense. I support a minor language change that would require DOD's procurement process to comply with the Buy American Act for electricity that is exclusively used by the Department of Defense or is generated from solar devices located on government property.

This small change is worthy of support. The Congressional Budget Office has scored this proposal as costing $2 million over a 10-year budget window, and my amendment was not made in order because of this score. I understand CBO rules, but I strongly submit that this investment in domestic manufacturing not only strengthens our energy independence, but also strengthens our industrial base. I hope the chairman and ranking member will work with me to advance this important issue.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her work in this

area, and I appreciate her efforts to advance U.S. manufacturing and our industrial base, and I thank her, again, for her hard work on this issue. I look forward to working with you as we move forward on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would like to address two amendments that I offered that are included in the en bloc amendment, one that deals with expanding financial resources and tools for servicemembers and one that funds an independent study to improve wounded warrior care.

For too long, unscrupulous lenders have targeted servicemembers on military bases with financial products that could have long-term negative impacts on their family's financial security. Inadequate financial understanding or literacy training on some of these financial products can lead to financial difficulty for servicemembers. Many servicemembers often require security clearances to perform their duties, and financial difficulties and the loss of a clearance can have an enormous impact on military combat readiness.

This first amendment that I offer would allocate $10 million to expand financial literacy resources for incoming and transitioning servicemembers to ensure that they are not unfairly targeted by predatory lenders.

The other amendment that is included is an important one to fund an independent study to improve wounded warrior care. While the DOD is still confronting significant challenges and issues regarding its care and transition of wounded warriors, and while improvements have been made, it is obvious that wounded warriors are still failing to receive the care that they need and that they deserve. Caring for these individuals who have served honorably should—and I know always will be—one of our most solemn duties.

For this reason, a review, a comprehensive review, an independent and comprehensive review and study of this type should be awarded to an entity that is free of any current obligation; 20 percent of its revenues in the last several years should not have come from contracts from the DOD or the VA, ensuring independence. It is really important that we take a close look at how we are providing services to these servicemembers, and this independent study would do so.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

It facilitates the transfer of a portion of the U.S. Air Force Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, also known as the Norwalk Tank Farm, to the city of Norwalk. If enacted, it would allow 15 acres of the 51-acre area to be designated for public purposes and transferred to city hands. City officials have worked tirelessly for over a decade, and this amendment is a reflection of the compromise reached by the U.S. Air Force and the city of Norwalk.

My amendment is of significant importance for my district. Once this land is transferred, this currently blighted property will mean real opportunity for the city of Norwalk and the surrounding communities. This property is currently located next to an elementary school and a child care learning center. Once the land has been completely cleaned and remediated and the park is built, children will have somewhere safe to go after school and on weekends.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, the ability of our national labs to meet their mission relies on the strength of their foundational capabilities. I submitted an amendment that would give the Directors of our national laboratories the authority to accept grant funding from nonprofits and foundations for scientific research that supports the core missions of these labs.

After discussion with the committee staff, rather than offering this amendment tonight, I look forward to working with Chairman ROGERS of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee and Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH of the Armed Services Committee to find an acceptable solution on this issue.

I also want to thank Mr. MCKEON for his service and his time. It has really been an honor to get to know him, and I continue to look forward to working with him for many years to come.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico. I agree with the importance of the national labs. I look forward to working with you to find ways to strengthen their capabilities and meet their important missions. I expect we will be able to find a way to ensure nonprofits have access to our national laboratories without using defense funding to subsidize such work.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I appreciate all the staff's time on this.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chairman, my amendment prohibits construction of any projects in Afghanistan over $500,000—unless the U.S. Government can conduct proper audits, inspection, and oversight.

Up to $79 billion has been authorized for new projects in this bill, most of which are outside the area in which our personnel can travel and operate safely and therefore will most likely go uninspected and unaudited. To date, $60 billion of the $100 billion of these so-called nation-building projects are completely unaccounted for.

The blue area here in this first chart shows where our military and civilian personnel were allowed to travel and operate safely in the year 2009. The blue area in the second chart shows how dramatically the safe areas have been reduced.

Moreover, since traditional banking services do not exist in these non-blue, non-safe areas, contracts are financed with truckloads of cash. It is the perfect recipe for fraud, graft, and abuse. It is time to stop it. Our Nation's taxpayers and our soldiers deserve better.

Madam Chairman, Members of the House, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to fix the Department of Defense (DoD) policy with respect to military bands.

I want to thank my friend, Congressman PATRICK MEEHAN, for cosponsoring this important amendment I also want to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their support.

For decades, military musical units have accepted assistance from community organizations to travel and perform at public events such as ceremonies and parades at no cost to taxpayers.

Last April, the DoD decided to no longer accept such support, forcing military bands to cancel numerous public performances across the country.

We learned that this new policy was issued because gifts from community organizations were not credited to the appropriate account.

To combat this problem, last year Congressman MEEHAN and I sponsored an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (NDAA) in order to credit these contributions to the appropriate accounts, and thus, allow military bands to perform at community events. Our amendment was adopted. A version was included as Section 351 of NDAA, as enacted into Public Law 133–66.

Despite the intent of the amendment, it has come to our attention that, although the Secretary of Defense is allowed to accept outside donations, his office likely will continue the status quo and prevent military musical units from receiving assistance from outside organizations.

It is hard to believe that during a time of tight budgets DoD would reject assistance from community organizations to facilitate band performances.

It would be in the financial interest of DoD to continue to allow military bands, such as the Marine bands, to travel with the assistance of community organizations.

Additionally, public performances by military bands bring a sense of patriotism and community to our cities and towns.

It also increases goodwill and helps to enliven community events, increasing attendance and economic activity.

The intent behind the Section 351 of Public Law 133–66 is clear—to allow bands, like the Marine Band, to perform at community events when the expenses are fully covered by a private organization.

In early May, Congressman MEEHAN and I sent a letter to DoD expressing our frustration with it continuing the current policy. We have not yet received a response from DoD on this issue.

Since DoD apparently is choosing not to abide by the intent of our original amendment, we offered this new amendment to require DoD to accept gifts for military bands. Our amendment removes the discretion of DoD.

This simple amendment will once again allow military musical units to travel and perform at community events at no cost to taxpayers.

I urge all Members to support the amendment.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 27 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 3143. BUDGET INCREASE FOR DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 3102 for defense environmental cleanup, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, is hereby increased by $20,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this title for weapons activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign is hereby reduced by $20,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, our nuclear weapons production programs played a pivotal role in our Nation's defense for decades. It helped end World War II, and it helped end the cold war. But these programs created a large amount of radioactive nuclear waste, and the Federal Government has a legal responsibility to clean up this waste.

This amendment restores a portion of the proposed reduction for the Department of Energy's environmental management program, which is tasked with cleaning up the nuclear defense waste at sites across our country.

Hanford's Richland Operations Office in my district is one of the defense nuclear waste sites, and it is facing a cut of over $100 million, putting cleanup progress and legally enforceable cleanup commitments at risk.

Even at a time of tight budget constraints, the Federal Government must meet existing legal obligations to clean up its defense nuclear waste. Existing legal obligations of the Federal Government, like cleanup of its nuclear waste sites, must be met before funding optional activities, regardless of how valuable those other activities may be.

By adding back $20 million for the defense environmental management program—a small portion of the overall cut—this amendment helps to ensure that cleanup can move forward safely, efficiently, and in a timely manner.

□ 2045

It would help ensure that the Richland Operations Office can complete the successful and nearly complete River Corridor Closure Project and meet cleanup commitments.

I might add that the river I am talking about that this River Corridor Closure Project abuts is the Columbia River, which is a main waterway through central Washington, so I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition on behalf of the ranking member.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the Hastings amendment, and while I understand and appreciate the gentleman from Washington's interest in environmental cleanup, I am afraid that it does so at the expense of research.

Inertial confinement fusion is critical to our national security. It keeps our nuclear weapons safe and ready at a time of growing threats across the globe.

This amendment does not just target research at the National Ignition Facility—which is in my congressional district, which includes Livermore, California—it also tries to cut the whole budget for inertial confinement fusion.

It ropes in the Z facility at Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico and the OMEGA laser at the University of Rochester in New York.

Budgets right now are tight, and I know all Members would welcome the chance to add more money to priorities they believe in, but it is a mistake to try to fund such priorities by short-changing critical science that helps us in our national security mission, as well as meet our future energy needs.

This science keeps us safe. It will also eventually revolutionize how we think about and produce energy, and we can't let ourselves fall behind or cede leadership to other nations who are making large investments in inertial confinement fusion, including France, Russia, and China.

I ask all Members to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I simply want to say, Madam Chair, that the environmental management program is a program that is the result of our war efforts going back to the Second World War. As I mentioned in my opening statement, we won the Second World War because of this activity and won the cold war largely because of this activity, but developing nuclear weapons creates a tremendous amount of waste, and that is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

I mentioned Hanford, and I mentioned one of the projects at Hanford, and I want to remind my colleagues of how much nuclear waste is stored underground at Hanford.

Fifty-six million gallons of radioactive/hazardous waste is stored underground on the upper plateau at Hanford. If you were to quantify how much 56 million gallons would be, it would fill up over 20 House chambers.

This amendment does not address particularly that program, but I just want to remind my colleagues that cleaning up this waste is a massive, massive taking, and it must be done, simply because what the programs did initially by ending the war, so I urge

my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 130, 133, 139, and 141 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 5___. ENHANCEMENT OF PARTICIPATION OF MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND BOARDS FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.—Section 1552 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):

''(g) Any medical advisory opinion issued to a board established under subsection (a)(1) with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces who was diagnosed while serving in the armed forces as experiencing a mental health disorder shall include the opinion of a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist if the request for correction of records concerned relates to a mental health disorder.''.

(b) BOARDS FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL.—

(1) REVIEW FOR CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS WITH PTSD OR TBI.—Subsection (d)(1) of section 1553 of such title is amended by striking ''physician, clinical psychologist, or psychiatrist'' the second place it appears and inserting ''clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with training on mental health issues connected with post traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury (as applicable)''.

(2) REVIEW FOR CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DIAGNOSES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) In the case of a former member of the armed forces (other than a former member covered by subsection (d)) who was diagnosed while serving in the armed forces as experiencing a mental health disorder, a board established under this section to review the former member's discharge or dismissal shall include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with special training on mental health disorders.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 108, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 528. PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 520d. Preliminary mental health assessments

''(a) PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.—Before any individual enlists in an armed force or is commissioned as an officer in an armed force, the Secretary concerned shall provide the individual with a mental health assessment. The Secretary shall use such results as a baseline for any subsequent mental health examinations, including such examinations provided under sections 1074f and 1074m of this title.

''(b) USE OF ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary may not consider the results of a mental health assessment conducted under subsection (a) in determining the assignment or promotion of a member of the Armed Forces.

''(c) APPLICATION OF PRIVACY LAWS.—With respect to applicable laws and regulations relating to the privacy of information, the Secretary shall treat a mental health assessment conducted under subsection (a) in the same manner as the medical records of a member of the armed forces.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 520c the following new item:

''520d. Preliminary mental health assessments.''.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health shall submit to Congress and the Secretary of Defense a report on preliminary mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Recommendations with respect to establishing a preliminary mental health assessment of members of the Armed Forces to bring mental health screenings to parity with physical screenings of members.

(B) Recommendations with respect to the composition of the mental health assessment, best practices, and how to track assessment changes relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions.

(3) COORDINATION.—The National Institute of Mental Health shall carry out paragraph (1) in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the surgeons general of the military departments, and other relevant experts.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 5___. ESTABLISHMENT OF PHONE SERVICE FOR PROMPT REPORTING OF HAZING INVOLVING A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code) shall develop and implement a phone service through which an individual can anonymously call to report incidents of hazing in that branch of the Armed Forces.

(b) HAZING DESCRIBED.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard operates) shall use the definition of hazing contained in the August 28, 1997, Secretary of Defense Policy Memorandum, which defined hazing as any conduct whereby a member of the Armed Forces, regardless of branch or rank, without proper authority causes another member to suffer, or be exposed to, any activity which is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Soliciting or coercing another person to perpetrate any such activity is also considered hazing. Hazing need not involve physical contact among or between members of the Armed Forces. Hazing can be verbal or psychological in nature. Actual or implied consent to acts of hazing does not eliminate the culpability of the perpetrator.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 548. ROLE OF MILITARY SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS IN ADDRESSING UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF SPOUSES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CLOSING THE WAGE GAP BETWEEN MILITARY SPOUSES AND THEIR CIVILIAN COUNTERPARTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Members of the Armed Forces and their families make enormous sacrifices in defense of the United States.

(2) Military spouses face a unique lifestyle marked by frequent moves, increased family responsibility during deployments, and limited career opportunities in certain geographic locations.

(3) These circumstances present significant challenges to military spouses who desire to build a portable career commensurate with their skills, including education and experience.

(4) According to a recent Department of Defense survey, the unemployment rate for civilians married to a military member is 25 percent, but the unemployment rate is 33 percent for spouses of junior enlisted members. The same survey revealed that 85 percent of military spouses want or need to work.

(5) A recent Military Officers Association of American (MOAA)/Institute for Veterans and Military Families' (IVMF) Military Spouse Employment Report revealed that an overwhelming ninety percent of female military spouses are underemployed.

(6) The Department of Defense has demonstrated its commitment to helping military spouses obtain employment by creating the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP), the Military Spouse Career Center, and the Military Spouse Career Advancement Accounts (MyCAA). More than 61,000 military spouses have been hired as part of the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP) since the MSEP launch in June 2011.

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

(1) the Secretary of Defense should continue to work to reduce the unemployment and underemployment of spouses of members of the Armed Forces (in this section referred to as ''military spouses'') and support closing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts;

(2) in this process, the Secretary should prioritize efforts that assist military spouses in pursuing portable careers that match their skill set, including education and experience; and

(3) in evaluating the effectiveness of military spouse employment programs, the Secretary should collect information that provides a comprehensive assessment of the program, including whether program goals are being achieved.

(c) DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO EFFORTS TO ADDRESS UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF MILITARY SPOUSES.—

(1) DATA COLLECTION REQUIRED.—In addition to monitoring the number of military spouses who obtain employment through military spouse employment programs, the Secretary of Defense shall collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of military spouse

employment programs in addressing the underemployment of military spouses and in closing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts. Information collected shall include whether positions obtained by military spouses through military spouse employment programs match their education and experience.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report evaluating the progress of military spouse employment programs in reducing military spouse unemployment, reducing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts, and addressing the underemployment of military spouses.

(d) MILITARY SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''military spouse employment programs'' means the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP).

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 127, line 10, insert after the period the following: ''In establishing the eligibility requirements to be used by the program manager for the selection of the civilian employment staffing agencies, the Secretary of Defense shall also take into account civilian employment staffing agencies that are willing to work and consult with State and county Veterans Affairs offices and State National Guard offices, when appropriate.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. COOK OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 553. DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PILOT PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members in the National Guard and Reserves.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The pilot program shall be offered to, and administered by, the adjutants general appointed under section 314 of title 32, United States Code.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition on the provision of funds under this section to a State to support the operation of the pilot program in the State, the State must agree to contribute an amount, derived from non-Federal sources, equal to at least 30 percent of the funds provided by the Secretary of Defense under this section.

(d) DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM MODEL.—The pilot program should follow a job placement program model that focuses on working one-on-one with a member of a reserve component to cost-effectively provide job placement services, including services such as identifying unemployed and under employed members, job matching services, resume editing, interview preparation, and post-employment follow up. Development of the pilot program should be informed by State direct employment programs for members of the reserve components, such as the programs conducted in California and South Carolina.

(e) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop outcome measurements to evaluate the success of the pilot program.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the results of the pilot program. The Secretary shall prepare the report in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(2) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—A report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description and assessment of the effectiveness and achievements of the pilot program, including the number of members of the reserve components hired and the cost-per-placement of participating members.

(B) An assessment of the impact of the pilot program and increased reserve component employment levels on the readiness of members of the reserve components.

(C) A comparison of the pilot program to other programs conducted by the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs to provide unemployment and underemployment support to members of the reserve components.

(D) Any other matters considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(g) LIMITATION ON TOTAL FISCAL-YEAR OBLIGATIONS.—The total amount obligated by the Secretary of Defense to carry out the pilot program for any fiscal year may not exceed $20,000,000.

(h) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to carry out the pilot program expires September 30, 2018.

(2) EXTENSION.—Upon the expiration of the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may extend the pilot program for not more than two additional fiscal years.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 553. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY ATHLETIC PROGRAMS.

Section 9362 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (e), (f), and (g) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(e) ACCEPTANCE OF SUPPORT.—

''(1) SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM THE CORPORATION.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Secretary of the Air Force may accept from the corporation funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy.

''(2) FUNDS RECEIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may charge fees for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy. The Secretary may accept and retain fees for services and other benefits provided incident to the operation of its athletic programs, including fees from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, fees from athletic conferences, game guarantees from other educational institutions, fees for ticketing or licensing, and other consideration provided incidental to the execution of the athletic programs of the Academy.

''(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that contributions accepted under this subsection do not reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Air Force, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner, or compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Air Force, or any individual involved in such a program.

''(f) LEASES AND LICENSES.—

''(1) SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM THE CORPORATION.—In accordance with section 2667 of this title, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into leases or licenses with the corporation for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. Consideration provided under such a lease or license may be provided in the form of funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy.

''(2) SUPPORT TO THE CORPORATION.—The Secretary may provide support services to the corporation without charge while the corporation conducts its support activities at the Academy. In this section, the term 'support services' includes the providing of utilities, office furnishings and equipment, communications services, records staging and archiving, audio and video support, and security systems in conjunction with the leasing or licensing of property. Any such support services may only be provided without any liability of the United States to the corporation.

''(g) CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with the corporation for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. Notwithstanding section 2304(k) of this title, the Secretary may enter such contracts or cooperative agreements on a sole source basis pursuant to section 2304(c)(5) of this title. Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, a cooperative agreement under this section may be used to acquire property, services, or travel for the direct benefit or use of the Academy athletic programs.

''(h) TRADEMARKS AND SERVICE MARKS.—

''(1) LICENSING, MARKETING, AND SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENTS.—Consistent with section 2260 (other than subsection (d)) of this title, an agreement under subsection (g) may authorize the corporation to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force.

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—No such licensing, marketing, or sponsorship agreement may be entered into if it would reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Air Force, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner, or if the Secretary determines that the use of the trademark or service mark would compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Air Force, or any individual involved in such a program.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Add at the end of subtitle F of title V the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 553. REPORT ON TUITION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the requirement of the Army, effective January 1, 2014, that members of the Army may become eligible for the Army's tuition assistance program only after serving a period of 1 year after completing certain training courses, such as advance individual training, officer candidate school, and the basic officer leader course.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the Secretary's—

(1) evaluation of the potential savings in costs resulting from requiring all service members to wait a period of 1 year after training described in subsection (a) before becoming eligible for the Army's tuition assistance program;

(2) evaluation of the impact that the 1-year waiting period described in subsection (a) will have on recruitment for the National Guard; and

(3) explanation of the extent to which the qualities of the National Guard, including the role of college students and college-bound students in the National Guard, were considered before reaching the decision to

require all service members to wait a period of 1 year before becoming eligible for the Army's tuition assistance program.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 132, lines 18 and 19, strike ''4-year'' and insert ''5-year''.

Page 133, lines 9 and 10, strike ''4-year'' and insert ''5-year''.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. GERLACH OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 5. RECOGNITION OF WERETH MASSACRE OF 11 AFRICAN-AMERICAN SOLDIERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY DURING THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE.

Congress officially recognizes the dedicated service and ultimate sacrifice on behalf of the United States of the 11 African-American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion of the United States Army who were massacred in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge on December 17, 1944.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 574. REPORT ON ARMY REVIEW, FINDINGS, AND ACTIONS PERTAINING TO MEDAL OF HONOR NOMINATION OF CAPTAIN WILLIAM L. ALBRACHT.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) conduct a review of the initial review, findings, and actions undertaken by the Army in connection with the Medal of Honor nomination of Captain William L. Albracht; and

(2) submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the review required by this section, including an accounting of all evidence submitted with regard to the nomination.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MS. CHU OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle I of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. COMPTROLLER GENERAL AND MILITARY DEPARTMENT REPORTS ON HAZING IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the designated congressional committees a report on the policies to prevent hazing, and systems initiated to track incidents of hazing, in each of the Armed Forces, including reserve components, officer candidate schools, military service academies, military academy preparatory schools, and basic training and professional schools for enlisted members.

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

(A) An evaluation of the definition of hazing by the Armed Forces.

(B) A description of the criteria used, and the methods implemented, in the systems to track incidents of hazing in the Armed Forces.

(C) An assessment of the following:

(i) The scope of hazing in each Armed Force.

(ii) The policies in place and the training on hazing provided to members throughout the course of their careers for each Armed Force.

(iii) The available outlets through which victims or witnesses of hazing can report hazing both within and outside their chain of command, and whether or not anonymous reporting is permitted.

(iv) The actions taken to mitigate hazing incidents in each Armed Force.

(v) The effectiveness of the training and policies in place regarding hazing.

(vi) The number of alleged and substantiated incidents of hazing over the last five years for each Armed Force, the nature of these cases and actions taken to address such matters through non-judicial and judicial action.

(D) An evaluation of the additional actions, if any, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security propose to take to further address the incidence of hazing in the Armed Forces.

(E) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for improving hazing prevention programs, policies, and other actions taken to address hazing within the Armed Forces.

(3) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''designated congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(b) MILITARY DEPARTMENT REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Secretary of a military department, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of each Armed Force under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing an update to the hazing reports required by section 534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1726).

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report on an Armed Force required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A discussion of the policies of the Armed Force for preventing and responding to incidents of hazing, including discussion of any changes or newly implemented policies since the submission of the reports required by section 534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

(B) A description of the methods implemented to track and report, including report anonymously, incidents of hazing in the Armed Force.

(C) An assessment by the Secretary submitting such report of the following:

(i) The scope of the problem of hazing in the Armed Force.

(ii) The effectiveness of training on recognizing, reporting and preventing hazing provided members of the Armed Force.

(iii) The actions taken to prevent and respond to hazing incidents in the Armed Force since the submission of the reports under such section.

(D) A description of the additional actions, if any, the Secretary submitting such report and the Chief of Staff of the Armed Force propose to take to further address the incidence of hazing in the Armed Force.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle I of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH STUDY OF RISK AND RESILIENCY OF UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESERVATION OF THE FORCE AND FAMILIES PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Director of the National Institute of Mental Health shall conduct a study of the risk and resiliency of the United States Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of the United States Special Operations Command's Preservation of the Force and Families Program on reducing risk and increasing resiliency.

(b) ELEMENTS OF THE STUDY.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall specifically include an assessment of each of the following: —

(1) The mental, behavioral, and psychological health of the United States Special Operations Force, the United States Special Operations Command's Preservation of the Force and Families Program's focus on physical development to address the mental, behavioral, and psychological health of the United States Special Operations Force, including measurements of effectiveness on reducing suicide and other mental, behavioral and psychological risks, and increasing resiliency of the United States Special Operations Forces.

(2) The United States Special Operations Command's Human Performance Program, including measurements of effectiveness on reducing risk and increasing resiliency of United States Special Operations Forces.

(3) Such other matters as the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health considers appropriate.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle J of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 594. ACCESS OF CONGRESSIONAL CASEWORKERS TO INFORMATION ABOUT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CASEWORK BROKERED TO OTHER OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT.

If Department of Veterans Affairs casework is brokered out to another office of the Department from its original submission site, a caseworker in a congressional office may contact the brokered office to receive an update on the constituent's case, and that office of the Department is required to update the congressional staffer regardless of their thoughts on jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle J of title V (page 162, after line 18) add the following:

SEC. ___. PILOT PROGRAM ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO STATE VETERANS AGENCIES TO FACILITATE THE TRANSITION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM MILITARY SERVICE TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—Commencing not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing the information described in subsection (b) on members of the Armed Forces who are separating from the Armed Forces to State veterans agencies as a means of facilitating the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life.

(b) COVERED INFORMATION.—The information described in this subsection with respect to a member is as follows:

(1) Department of Defense Form DD 214.

(2) A personal email address.

(3) A personal telephone number.

(4) A mailing address.

(c) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The participation of a member in the pilot program shall be at the election of the member.

(d) FORM OF PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Information shall be provided to State veterans agencies under the pilot program in digitized electronic form.

(e) USE OF INFORMATION.—Information provided to State veterans agencies under the pilot program may be shared by such agencies with appropriate county veterans service offices in such manner and for such purposes as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of the pilot program.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 15 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program. The report shall include a description of the pilot program and such recommendations, including recommendations for continuing or expanding the pilot program, as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Page 162, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 594. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE RECOVERY OF THE REMAINS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES KILLED IN THURSTON ISLAND, ANTARCTICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Commencing August 26, 1946, though late February 1947 the United States Navy Antarctic Developments Program Task Force 68, codenamed ''Operation Highjump'' initiated and undertook the largest ever-to-this-date exploration of the Antarctic continent.

(2) The primary mission of the Task Force 68 organized by Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd Jr. USN, (Ret) and led by Rear Admiral Richard H. Cruzen, USN, was to do the following:

(A) Establish the Antarctic research base Little America IV.

(B) In the defense of the United States of America from possible hostile aggression from abroad - to train personnel test equipment, develop techniques for establishing, maintaining and utilizing air bases on ice, with applicability comparable to interior Greenland, where conditions are similar to those of the Antarctic.

(C) Map and photograph a full two-thirds of the Antarctic Continent during the classified, hazardous duty/volunteer-only operation involving 4700 sailors, 23 aircraft and 13 ships including the first submarine the U.S.S. *Sennet*, and the aircraft carrier the U.S.S. *Philippine Sea*, brought to the edge of the ice pack to launch (6) Navy ski-equipped, rocket-assisted R4Ds.

(D) Consolidate and extend United States sovereignty over the largest practicable area of the Antarctic continent.

(E) Determine the feasibility of establishing, maintaining and utilizing bases in the Antarctic and investigating possible base sites.

(3) While on a hazardous duty/all volunteer mission vital to the interests of National Security and while over the eastern Antarctica coastline known as the Phantom Coast, the PBM-5 Martin Mariner ''Flying Boat'' ''George 1'' entered a whiteout over Thurston Island. As the pilot attempted to climb, the aircraft grazed the glacier's ridgeline and exploded within 5 seconds instantly killing Ensign Maxwell Lopez, Navigator and Wendell ''Bud'' Hendersin, Aviation Machinists Mate 1st Class while Frederick Williams, Aviation Radioman 1st Class died several hours later. Six other crewmen survived including the Captain of the ''George 1's'' seaplane tender U.S.S. *Pine Island*.

(4) The bodies of the dead were protected from the desecration of Antarctic scavenging birds (Skuas) by the surviving crew wrapping the bodies and temporarily burying the men under the starboard wing engine nacelle.

(5) Rescue requirements of the ''George-1'' survivors forced the abandonment of their crewmates' bodies.

(6) Conditions prior to the departure of Task Force 68 precluded a return to the area to the recover the bodies.

(7) For nearly 60 years Navy promised the families that they would recover the men: ''If the safety, logistical, and operational prerequisites allow a mission in the future, every effort will be made to bring our sailors home.''.

(8) The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command twice offered to recover the bodies of this crew for Navy.

(9) A 2004 NASA ground penetrating radar overflight commissioned by Navy relocated the crash site three miles from its crash position.

(10) The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command offered to underwrite the cost of an aerial ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey of the crash site area by NASA.

(11) The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command studied the recovery with the recognized recovery authorities and national scientists and determined that the recovery is only ''medium risk''.

(12) National Science Foundation and scientists from the University of Texas, Austin, regularly visit the island.

(13) The crash site is classified as a ''perishable site'', meaning a glacier that will calve into the Bellingshausen Sea.

(14) The National Science Foundation maintains a presence in area - of the Pine Island Glacier.

(15) The National Science Foundation Director of Polar Operations will assist and provide assets for the recovery upon the request of Congress.

(16) The United States Coast Guard is presently pursuing the recovery of 3 WWII air crewmen from similar circumstances in Greenland.

(17) On Memorial Day, May 25, 2009, President Barak Obama declared: ''. . .the support of our veterans is a sacred trust. . .we need to serve them as they have served us. . .that means bringing home all our POWs and MIAs. . .''.

(18) The policies and laws of the United States of America require that our armed service personnel be repatriated.

(19) The fullest possible accounting of United States fallen military personnel means repatriating living American POWs and MIAs, accounting for, identifying, and recovering the remains of military personnel who were killed in the line of duty, or providing convincing evidence as to why such a repatriation, accounting, identification, or recovery is not possible.

(20) It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to return to the United States for proper burial and respect all members of the Armed Forces killed in the line of duty who lie in lost graves.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings under subsection (a), Congress—

(1) reaffirms its support for the recovery and return to the United States, the remains and bodies of all members of the Armed Forces killed in the line of duty, and for the efforts by the Joint POW-MIA Accounting Command to recover the remains of members of the Armed Forces from all wars, conflicts and missions;

(2) recognizes the courage and sacrifice of all members of the Armed Forces who participated in Operation Highjump and all missions vital to the national security of the United States of America;

(3) acknowledges the dedicated research and efforts by the US Geological Survey, the National Science Foundation, the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command, the Fallen American Veterans Foundation and all persons and organizations to identify, locate, and advocate for, from their temporary Antarctic grave, the recovery of the well-preserved frozen bodies of Ensign Maxwell Lopez, Naval Aviator, Frederick Williams, Aviation Machinist's Mate 1ST Class, Wendell Hendersin, Aviation Radioman 1ST Class of the ''George 1'' explosion and crash; and

(4) encourages the Department of Defense to review the facts, research and to pursue new efforts to undertake all feasible efforts to recover, identify, and return the well-preserved frozen bodies of the ''George 1'' crew from Antarctica's Thurston Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 162, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 594. NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE JOINT OUTPATIENT CLINIC, MARINA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed at the intersection of the proposed Ninth Street and the proposed First Avenue in Marina, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic''.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. __. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty, or to make any change to existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by Congress in furtherance of, pursuant to, or otherwise to implement the Arms Trade Treaty, unless the Arms Trade Treaty has received the advice and consent of the Senate and has been the subject of implementing legislation, as required, by the Congress.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Department of Defense from assisting foreign countries in bringing their laws and regulations up to United States standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle F of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NAVAL CAPABILITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Mistral class amphibious assault warships, each of which has the capacity to carry 16 helicopters, up to 700 soldiers, four landing craft, 60 armored vehicles, and 13

tanks, would significantly increase the the naval capabilities of the Russian navy;

(2) Mistral class warships would allow the Russian navy to expand its naval presence in the region, thereby augmenting its capabilities against Ukraine, Georgia, and Baltic member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(3) France should not proceed with its sale of two Mistral class warships to the Russian Federation; and

(4) the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense should use diplomatic means to urge their counterparts in the Government of France not to proceed with its sale of two Mistral class warships to the Russian Federation.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 1523. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund until all funds appropriated for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund before the date of the enactment of this Act are obligated or expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title 16, insert the following new section:

SEC. 16___. REPORT ON GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report on the status of governance and democratization in the Russian Federation.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the extent of political and economic corruption among the senior leadership of the Russian Federation; and

(2) an analysis of the assets of the senior leadership of the Russian Federation, with a particular focus on the illegal attainment and movement of those assets, including the use of family or friends to hide assets.

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

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of National Intelligence shall make publicly available on the Internet the unclassified portion of the report required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman.

I rise in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 4435, the FY15 NDAA, to renew a 1-year ban on the Obama administration from using any Department of Defense funds to implement the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

This language is identical to the version of my amendment that was enacted into law FY14 NDAA and reflects the consistent will of the American people and the unified position of Congress in opposition to this misguided and dangerous treaty.

Renewal of this ban is timely and necessary. In January, the Obama administration, unexpectedly and without consultation, issued a new arms export control policy, which has not been changed since 1995.

The administration's new policy clearly seeks to implement the ATT and is based on the most dangerous part of the treaty, the international human rights law/international humanitarian law standard, that can be readily politicized by bad actors to stop the U.S. from providing arms to our friends and allies, including Israel.

The Obama administration has been so brazen about this that, in a speech to CSIS on April 23, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Countryman openly stated:

> We're already implementing the treaty.

Amazingly, in that same speech, Mr. Countryman stated:

> We don't have to change any laws to implement the treaty.

That is not up to him or the administration to decide. It is up to the Senate to provide its advice and consent on the treaty, and the House and Senate to pass the necessary implementing legislation.

This President's assertion is deeply disrespectful to the Senate and the House and to the Constitution he is sworn to uphold. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of the Second Amendment, our Nation's sovereignty, and vote in support of this amendment to renew the annual ban on funding the ATT.

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

Mr. MCKEON. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 4435 to express the sense of Congress against France's impending sale of Mistral class helicopter amphibious assault warships to Russia and urging the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense to seek to stop this sale.

Zoos often have signs posted that say don't feed the bears because it is just common sense. Similarly, I would like to say now, especially, don't feed the Russian bear; but with the sale of these advanced warships, France isn't just feeding the Russian bear, it is serving up fine dining on a silver plate.

A Mistral is no mere civilian hull, as France's Defense Minister claims. Just one Mistral class warship has the capacity to carry 16 helicopters, up to 700 soldiers, four landing craft, 60 armored vehicles, and 13 tanks and has the advanced communications capabilities that make it capable of operating as a command and control vessel.

France wants to send Russia two of them—Vladivostok and Sevastopol—which just happens to be the name of the naval base in Crimea, which Russia has just annexed from Ukraine.

These warships would allow the Russian navy to expands its naval presence in the region, augmenting its capabilities against Ukraine, Georgia, and Baltic members of NATO, but don't take my word for it. Admiral Vysotsky, former head of Russia's navy, boasted that Russia would have won its war against Georgia in 2008 in just 40 minutes, instead of 26 hours, if it just had these ships back then.

It makes no sense for France to provide these warships to Russia when it is occupying Georgia and amassing troops on Ukraine's border. France's support of Russia's navy is unbecoming of a close NATO ally, and it has got to stop.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this commonsense amendment for the sake of our allies and our friends in Europe.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I rise in support of the en bloc amendment, which includes the amendment I offered with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), to call attention to an important issue facing the Army National Guard.

Soldiers join the National Guard to serve their country. Often, they choose the National Guard because they want to balance service with civilian careers or postsecondary education. The Army's tuition assistance program is a valuable benefit for soldiers who want to pursue opportunities for professional growth or attend college while off duty.

In January of 2014, the Army changed its tuition assistance program, and now, all soldiers must wait one full year after initial training before becoming eligible for tuition assistance. This change affects all soldiers, but it may disproportionately harm those in the National Guard.

Nonprior service soldiers in the National Guard, some of whom attend college full time, will have to wait at least a year, and perhaps much longer, depending on the availability of training courses before they get help paying for their education.

The Bonamici-Walden amendment asks the Secretary of the Army to evaluate how this one-size-fits-all change to tuition assistance could affect citizens-soldiers enrolled in education programs.

I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, and their staffs for their willingness to accept this important amendment to help protect education benefits and ensure a strong citizen-soldier force.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, first of all, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for his service on this committee and in this body as a colleague; and quite frankly, on behalf of my wife Penny and I, as military parents, thank you for your service to those who serve.

I want to thank you, also, for allowing me to discuss my amendment and have it as part of this en bloc. My amendment will institute a preliminary mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits. A recent Army study found:

> Nearly one in five Army soldiers enters the service with a mental disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who have tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting.

In March, Representative TIM RYAN of Ohio, and I introduced the bipartisan H.R. 4305, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Service Members Act of 2014, which is the exact language of this amendment.

This small but subsequent change to current law will bring mental health to parity with physical health during entrance screenings. A preliminary evaluation will also have the purpose of serving as a baseline to identify changes in behavioral health, including traumatic brain injury and/or posttraumatic stress injury throughout an individual's military career.

Protecting individual privacy was taken into the utmost consideration when putting this amendment together. While the MEPS Act is not a cure-all, it will be a significant step in further understanding a well-documented gap in behavioral health information that exists among our service branches; and of equal importance, it will assist with the mental wellness of our servicemembers and veterans.

Since introduction, the MEPS Act has garnered over 35 bipartisan cosponsors and the support of over 40 major military, veteran, and health advocacy groups.

I thank all those who supported this legislation and worked with me and my staff to put this together. I ask for your support as we pass this important piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I want to thank Rules Committee Chairman PETE SESSIONS for making this amendment in order, and I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for his service and for allowing this amendment to be part of the en bloc package.

My amendment adds the voice of the House to those of many Americans, including Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who would like to see the names of the 74 sailors lost aboard the USS *Frank E. Evans* added to the Vietnam Memorial.

The USS *Frank Evans*, a destroyer, was launched near the end of World War II and was recommissioned for the Korea and Vietnam conflicts. After participating in combat off the coast of Vietnam, the *Evans* was deployed for the Operation Sea Spirit training exercise in the South China Sea.

On the morning of June 3, 1969, the *Evans* was training with an Australian navy carrier when the two ships collided.

□ 2100

The *Melbourne* ripped the American destroyer in two. The bow sank in just 3 minutes, leaving only a stern section afloat. Seventy-four sailors perished.

Although they were in the South China Sea, these sailors' names have been excluded from the Vietnam Memorial because the *Evans* was outside the designated combat zone which determines inclusion on the wall.

Although these men did not die in direct combat, they were instrumental in advancing military objectives in Vietnam and participated in the conflict just days before the collision.

I thank the chairman for allowing this amendment which would encourage the addition of their names to the wall.

My amendment adds the voice of this House to those of many Americans, including Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who would like to see the names of the 74 sailors lost aboard the USS *Frank E. Evans* added to the Vietnam Memorial.

The USS *Frank E. Evans,* a destroyer, was launched near the end of World War II and was recommissioned for the Korea and Vietnam conflicts. After participating in combat off the coast of Vietnam, the *Evans* was deployed for the "Operation Sea Spirit" training exercises in the South China Sea.

On the morning of June 3, 1969, the *Evans* was training with the Australian Navy carrier HMAS *Melbourne,* when the two ships collided. The *Melbourne* ripped the American destroyer in two. The bow sank in just three minutes, leaving only the stern section afloat. Seventy-four sailors perished.

Although they were in the South China Sea, these sailors' names have been excluded from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial because the *Evans* was outside the designated combat zone which determines inclusion on the Wall. Although these men did not die in direct combat, they were instrumental in advancing American military objectives in Vietnam and had participated in the conflict just days before the collision. This happenstance should not obscure their valor, patriotism, and ultimate sacrifice for their country, especially as other exceptions to the stated policy have been made, including by Ronald Reagan, who waived the combat zone criteria to add 68 names of U.S. Marines who were killed when a "rest and recreation" flight to Hong Kong crashed.

It has been nearly 45 years to the day since that June night in 1969, and the passage of time has made duller and less distinct, boundaries and criteria that may have seemed reasonable and clear back then. The 74 sailors from the *Evans* belong with the other 58,000 Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam—on the Wall—where Americans from every corner of this great nation can give our silent thanks for their having given the "last full measure of devotion."

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my friend and colleague.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman for including this amendment en bloc.

As our men and women transition out of the Armed Forces, they are confronted with a number of challenges as they reintegrate into civilian life. My amendment offers a simple change to current DOD policy that I believe will greatly benefit our servicemembers as they return home.

Based on bipartisan legislation I have introduced, the Servicemembers Transition Improvement Act, this amendment would require a pilot program at DOD to transmit a comprehensive copy of a servicemember's information to State veterans agencies.

Veterans service agencies are a powerful resource, helping veterans through job assistance programs and navigating the benefits they have earned. This legislation will enable veterans service offices to assist separating servicemembers who reside in their communities and confirms that caring for our men and women in uniform does not end when they leave military service.

Also, Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment with Mr. COHEN of Tennessee to prohibit new funds for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund and ensure American tax dollars are invested wisely.

We have already spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has appropriated over $1.2 billion alone to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund since it was created in 2011.

In their most recent report, SIGAR reported that only $229 million of the $1.2 billion Congress has appropriated has actually been disbursed for projects. More importantly, SIGAR has repeatedly found that the projects which are underway are behind schedule and years away from completion.

Without any assurance that these projects are needed or can be completed, let's focus these funds on growing our economy, investing in American infrastructure, and paying off our debt.

I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for accepting this amendment in the en bloc and would encourage my colleagues to vote in support of it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH).

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc package, including my amendment which will strengthen our military families.

Madam Chair, last Mother's Day I traveled to Afghanistan with a bipartisan group of Members of Congress. We heard firsthand about the difficult mental and physical challenges our brave servicemen and -women must overcome. One such challenge was their maternity leave policy, which is not in line with the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Currently, the Department of Defense permits Active Duty mothers to take 6 weeks of maternity leave. This is 6 weeks less than mandated by the Family and Medical Leave Act.

My amendment, which is based on my widely supported bipartisan bill, the Military Opportunities for Mothers, or MOM, Act, would give servicemembers the option of extending leave to the same amount that is guaranteed to their civilian sisters. It has received widespread support because my colleagues have heard from female servicemembers and veterans on how bad this policy of just 6 weeks is for the retention of talented women, morale, and mental health.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and give our military mothers a chance at a healthier, stronger future for their families and our country. Extending maternity leave for these women is the least we can do for those who sacrifice so much for our country.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your service to our Nation as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. As a veteran, I deeply appreciate all you have done and will do until the end of your term.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this en bloc amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act because it contains an amendment I offered which provides servicemembers diagnosed with a mental health condition who have been discharged access to a physician with special mental health training to provide an additional level of expert review on appeal.

According to the Congressional Research Service, from 2001 to 2011, well over 900,000 servicemembers were diagnosed with at least one mental health condition. While the majority of those diagnosed were able to continue serving, many were ultimately discharged from the military either directly for their mental health issues or for conduct linked to those diagnoses.

Current law insufficiently equips servicemembers diagnosed with a mental health disorder during appeal of a discharge. My amendment corrects this injustice and ensures fairness for those suffering from mental health issues as a result of their service to our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding. I want to thank the chairman for his efforts on this evening's work.

I rise today in support of my amendment to improve mental health and suicide prevention for our Nation's veterans.

Every day our country loses 22 of our Nation's heroes to suicide. This heartbreaking statistic remains a devastating reality that should shake every Member in this House. Truly providing our heroes with the respect and care they have earned means treating not only physical, but invisible wounds as well.

With damning reports about the VA failing our veterans and our country, my amendment would insist on more accountability by requiring an independent third-party evaluation of existing suicide prevention efforts to improve coordination and integration between the DOD and the VA.

Outcomes of servicemember and veteran suicide prevention programs are too important to be left to government agencies, particularly ones embroiled in scandal.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. Our Nation must not continue to fail those who served us so bravely.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH).

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment which is included in the next en bloc amendment, which will strengthen small business participation in government contracts.

In my district and across the country, small businesses are the backbone of our economy. They innovate, know how to operate on a tight budget, and create good-paying jobs. My small businesses in Elgin, Illinois, should be able to win government contracts from the Department of Defense because I know they will do more with taxpayer dollars and provide superior products and services for our military.

This amendment would raise the small business prime contracting goal from 23 percent to 25 percent and establish a subcontracting goal of 40 percent. It would allow small businesses to reap $10 billion annually in new work. These steps will ensure small businesses are able to compete, remain a powerful employment source, and save taxpayers money.

Small businesses are a vital part of Illinois' Eighth Congressional District. That is why last year I came to the House floor to speak on behalf of small business amendments that I offered in the past. This time I am happy to partner with my colleague, the chairman of the Small Business Committee, to fight for this critical pillar of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the en bloc package that is before us tonight, which includes my amendment that will finally recognize the valiant service of merchant mariners who operated domestically during World War II.

Ensuring that individuals who sacrifice so much in service to our country receive the recognition they deserve is one of the most important jobs we have as Members of Congress.

I am grateful for the bipartisan support my amendment has received from colleagues like my good friends JANICE HAHN from California and WALTER JONES from North Carolina. With support for my amendment coast to coast, I am proud to stand here today one step closer to correcting an injustice that has remained for over 70 years. Madam Chair, after 70 long years, these mariners deserve to receive recognition for their service to our country.

I thank the chairman, I thank the ranking member for including this amendment in the en bloc package this evening, and I ask my colleagues to support final passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, 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 California (Mr. MCKEON).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 590, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 41, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 110, 112, 125, 138, 156, 157, and 160 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. DUCKWORTH OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 5____. AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN CONNECTION WITH THE BIRTH OF A CHILD.

Section 701(j) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting after ''(j)'' the following new paragraph (1):

''(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a member of the armed forces who gives birth to a child shall receive 42 days of convalescent leave to be used in connection with the birth of the child. At the discretion of the member, the member shall be allowed up to 42 additional days in a leave of absence status in connection with the birth of the child upon the expiration of the convalescent leave, except that—

''(A) a member who uses this additional leave is not entitled to basic pay for any day

on which such additional leave is used, but shall be considered to be on active duty for all other purposes; and

''(B) the commanding officer of the member may recall the member to duty from such leave of absence status when necessary to maintain unit readiness.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1) and (2)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. BILIRAKIS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 6___. TRANSPORTATION ON MILITARY AIRCRAFT ON A SPACE-AVAILABLE BASIS FOR DISABLED VETERANS WITH A SERVICE-CONNECTED, PERMANENT DISABILITY RATED AS TOTAL.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

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

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

''(f) SPECIAL PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide, at no additional cost to the Department of Defense and with no aircraft modification, transportation on scheduled and unscheduled military flights within the continental United States and on scheduled overseas flights operated by the Air Mobility Command on a space-available basis for any veteran with a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total.

''(2) Notwithstanding subsection (d)(1), in establishing space-available transportation priorities under the travel program, the Secretary shall provide transportation under paragraph (1) on the same basis as such transportation is provided to members of the armed forces entitled to retired or retainer pay.

''(3) The requirement to provide transportation on Department of Defense aircraft on a space-available basis on the priority basis described in paragraph (2) to veterans covered by this subsection applies whether or not the travel program is established under this section.

''(4) In this subsection, the terms 'veteran' and 'service-connected' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of title 38.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (f) of section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. ROSS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 634. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE COMMISSARY STORES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to close any commissary store.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

Page 175, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 642. AVAILABILITY FOR PURCHASE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEMORIAL HEADSTONES AND MARKERS FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO PERFORMED CERTAIN TRAINING.

Section 2306 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i)(1) The Secretary shall make available for purchase a memorial headstone or marker for the marked or unmarked grave of an individual described in paragraph (2) or for the purpose of commemorating such an individual whose remains are unavailable.

''(2) An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who—

''(A) as a member of a National Guard or Reserve component performed inactive duty training or active duty for training for at least six years but did not serve on active duty; and

''(B) is not otherwise ineligible for a memorial headstone or marker on account of the nature of the individual's separation from the Armed Forces or other cause.

''(3) A headstone or marker for the grave of an individual may be purchased under this subsection by—

''(A) the individual;

''(B) the surviving spouse, child, sibling, or parent of the individual; or

''(C) an individual other than the next of kin, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(4) In establishing the prices of the headstones and markers made available for purchase under this section, the Secretary shall ensure the prices are sufficient to cover the costs associated with the production and delivery of such headstones and markers.

''(5) No person may receive any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs solely by reason of this subsection.

''(6) This subsection does not authorize any new burial benefit for any person or create any new authority for any individual to be buried in a national cemetery.

''(7) The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Defense in establishing procedures to determine whether an individual is an individual described in paragraph (2).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 177, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 703. AVAILABILITY OF BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT, SUPPLIES, AND COUNSELING UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1079(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(18) Breastfeeding support, supplies (including breast pumps and associated equipment), and counseling shall be provided as appropriate during pregnancy and the postpartum period.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 184, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 715. PROVISION OF WRITTEN NOTICE OF CHANGE TO TRICARE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1097c the following new section:

''§ 1097d. TRICARE program: notice of change to benefits

''(a) PROVISION OF NOTICE.—(1) If the Secretary makes a significant change to any benefits provided by the TRICARE program to covered beneficiaries, the Secretary shall provide individuals described in paragraph (2) with written notice explaining such changes.

''(2) The individuals described by this paragraph are covered beneficiaries and providers participating in the TRICARE program who may be affected by a significant change covered by a notification under paragraph (1).

''(3) The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) through electronic means.

''(b) TIMING OF NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) by the earlier of the following dates:

''(1) The date that the Secretary determines would afford individuals described in paragraph (2) of such subsection adequate time to understand the change covered by the notification.

''(2) The date that is 90 days before the date on which the change covered by the notification becomes effective.

''(3) The effective date of a significant change that is required by law.

''(c) SIGNIFICANT CHANGE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'significant change' means a system-wide change—

''(1) in policy regarding services provided under the TRICARE program (not including the addition of new services or benefits); or

''(2) in payment rates of more than 20 percent.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1097c the following new item:

''1097d. TRICARE program: notice of change to benefits.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. _____. IMPROVEMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE.

(a) EVALUATIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than once each year, the Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code) shall contract with a third party unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense to conduct an evaluation of the mental health care and suicide prevention programs carried out under the laws administered by such Secretary.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) use metrics that are common among and useful for practitioners in the field of mental health care and suicide prevention;

(B) identify the most effective mental health care and suicide prevention programs conducted by the Secretary concerned;

(C) propose best practices for caring for individuals who suffer from mental health disorders or are at risk of suicide; and

(D) make recommendations to improve the coordination and integration of mental health and suicide prevention services between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to improve the delivery and effectiveness of such services.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. 7___. PRIMARY BLAST INJURY RESEARCH.

The peer-reviewed Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program shall conduct a study on blast injury mechanics covering a wide range of primary blast injury conditions, including traumatic brain injury, in order to accelerate solution development in this critical area.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 729. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO TREAT INFERTILITY OF MILITARY FAMILIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on what steps the Secretary is taking to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members have access to reproductive counseling and a full spectrum of treatments for infertility, including in vitro fertilization.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of treatment options available at military medical treatment facilities throughout the military health system.

(2) An identification of factors that might disrupt treatment, including availability of options, lack of timely access to treatment, change in duty station, or overseas deployments.

(3) The number of members of the Armed Forces who have used specific treatment options, including in vitro fertilization.

(4) The number of dependents of members who have used specific treatment options, including in vitro fertilization.

(5) An identification of non-Department of Defense treatment options for infertility that could benefit members and the dependents of members.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 197, after line 16, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 805. MAXIMIZING COMPETITION IN DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACTS.

(a) PUBLIC DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.—Section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and the contract is in an amount of $1,000,000 or greater'' after ''appropriate for use'';

(2) by striking the second sentence of subsection (d) and inserting the following: ''The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the agency approves the contracting officer's justification with respect to the solicitation that a number greater than 5 is in the Federal Government's interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection procedures.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require the head of each agency to appoint an individual who shall provide to the Director an annual compilation of each instance the agency awarded a contract pursuant to this section in which—

''(A) more than 5 offerors were selected to submit competitive proposals pursuant to subsection (c)(4); or

''(B) the contract was awarded without using the two-phase selection procedures described in subsection (c).

''(2) PUBLICATION.—The Director shall prepare an annual report containing the information provided by each executive agency under subparagraph (A). The report shall be accessible to the public through electronic means, and the Director shall publish a notice of availability in the Federal Register.

''(3) FISCAL YEARS COVERED; DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report prepared under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year during which this subsection is enacted, and each of the next 4 fiscal years, not later than 60 days after the end of each such fiscal year.''.

(b) DEFENSE DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.—Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and the contract is in an amount of $1,000,000 or greater'' after ''appropriate for use'';

(2) by striking the second sentence of subsection (d) and inserting the following: ''The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the agency approves the contracting officer's justification with respect to an individual solicitation that a number greater than 5 is in the Federal Government's interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection procedures.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) REPORT.—(1) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require the head of each agency to appoint an individual who shall provide to the Director an annual compilation of each instance the agency awarded a contract pursuant to this section in which—

''(A) more than 5 offerors were selected to submit competitive proposals pursuant to subsection (c)(4); or

''(B) the contract was awarded without using the two-phase selection procedures described in subsection (c).

''(2) The Director shall prepare an annual report containing the information provided by each executive agency under subparagraph (A). The report shall be accessible to the public through electronic means, and the Director shall publish a notice of availability in the Federal Register.

''(3) The Director shall submit to Congress the report prepared under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year during which this subsection is enacted, and each of the next 4 fiscal years, not later than 60 days after the end of each such fiscal year''.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than the end of fiscal year 2021, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the extent to which Federal agencies are in compliance with the reporting requirements in section 2305a(f) of title 10, United States Code, and section 3309(g) of title 41, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII (page 197, after line 16), insert the following new section:

SEC. 805. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR USE OF SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

Section 4202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (division D of Public Law 104–106; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended by striking subsection (e).

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 214, line 9, insert after ''terms.'' the following:

''(C) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative' shall mean a contract award pursuant to the process established by the Interagency Strategic Sourcing Leadership Council that was created by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to Memorandum M-13-02 issued on December 5, 2012.

''(8) STUDY OF STRATEGIC SOURCING.—

''(A) STUDY.—Not later than the last day of fiscal year 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study on the affect of contracts awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative on the small business industrial base.

''(B) SCOPE.—For each North American Classification System Code assigned to a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative, the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the following:

''(i) The number of small business concerns participating as prime contractors in that North American Industrial Classification System code in the federal procurement marketplace prior to the award of a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

''(ii) The number of small business concerns participating as prime contractors in that North American Industrial Classification System code in the federal procurement marketplace after the award of a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

''(iii) The number of small business concerns anticipated to be participating as prime contractors in that North American Industrial Classification System code in the federal procurement marketplace at the time that the a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative expires.

''(iv) The affect of any changes between subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) on the health of the small business industrial base, and the sustainability of any savings achieved by contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after initiating the study required by subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on the results from such study and, if warranted, any recommendations on how to mitigate any negative affects ont eh small business industrial base or the sustainability of savings.''.

Page 218, insert after line 20 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 817. PUBLICATION OF REQUIRED JUSTIFICATION THAT CONSOLIDATION OF CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

Section 44(c)(2)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(c)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This justification shall be published prior to the issuance of a solicitation.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

Page 218, strike lines 17 through 20 and insert the following (and conform the table the contents accordingly):

SEC. 816. IMPROVING FEDERAL SURETY BONDS.

(a) SURETY BOND REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter 93 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 9310. INDIVIDUAL SURETIES.

''If another applicable law or regulation permits the acceptance of a bond from a surety that is not subject to sections 9305 and 9306 and is based on a pledge of assets by the surety, the assets pledged by such surety shall—

''(1) consist of eligible obligations described under section 9303(a); and

''(2) be submitted to the official of the Government required to approve or accept the bond, who shall deposit the assets with a depository described under section 9303(b).''; and

(2) in the table of contents for such chapter, by adding at the end the following:

''9310. Individual sureties''.

(b) SBA SURETY BOND GUARANTEE.—Section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''70'' and inserting ''90''.

(c) GAO STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the following:

(A) All instances during the 10-year period prior to the date of enactment of the Act in

which a surety bond proposed or issued by a surety in connection with a Federal project was—

(i) rejected by a Federal contracting officer; or

(ii) accepted by a Federal contracting officer, but was later found to have been backed by insufficient collateral or to be otherwise deficient or with respect to which the surety did not perform.

(B) The consequences to the Federal Government, subcontractors, and suppliers of the instances described under paragraph (1).

(C) The percentages of all Federal contracts that were awarded to new startup businesses (including new startup businesses that are small disadvantaged businesses or disadvantaged business enterprises), small disadvantaged businesses, and disadvantaged business enterprises as prime contractors in the 2-year period prior to and the 2-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, and an assessment of the impact of this Act and the amendments made by this Act upon such percentages.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(A) DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.—The term ''disadvantaged business enterprise'' has the meaning given that term under section 26.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) NEW STARTUP BUSINESS.—The term ''new startup business'' means a business that was formed in the 2-year period ending on the date on which the business bids on a Federal contract that requires giving a surety bond.

(C) SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS.—The term ''small disadvantaged business'' has the meaning given that term under section 124.1002(b) of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 1082. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERFORMANCE OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 7734 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: ''and on the performance of any regional office that fails to meet its administrative goals'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) in the case of any regional office that, for the year covered by the report, did not meet the administrative goal of no claim pending for more than 125 days and an accuracy rating of 98 percent—

''(A) a signed statement prepared by the individual serving as director of the regional office as of the date of the submittal of the report containing—

''(i) an explanation for why the regional office did not meet the goal;

''(ii) a description of the additional resources needed to enable the regional office to reach the goal; and

''(iii) a description of any additional actions planned for the subsequent year that are proposed to enable the regional office to meet the goal; and

''(B) a statement prepared by the Under Secretary for Benefits explaining how the failure of the regional office to meet the goal affected the performance evaluation of the director of the regional office; and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1107. EXTENSION OF PART-TIME REEMPLOYMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) CSRS.—Section 8344(l)(7) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by strike ''5 years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

(b) FERS.—Section 8468(i)(7) of such title is amended by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle D of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. SALE OF F-16 AIRCRAFT TO TAIWAN.

The President shall carry out the sale of no fewer than 66 F-16C/D multirole fighter aircraft to Taiwan.

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 484, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 1523. CODIFICATION OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET CRITERIA.

The Secretary of Defense shall implement the following criteria in requests for overseas contingency operations:

(1) Geographic Area Covered – For theater of operations for non-classified war overseas contingency operations funding, the geographic areas in which combat or direct combat support operations occur are: Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrhyzstan, the Horn of Africa, Persian Gulf and Gulf nations, Arabian Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Philippines, and other countries on a case-by-case basis.

(2) Permitted Inclusions in the Overseas Contingency Operation Budget

(A) Major Equipment

(i) Replacement of loses that have occurred but only for items not already programmed for replacement in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP), but not including accelerations, which must be made in the base budget.

(ii) Replacement or repair to original capability (to upgraded capability if that is currently available) of equipment returning from theater. The replacement may be a similar end item if the original item is no longer in production. Incremental cost of non-war related upgrades, if made, should be included in the base.

(iii) Purchase of specialized, theater-specific equipment.

(iv) Funding for major equipment must be obligated within 12 months.

(B) Ground Equipment Replacement

(i) For combat losses and returning equipment that is not economical to repair, the replacement of equipment may be given to coalition partners, if consistent with approved policy.

(ii) In-theater stocks above customary equipping levels on a case-by-case basis.

(C) Equipment Modifications

(i) Operationally-required modifications to equipment used in theater or in direct support of combat operations and that is not already programmed in FYDP.

(ii) Funding for equipment modifications must be able be obligated in 12 months.

(D) Munitions

(i) Replenishment of munitions expended in combat operations in theater.

(ii) Training ammunition for theater-unique training events.

(iii) While forecasted expenditures are not permitted, a case-by-case assessment for munitions where existing stocks are insufficient to sustain theater combat operations.

(E) Aircraft Replacement

(i) Combat losses by accident that occur in the theater of operations.

(ii) Combat losses by enemy action that occur in the theater of operations.

(F) Military Construction

(i) Facilities and infrastructure in the theater of operations in direct support of combat operations. The level of construction should be the minimum to meet operational requirements.

(ii) At non-enduring locations, facilities and infrastructure for temporary use.

(iii) At enduring locations, facilities and infrastructure for temporary use.

(iv) At enduring locations, construction requirements must be tied to surge operations or major changes in operational requirements and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

(G) Research and development projects for combat operations in these specific theaters that can be delivered in 12 months.

(H) Operations

(i) Direct War costs:

(I) Transport of personnel, equipment, and supplies to, from and within the theater of operations.

(II) Deployment-specific training and preparation for unites and personnel (military and civilian) to assume their directed missions as defined in the orders for deployment into the theater of operations.

(ii) Within the theater, the incremental costs above the funding programmed in the base budget to:

(I) Support commanders in the conduct of their directed missions (to include Emergency Response Programs).

(II) Build and maintain temporary facilities.

(III) Provide food, fuel, supplies, contracted services and other support.

(IV) Cover the operational costs of coalition partners supporting US military missions, as mutually agreed.

(iii) Indirect war costs incurred outside the theater of operations will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

(I) Health

(i) Short-term care directly related to combat.

(ii) Infrastructure that is only to be used during the current conflict.

(J) Personnel

(i) Incremental special pays and allowances for Service members and civilians deployed to a combat zone.

(ii) Incremental pay, special pays and allowances for Reserve Component personnel mobilized to support war missions.

(K) Special Operations Command

(i) Operations that meet the criteria in this guidance.

(ii) Equipment that meets the criteria in this guidance.

(L) Prepositioned Supplies and equipment for resetting in-theater stocks of supplies and equipment to pre-war levels.

(M) Security force funding to train, equip, and sustain Iraqi and Afghan military and police forces.

(N) Fuel

(i) War fuel costs and funding to ensure that logistical support to combat operations is not degraded due to cash losses in the Department of Defense's baseline fuel program.

(ii) Enough of any base fuel shortfall attributable to fuel price increases to maintain sufficient on-hand cash for the Defense Working Capital Funds to cover seven days disbursements.

(3) Excluded items from Overseas Contingency Funding that must be funded from the base budget

(A) Training vehicles, aircraft, ammunition, and simulators, but not training base stocks of specialized, theater-specific equipment that is required to support combat operations in the theater of operations, and support to deployment-specific training described above.

(B) Acceleration of equipment service life extension programs already in the Future Years Defense Plan.

(C) Base Realignment and Closure projects.

(D) Family support initiatives

(i) Construction of childcare facilities.

(ii) Funding for private-public partisanships to expand military families' access to childcare.

(iii) Support for service members' spouses professional development.

(E) Programs to maintain industrial base capacity including ''war-stoppers.''

(F) Personnel

(i) Recruiting and retention bonuses to maintain end-strength.

(ii) Basic Pay and the Basic allowances for Housing and Subsistence for permanently authorized end strength.

(iii) Individual augmentees on a case-by-case basis.

(G) Support for the personnel, operations, or the construction or maintenance of facilities, at U.S. Offices of Security Cooperation in theater.

(H) Costs for reconfiguring prepositioned supplies and equipment or for maintaining them.

(4) Special Situations – Items proposed for increases in reprogrammings or as payback for prior reprogrammings must meet the criteria above.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI OF PUERTO RICO

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

SEC. 28___. USE OF FORMER BOMBARDMENT AREA ON ISLAND OF CULEBRA, PUERTO RICO.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the statutory prohibition restricting environmental cleanup of the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico, is a unique anomaly for the Department of Defense and its formerly used defense sites.

(b) MODIFICATION OF RESTRICTION ON FEDERAL DECONTAMINATION AUTHORITY.—Section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93–166; 87 Stat. 668) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The first sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the portions of the former bombardment area that were identified as having regular public access in the Department of Defense study entitled 'Study Relating to the Presence of Unexploded Ordnance in a Portion of the Former Naval Bombardment Area of Culebra Island, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico' and dated April 20, 2012, which was prepared in accordance with section 2815 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4464).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new division:

DIVISION E—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act''.

SEC. 5002. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this division is as follows:

DIVISION E—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM

Sec. 5001. Short title.
Sec. 5002. Table of contents.
Sec. 5003. Definitions.

TITLE LI—MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITHIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Sec. 5101. Increased authority of agency Chief Information Officers over information technology.
Sec. 5102. Lead coordination role of Chief Information Officers Council.
Sec. 5103. Reports by Government Accountability Office.

TITLE LII—DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION

Sec. 5201. Purpose.
Sec. 5202. Definitions.
Sec. 5203. Federal data center optimization initiative.
Sec. 5204. Performance requirements related to data center consolidation.
Sec. 5205. Cost savings related to data center optimization.
Sec. 5206. Reporting requirements to Congress and the Federal Chief Information Officer.

TITLE LIII—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATION AND WASTE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION

Sec. 5301. Inventory of information technology software assets.
Sec. 5302. Website consolidation and transparency.
Sec. 5303. Transition to the cloud.
Sec. 5304. Elimination of unnecessary duplication of contracts by requiring business case analysis.

TITLE LIV—STRENGTHENING IT ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

Sec. 5411. Expansion of training and use of information technology acquisition cadres.
Sec. 5412. Plan on strengthening program and project management performance.
Sec. 5413. Personnel awards for excellence in the acquisition of information systems and information technology.

TITLE LV—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

Sec. 5501. Maximizing the benefit of the Federal strategic sourcing initiative.
Sec. 5502. Governmentwide software purchasing program.
Sec. 5503. Promoting transparency of blanket purchase agreements.
Sec. 5504. Additional source selection technique in solicitations.
Sec. 5505. Enhanced transparency in information technology investments.
Sec. 5506. Enhanced communication between government and industry.
Sec. 5507. Clarification of current law with respect to technology neutrality in acquisition of software.
Sec. 5508. No additional funds authorized.

SEC. 5003. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term ''Chief Acquisition Officers Council'' means the Chief Acquisition Officers Council established by section 1311(a) of title 41, United States Code.

(2) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term ''Chief Information Officer'' means a Chief Information Officer (as designated under section 3506(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code) of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term ''Chief Information Officers Council'' or ''CIO Council'' means the Chief Information Officers Council established by section 3603(a) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''Federal agency'' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(6) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term ''Federal Chief Information Officer'' means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code.

(7) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OR IT.—The term ''information technology'' or ''IT'' has the meaning provided in section 11101(6) of title 40, United States Code.

(8) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''relevant congressional committees'' means each of the following:

(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE LI—MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITHIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 5101. INCREASED AUTHORITY OF AGENCY CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS OVER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF CIOS OF CERTAIN AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (a) as subsection (e) and moving such subsection to the end of the section; and

(B) by inserting before subsection (b) the following new subsection (a):

''(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OR DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be within each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) of title 31 an agency Chief Information Officer. Each agency Chief Information Officer shall—

''(A)(i) be appointed by the President; or

''(ii) be designated by the President, in consultation with the head of the agency; and

''(B) be appointed or designated, as applicable, from among individuals who possess demonstrated ability in general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, information technology management practices in large governmental or business entities.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—An agency Chief Information Officer appointed or designated under this section shall report directly to the head of the agency and carry out, on a full-time basis, responsibilities as set forth in this section and in section 3506(a) of title 44 for Chief Information Officers designated under paragraph (2) of such section.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3506(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the head of each agency'' and inserting ''The head of each agency, other than an agency with a Presidentially appointed or designated Chief Information Officer as provided in section 11315(a)(1) of title 40,''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(b) AUTHORITY RELATING TO BUDGET AND PERSONNEL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN CIOS.—

''(1) BUDGET-RELATED AUTHORITY.—

''(A) PLANNING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31 and in section 102 of title 5 shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology or programs that include significant information technology components.

''(B) ALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts appropriated for any agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31 and in section 102 of title 5 for any fiscal year that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

''(2) PERSONNEL-RELATED AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31 shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority necessary to approve the hiring of personnel who will have information technology responsibilities within the agency and to require that such personnel have the obligation to report to the Chief Information Officer in a manner considered sufficient by the Chief Information Officer.''.

(c) SINGLE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER IN EACH AGENCY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 3506(a)(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) Each agency shall have only one individual with the title and designation of 'Chief Information Officer'. Any bureau, office, or subordinate organization within the agency may designate one individual with the title 'Deputy Chief Information Officer', 'Associate Chief Information Officer', or 'Assistant Chief Information Officer'.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 3506(a)(3)(B) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect as of October 1, 2014. Any individual serving in a position affected by such section before such date may continue in that position if the requirements of such section are fulfilled with respect to that individual.

SEC. 5102. LEAD COORDINATION ROLE OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.

(a) LEAD COORDINATION ROLE.—Subsection (d) of section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d) LEAD INTERAGENCY FORUM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council is designated the lead interagency forum for improving agency coordination of practices related to the design, development, modernization, use, operation, sharing, performance, and review of Federal Government information resources investment. As the lead interagency forum, the Council shall develop cross-agency portfolio management practices to allow and encourage the development of cross-agency shared services and shared platforms. The Council shall also issue guidelines and practices for infrastructure and common information technology applications, including expansion of the Federal Enterprise Architecture process if appropriate. The guidelines and practices may address broader transparency, common inputs, common outputs, and outcomes achieved. The guidelines and practices shall be used as a basis for comparing performance across diverse missions and operations in various agencies.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 1 in each of the 6 years following the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Council shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report (to be known as the 'CIO Council Report') summarizing the Council's activities in the preceding fiscal year and containing such recommendations for further congressional action to fulfill its mission as the Council considers appropriate.

''(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of the report required by paragraph (2), the relevant congressional committees are each of the following:

''(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.''.

(b) REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATOR OF E-GOVERNMENT AS FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—

(1) REFERENCES.—Section 3602(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The Administrator may also be referred to as the Federal Chief Information Officer.''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 3601(1) of such title is amended by inserting ''or Federal Chief Information Officer'' before ''means''.

SEC. 5103. REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO EXAMINE EFFECTIVENESS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the effectiveness of the Chief Information Officers Council in meeting its responsibilities under section 3603(d) of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 5102, with particular focus on whether agencies are actively participating in the Council and heeding the Council's advice and guidance.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General from the examination required by subsection (a).

TITLE LII—DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION

SEC. 5201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to optimize Federal data center usage and efficiency.

SEC. 5202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.—The term ''Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative'' or the ''Initiative'' means the initiative developed and implemented by the Director, through the Federal Chief Information Officer, as required under section 5203.

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ''covered agency'' means any agency included in the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

(3) DATA CENTER.—The term ''data center'' means a closet, room, floor, or building for the storage, management, and dissemination of data and information, as defined by the Federal Chief Information Officer under guidance issued pursuant to this section.

(4) FEDERAL DATA CENTER.—The term ''Federal data center'' means any data center of a covered agency used or operated by a covered agency, by a contractor of a covered agency, or by another organization on behalf of a covered agency.

(5) SERVER UTILIZATION.—The term ''server utilization'' refers to the activity level of a server relative to its maximum activity level, expressed as a percentage.

(6) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—The term ''power usage effectiveness'' means the ratio obtained by dividing the total amount of electricity and other power consumed in running a data center by the power consumed by the information and communications technology in the data center.

SEC. 5203. FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR INITIATIVE.—The Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and implement an initiative, to be known as the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, to optimize the usage and efficiency of Federal data centers by meeting the requirements of this division and taking additional measures, as appropriate.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and submit to Congress a plan for implementation of the Initiative required by subsection (a) by each covered agency. In developing the plan, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall take into account the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General review required by section 5205(e).

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall include—

(1) descriptions of how covered agencies will use reductions in floor space, energy use, infrastructure, equipment, applications, personnel, increases in multiorganizational use, server virtualization, cloud computing, and other appropriate methods to meet the requirements of the initiative; and

(2) appropriate consideration of shifting Federally owned data center workload to commercially owned data centers.

SEC. 5204. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION.

(a) SERVER UTILIZATION.—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum server utilization possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

(1) The closing of existing data centers that lack adequate server utilization, as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer. If the agency fails to close such data centers, the agency shall provide a detailed explanation as to why this data center should remain in use as part of the submitted plan. The Federal Chief Information Officer shall include an assessment of the agency explanation in the annual report to Congress.

(2) The consolidation of services within existing data centers to increase server utilization rates.

(3) Any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize server utilization.

(b) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum energy efficiency possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

(1) The use of the measurement of power usage effectiveness to calculate data center energy efficiency.

(2) The use of power meters in facilities dedicated to data center operations to frequently measure power consumption over time.

(3) The establishment of power usage effectiveness goals for each data center.

(4) The adoption of best practices for managing—

(A) temperature and airflow in facilities dedicated to data center operations; and

(B) power supply efficiency.

(5) The implementation of any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize data center energy efficiency.

SEC. 5205. COST SAVINGS RELATED TO DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track costs resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those costs annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net costs from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net costs each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

(A) Energy costs.

(B) Personnel costs.

(C) Real estate costs.

(D) Capital expense costs.

(E) Maintenance and support costs such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense costs.

(F) Other appropriate costs, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK SAVINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track realized and projected savings resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those savings annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net savings from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net savings each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

(A) Energy savings.

(B) Personnel savings.

(C) Real estate savings.

(D) Capital expense savings.

(E) Maintenance and support savings such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense savings.

(F) Other appropriate savings, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Federal Chief Information Officer shall make publicly available a summary of realized and projected savings for each covered agency. The Federal Chief Information Officer shall identify any covered agency that failed to provide the annual report required under paragraph (1).

(c) REQUIREMENT TO USE COST-EFFECTIVE MEASURES.—Covered agencies shall use the most cost-effective measures to implement the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, such as using estimation to measure or track costs and savings using a methodology approved by the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(d) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine methods for calculating savings from the Initiative and using them for the purposes identified in subsection (d), including establishment and use of a special revolving fund that supports data centers and server optimization, and shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer and Congress a report on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations.

SEC. 5206. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

(a) AGENCY REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CIO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each covered agency each year shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report on the implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, including savings resulting from such implementation. The report shall include an update of the agency's plan for implementing the Initiative.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall comply with paragraph (1) each year by submitting to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report with relevant information collected under section 2867 of Public Law 112–81 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note) or a copy of the report required under section 2867(d) of such law.

(b) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Each year, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report that assesses agency progress in carrying out the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative and updates the plan under section 5203. The report may be included as part of the annual report required under section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

TITLE LIII—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATION AND WASTE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION

SEC. 5301. INVENTORY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SOFTWARE ASSETS.

(a) PLAN.—The Director shall develop a plan for conducting a Governmentwide inventory of information technology software assets.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall cover the following:

(1) The manner in which Federal agencies can achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and cost savings in the procurement of information technology software assets, through measures such as reducing the procurement of new software licenses until such time as agency needs exceed the number of existing and unused licenses.

(2) The capability to conduct ongoing Governmentwide inventories of all existing software licenses on an application-by-application basis, including duplicative, unused, overused, and underused licenses, and to assess the need of agencies for software licenses.

(3) A Governmentwide spending analysis to provide knowledge about how much is being spent for software products or services to support decisions for strategic sourcing under the Federal strategic sourcing program managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The inventory of information technology software assets shall be available to Chief Information Officers and such other Federal officials as the Chief Information Officers may, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, designate.

(d) DEADLINE AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete and submit to Congress the plan required by subsection (a).

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete implementation of the plan required by subsection (a).

(f) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan required by subsection (a) and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

SEC. 5302. WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION AND TRANSPARENCY.

(a) WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION.—The Director shall—

(1) in consultation with Federal agencies, and after reviewing the directory of public Federal Government websites of each agency (as required to be established and updated under section 207(f)(3) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note)), assess all the publicly available websites of Federal agencies to determine whether there are duplicative or overlapping websites; and

(2) require Federal agencies to eliminate or consolidate those websites that are duplicative or overlapping.

(b) WEBSITE TRANSPARENCY.—The Director shall issue guidance to Federal agencies to ensure that the data on publicly available websites of the agencies are open and accessible to the public.

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—In preparing the guidance required by subsection (b), the Director shall—

(1) develop guidelines, standards, and best practices for interoperability and transparency;

(2) identify interfaces that provide for shared, open solutions on the publicly available websites of the agencies; and

(3) ensure that Federal agency Internet home pages, web-based forms, and web-based applications are accessible to individuals with disabilities in conformance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

(d) DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.—The guidance required by subsection (b) shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5303. TRANSITION TO THE CLOUD.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that transition to cloud computing offers significant potential benefits for the implementation of Federal information technology projects in terms of flexibility, cost, and operational benefits.

(b) GOVERNMENTWIDE APPLICATION.—In assessing cloud computing opportunities, the Chief Information Officers Council shall define policies and guidelines for the adoption of Governmentwide programs providing for a standardized approach to security assessment and operational authorization for cloud products and services.

(c) ADDITIONAL BUDGET AUTHORITIES FOR TRANSITION.—In transitioning to the cloud, a Chief Information Officer of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, may establish such cloud service Working Capital Funds, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency, as may be necessary to transition to cloud-based solutions. Any establishment of a new Working Capital Fund under this subsection shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and relevant Congressional committees.

SEC. 5304. ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF CONTRACTS BY REQUIRING BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to leverage the Government's buying power and achieve administrative efficiencies and cost savings by eliminating unnecessary duplication of contracts.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR BUSINESS CASE APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 3312. Requirement for business case approval for new Governmentwide contracts

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An executive agency may not issue a solicitation for a covered Governmentwide contract unless the agency performs a business case analysis for the contract and obtains an approval of the business case analysis from the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

''(b) REVIEW OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any covered Governmentwide contract, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall review the business case analysis submitted for the contract and provide an approval or disapproval within 60 days after the date of submission. Any business case analysis not disapproved within such 60-day period is deemed to be approved.

''(2) BASIS FOR APPROVAL OF BUSINESS CASE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall approve or disapprove a business case analysis based on the adequacy of the analysis submitted. The Administrator shall give primary consideration to whether an agency has demonstrated a compelling need that cannot be satisfied by existing Governmentwide contract in a timely and cost-effective manner.

''(c) CONTENT OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance specifying the content for a business case analysis submitted pursuant to this section. At a minimum, the business case analysis shall include details on the administrative resources needed for such contract, including an analysis of all direct and indirect costs to the Federal Government of awarding and administering such contract and the impact such contract will have on the ability of the Federal Government to leverage its purchasing power.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED GOVERNMENTWIDE CONTRACT.—The term 'covered Governmentwide contract' means any contract, blanket purchase agreement, or other contractual instrument for acquisition of information technology or other goods or services that allows for an indefinite number of orders to be placed under the contract, agreement, or instrument, and that is established by one executive agency for use by multiple executive agencies to obtain goods or services. The term does not include—

''(A) a multiple award schedule contract awarded by the General Services Administration;

''(B) a Governmentwide acquisition contract for information technology awarded pursuant to sections 11302(e) and 11314(a)(2) of title 40;

''(C) orders under Governmentwide contracts in existence before the effective date of this section; or

''(D) any contract in an amount less than $10,000,000, determined on an average annual basis.

''(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning provided that term by section 105 of title 5.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3311 the following new item:

''3312. Requirement for business case approval for new Governmentwide contracts.''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the next 6 years following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the implementation of section 3312 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), including a summary of the submissions, reviews, approvals, and disapprovals of business case analyses pursuant to such section.

(d) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance for implementing section 3312 of such title.

(e) REVISION OF FAR.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement section 3312 of such title.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 3312 of such title is effective on and after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE LIV—STRENGTHENING IT ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

SEC. 5411. EXPANSION OF TRAINING AND USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure timely progress by Federal agencies toward developing, strengthening, and deploying personnel with highly specialized skills in information technology acquisition, including program and project managers, to be known as information technology acquisition cadres.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1704 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) STRATEGIC PLAN ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.—

''(1) FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a 5-year strategic plan (to be known as the 'IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan') to develop, strengthen, and solidify information technology acquisition cadres. The plan shall include a timeline for implementation of the plan and identification of individuals responsible for specific elements of the plan during the 5-year period covered by the plan.

''(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall address, at a minimum, the following matters:

''(A) Current information technology acquisition staffing challenges in Federal agencies, by previous year's information technology acquisition value, and by the Federal Government as a whole.

''(B) The variety and complexity of information technology acquisitions conducted by each Federal agency covered by the plan, and the specialized information technology acquisition workforce needed to effectively carry out such acquisitions.

''(C) The development of a sustainable funding model to support efforts to hire, retain, and train an information technology acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill to effectively carry out the acquisition programs of the Federal agencies covered by the plan, including an examination of interagency funding methods and a discussion of how the model of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund could be applied to civilian agencies.

''(D) Any strategic human capital planning necessary to hire, retain, and train an information acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill at each Federal agency covered by the plan.

''(E) Governmentwide training standards and certification requirements necessary to enhance the mobility and career opportunities of the Federal information technology acquisition cadre within the Federal agencies covered by the plan.

''(F) New and innovative approaches to workforce development and training, including cross-functional training, rotational development, and assignments both within and outside the Government.

''(G) Appropriate consideration and alignment with the needs and priorities of the acquisition intern programs.

''(H) Assessment of the current workforce competency and usage trends in evaluation technique to obtain best value, including proper handling of tradeoffs between price and nonprice factors.

''(I) Assessment of the current workforce competency in designing and aligning performance goals, life cycle costs, and contract incentives.

''(J) Assessment of the current workforce competency in avoiding brand-name preference and using industry-neutral functional specifications to leverage open industry standards and competition.

''(K) Use of integrated program teams, including fully dedicated program managers, for each complex information technology investment.

''(L) Proper assignment of recognition or accountability to the members of an integrated program team for both individual functional goals and overall program success or failure.

''(M) The development of a technology fellows program that includes provisions for recruiting, for rotation of assignments, and for partnering directly with universities with well-recognized information technology programs.

''(N) The capability to properly manage other transaction authority (where such authority is granted), including ensuring that the use of the authority is warranted due to unique technical challenges, rapid adoption of innovative or emerging commercial or noncommercial technologies, or other circumstances that cannot readily be satisfied using a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement in accordance with applicable law and the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(O) The use of student internship and scholarship programs as a talent pool for permanent hires and the use and impact of special hiring authorities and flexibilities to recruit diverse candidates.

''(P) The assessment of hiring manager satisfaction with the hiring process and hiring outcomes, including satisfaction with the quality of applicants interviewed and hires made.

''(Q) The assessment of applicant satisfaction with the hiring process, including the clarity of the hiring announcement, the user-friendliness of the application process, communication from the hiring manager or agency regarding application status, and timeliness of the hiring decision.

''(R) The assessment of new hire satisfaction with the onboarding process, including the orientation process, and investment in training and development for employees during their first year of employment.

''(S) Any other matters the Director considers appropriate.

''(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the 5 years following the year of submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees an annual report outlining the progress made pursuant to the plan.

''(4) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF THE PLAN AND ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(A) Not later than 1 year after the submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

''(B) Not later than 6 months after the submission of the first, third, and fifth annual report required under paragraph (3), the Comptroller General shall independently assess the findings of the annual report and brief the relevant congressional committees on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations to ensure the objectives of the plan are accomplished.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'Federal agency' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

''(B) The term 'relevant congressional committees' means each of the following:

''(i) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on

Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.''.

SEC. 5412. PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.

(a) PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a plan for improving management of IT programs and projects.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Creation of a specialized career path for program management.

(2) The development of a competency model for program management consistent with the IT project manager model.

(3) A career advancement model that requires appropriate expertise and experience for advancement.

(4) A career advancement model that is more competitive with the private sector and that recognizes both Government and private sector experience.

(c) COMBINATION WITH OTHER CADRES PLAN.—The Director may combine the plan required by subsection (a) with the IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan required under section 1704(j) of title 41, United States Code, as added by section 5411.

SEC. 5413. PERSONNEL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE ACQUISITION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall develop policy and guidance for agencies to develop a program to recognize excellent performance by Federal Government employees and teams of such employees in the acquisition of information systems and information technology for the agency.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The program referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable—

(1) obtain objective outcome measures; and

(2) include procedures for—

(A) the nomination of Federal Government employees and teams of such employees for eligibility for recognition under the program; and

(B) the evaluation of nominations for recognition under the program by 1 or more agency panels of individuals from Government, academia, and the private sector who have such expertise, and are appointed in such a manner, as the Director of the Office of Personal Management shall establish for purposes of the program.

(c) AWARD OF CASH BONUSES AND OTHER INCENTIVES.—In carrying out the program referred to in subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish policies and guidance for agencies to reward any Federal Government employee or teams of such employees recognized pursuant to the program—

(1) with a cash bonus, to the extent that the performance of such individual or team warrants the award of such bonus and is authorized by any provision of law;

(2) through promotions and other nonmonetary awards;

(3) by publicizing—

(A) acquisition accomplishments by individual employees; and

(B) the tangible end benefits that resulted from such accomplishments, as appropriate; and

(4) through other awards, incentives, or bonuses that the head of the agency considers appropriate.

TITLE LV—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

SEC. 5501. MAXIMIZING THE BENEFIT OF THE FEDERAL STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall prescribe regulations providing that when the Federal Government makes a purchase of services and supplies offered under the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative (managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy) but such Initiative is not used, the contract file for the purchase shall include a brief analysis of the comparative value, including price and nonprice factors, between the services and supplies offered under such Initiative and services and supplies offered under the source or sources used for the purchase.

SEC. 5502. GOVERNMENTWIDE SOFTWARE PURCHASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services, in collaboration with the Department of Defense, shall identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative to enhance Governmentwide acquisition, shared use, and dissemination of software, as well as compliance with end user license agreements.

(b) EXAMINATION OF METHODS.—In developing the initiative under subsection (a), the Administrator shall examine the use of realistic and effective demand aggregation models supported by actual agency commitment to use the models, and supplier relationship management practices, to more effectively govern the Government's acquisition of information technology.

(c) GOVERNMENTWIDE USER LICENSE AGREEMENT.—The Administrator, in developing the initiative under subsection (a), shall allow for the purchase of a license agreement that is available for use by all executive agencies as one user to the maximum extent practicable and as appropriate.

SEC. 5503. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

(a) PRICE INFORMATION TO BE TREATED AS PUBLIC INFORMATION.—The final negotiated price offered by an awardee of a blanket purchase agreement shall be treated as public information.

(b) PUBLICATION OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT INFORMATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall make available to the public a list of all blanket purchase agreements entered into by Federal agencies under its Federal Supply Schedules contracts and the prices associated with those blanket purchase agreements. The list and price information shall be updated at least once every 6 months.

SEC. 5504. ADDITIONAL SOURCE SELECTION TECHNIQUE IN SOLICITATIONS.

Section 3306(d) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period and inserting ''; or'' at the end of paragraph (2); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) stating in the solicitation that the award will be made using a fixed price technical competition, under which all offerors compete solely on nonprice factors and the fixed award price is pre-announced in the solicitation.''.

SEC. 5505. ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT IT INVESTMENTS.—Section 11302(c) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall make available to the public the cost, schedule, and performance data for all of the IT investments listed in subparagraph (B), notwithstanding whether the investments are for new IT acquisitions or for operations and maintenance of existing IT.

''(B) INVESTMENTS LISTED.—The investments listed in this subparagraph are the following:

''(i) At least 80 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments Governmentwide.

''(ii) At least 60 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments in each Federal agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

''(iii) Every major information technology investment (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) in each Federal agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

''(C) QUARTERLY REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION.—For each investment listed in subparagraph (B), the agency Chief Information Officer and the program manager of the investment within the agency shall certify, at least once every quarter, that the information is current, accurate, and reflects the risks associated with each listed investment. The Director shall conduct quarterly reviews and publicly identify agencies with an incomplete certification or with significant data quality issues.

''(D) CONTINUOUS AVAILABILITY.—The information required under subparagraph (A), in its most updated form, shall be publicly available at all times.

''(E) WAIVER OR LIMITATION AUTHORITY.—The applicability of subparagraph (A) may be waived or the extent of the information may be limited—

''(i) by the Director, with respect to IT investments Governmentwide; and

''(ii) by the Chief Information Officer of a Federal agency, with respect to IT investments in that agency;

if the Director or the Chief Information Officer, as the case may be, determines that such a waiver or limitation is in the national security interests of the United States.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 11302(c) of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The report shall include an analysis of agency trends reflected in the performance risk information required in paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 5506. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe a regulation making clear that agency acquisition personnel are permitted and encouraged to engage in responsible and constructive exchanges with industry, so long as those exchanges are consistent with existing law and regulation and do not promote an unfair competitive advantage to particular firms.

SEC. 5507. CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW WITH RESPECT TO TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY IN ACQUISITION OF SOFTWARE.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish guidance and processes to

clarify that software acquisitions by the Federal Government are to be made using merit-based requirements development and evaluation processes that promote procurement choices—

(1) based on performance and value, including the long-term value proposition to the Federal Government;

(2) free of preconceived preferences based on how technology is developed, licensed, or distributed; and

(3) generally including the consideration of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software technologies.

(b) TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the Federal Government's long-standing policy of following technology-neutral principles and practices when selecting and acquiring information technology that best fits the needs of the Federal Government.

(c) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, shall issue guidance concerning the technology-neutral procurement and use of software within the Federal Government.

(d) MATTERS COVERED.—In issuing guidance under subsection (c), the Director shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Guidance to clarify that the preference for commercial items in section 3307 of title 41, United States Code, includes proprietary, open source, and mixed source software that meets the definition of the term ''commercial item'' in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, including all such software that is used for non-Government purposes and is licensed to the public.

(2) Guidance regarding the conduct of market research to ensure the inclusion of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software options.

(3) Guidance to define Governmentwide standards for security, redistribution, indemnity, and copyright in the acquisition, use, release, and collaborative development of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software.

(4) Guidance for the adoption of available commercial practices to acquire proprietary, open source, and mixed source software for widespread Government use, including issues such as security and redistribution rights.

(5) Guidance to establish standard service level agreements for maintenance and support for proprietary, open source, and mixed source software products widely adopted by the Government, as well as the development of Governmentwide agreements that contain standard and widely applicable contract provisions for ongoing maintenance and development of software.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of the guidance required by subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing—

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the guidance;

(2) an identification of barriers to widespread use by the Federal Government of specific software technologies; and

(3) such legislative recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to further the purposes of this section.

SEC. 5508. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this division and the amendments made by this division. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Page 459, line 15, strike ''None'' and insert ''(a) PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—None''.

Page 459, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(b) RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that missile defense systems of the Russian Federation should not be integrated into the missile defense systems of the United States or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization if such integration undermines the security of the United States or NATO.

(2) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense or for United States contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization may be obligated or expended to integrate missile defense systems of the Russian Federation into missile defense systems of the United States if such integration undermines the security of the United States or NATO.

(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (2) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the Russian Federation—

(A) has withdrawn military forces and assets from Ukraine's Crimean peninsula, other than at those operating in accordance with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Conditions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Territory of Ukraine; and

(B) has ceased aggressive actions, particularly along Ukraine's eastern border, that have led to a destabilization of the Ukrainian government and the safety of its residents.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I agree with the chairman we should adopt the en bloc amendments.

I did want to take a moment here—we don't have any speakers on this—to make a couple comments about some Rules Committee decisions that I have not had a chance to speak about before.

Overall, I applaud the product that we have crated here in a bipartisan way. I thank the chairman for doing that.

I do think it is a fortunate the Rules Committee ruled out of order a number of amendments. Two of them were mine. One was to offer a BRAC amendment to give Members of Congress a chance to vote on it. The other was to offer up the administration's proposal to lay up 14 Navy vessels as an effort to save money.

There are several problems with the fact that these amendments were ruled out of order, and the biggest one is one of the arguments that I have made of concern about this bill from the very beginning, because even though I support the product and there are a lot of very good things in this bill, I think the weakness of it and the thing that we are going have to confront when we go to conference is the fact that it delays every single difficult decision.

During the debate and during general debate yesterday, a couple of people commented that they liked the bill for a variety of different reasons and said that it made some tough choices. I asked a couple of times to name one. I don't believe we did make a tough choice. When you look at the issues that we face in terms of the budget, we ducked every single one of them. We have both sequestrations for another 8 years. Even if sequestration doesn't come, we also have substantial cuts coming to the defense budget as a result of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 and a series of CRs and a series of cuts to the defense budget that we did not anticipate.

□ 2115

We are going to have substantially less money over the course of the next 10 years for defense than we thought we were going to have.

That is true even if sequestration goes away. If sequestration happens, we really face a challenge. So the question is how are we going to restructure our defense plans to deal with the fact that we are going to have substantially less money than we had going forward. The answer in this bill is we are not going to deal with it this year, and we are going to hope things get better and maybe deal with it next year.

The administration confronted this problem in a number of areas. I will walk through them. Number one, in the very controversial and difficult area of personnel costs, they found savings in health care by expanding what servicemembers would have to pay for their health care, they reduced somewhat the subsidy to our commissaries, they reduced the housing subsidy, and they also reduced the pay raise down to 1 percent and got rid of it for senior officers.

Except for the last part of that, we ducked all of those. That is $2 billion over 5 years that the administration was able to save. Nothing was offered, nothing was done on our part to deal with that.

In the Guard and Reserve, the Army has put together a plan to restructure their helicopters in a way that is way too complicated to explain, but that saves $12 billion over the course of 5 years. We put into our bill an amendment saying they can't do that at all in 2015. Also added in one of the en bloc amendments was an amendment now that says we are going to study it for a longer period of time even beyond that—that is another $12 billion—and we don't make it up anywhere because that is over 5 years, so we can get away with that in 2015.

I mentioned the Navy issue: 14 ships that the Navy has said they will lay up

in order to save money. That is roughly $3.5 billion that they will save. Again, we got rid of that in order to pay for it in the short-term. We didn't come up with more money or cut something else. We raided the ship modernization accounts to fund that in the short term, which again does not deal or address the problem. DOD also proposed getting rid of the A–10 and getting rid of the U–2. We stopped them from doing both of those things.

We have at every turn blocked just about every single proposal the administration has made to save money over the long-term. In each one of those isolated incidents, there are strong arguments that tend to be mostly parochial. In other words, if it is in your district or in your neighborhood then you rise up in furious anger against it, but there may be arguments as to why that isn't the best choice. But there was no alternative proposed. We simply got creative in our accounting to get through 2015. These are mostly 5-year savings, so we can sort of stagger our way through 2015 and create a massive bow wave down the road that we are not at all prepared to deal with.

I am sorry I left out the big one: BRAC. It is estimated we are wasting $6 billion a year on facilities that we don't need. Absolutely the only argument that exists against doing another BRAC round, given how much we have drawn down our force structure and the fact that the military estimates that they are 25 percent over capacity in terms of their facilities, is that Members don't want to run the risk of having a base be closed in their district. I get that. There are a ton of bases in the State of Washington. But we have to confront these issues because the money is not going to magically appear.

So the amendments that were disallowed, I was hoping to have the opportunity on those two amendments to have the broader debate about making the choices now. I don't think we should simply rubberstamp what the White House has done. If we don't like those cuts, let's come up with another one. This is the conversation I had with my adjutant general in the State of Washington, who was concerned about the cuts to the Army Guard and the Air Force Guard. He was talking about everything he didn't like about it. I said: Look, present me an alternative, give us an alternative that says here is how we are going to save $12 billion instead, and I am happy to look at it. But just to say: We don't like the cuts, I get that. Nobody—well, there are some. Most people don't like the cuts, but they are there. We passed the Budget Control Act, we shut down the government, we passed the budget agreement last year that set the levels for FY14 and FY15, and we still have on the books 8 more years of sequestration.

If Congress doesn't want the administration to wind up making all these choices, then we have got to step up and make the decisions now rationally about where we are going to be in terms of the budget.

The final point I will make on that is that what happens when we don't make those decisions is that readiness gets cut. In this bill, readiness is cut by $1.2 billion from the President's request. Plus, there is another $633 billion that we take out of OCO to fund the A–10. That is probably readiness as well, because they use the OCO account to backfill some of the cuts in readiness. So that is $1.8 billion out of the readiness account that was already depleted because of the shutdowns, because of the CRs.

Well, what is readiness? We had an interesting discussion about this in committee. Readiness is not the size of the force. Readiness is the capability of the force. Are the troops trained and equipped to perform the missions that we have asked them to do?

The chairman has quite eloquently on a number of occasions pointed to past wars: the Korean war and World War II, where we had to ramp up in a hurry and we sent troops over who were not ready to fight, and many of them were killed and injured because they were not ready to fight.

If we raid readiness accounts to protect personnel, to stop BRAC, to stop the Pentagon from cutting the U–2 or the A–10, or from shutting down a Guard unit, if we do that they've got to raid readiness, because that is the easiest thing to do. You spend less on fuel, you don't repair some equipment that is out there, you fly less, you drive less, you train less. What we wind up with is the hollow force that nobody wants.

So as we go into conference and as we go forward, it is an obligation of this Congress to say: What is our plan? Right now our plan is hope. I didn't serve in the military, but I heard very early on in my time on the Armed Services Committee one of the sayings in the military is ''hope is not a strategy.'' We are hoping that the money will appear, we are hoping that somehow we magically won't have to make those decisions.

I think we are past that point. The decisions are going to get made. They are either going to get made poorly if we ignore them, or preferably they will get made well so that we do our best to put together a force that no matter the size is at least capable and ready to perform the missions that we might ask of them.

So ruling those amendments out of order I think was most unfortunate—that we weren't able to have that debate. But rest assured, as the chairman has pointed out, this is his last term, so I would say there is no ducking this, but I guess you can retire. You won't be here. But the country will have to deal with those decisions one way or the other, and we thus far have not made them.

So I would urge us to start looking at this and saying if we are not going to do a BRAC, then what are we going to do. If we are not going to shrink the Guard this way, then what are we going to do.

Let's get some concrete proposals on the table that are something other than, don't cut anything in my backyard, and closing our eyes and hoping that the problem will go away.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for including this amendment that I cosponsor with Congressman ROSKAM.

Israel and the United States face common threats in the Middle East, from the ongoing civil war in Syria, continued rocket fire from terrorist organizations in the Gaza Strip, and the looming threat of a nuclear-armed Iran.

In particular, Iran's brazen quest for nuclear weapons poses an existential threat to our ally Israel. A nuclear Iran would trigger an arms race in the Middle East, further destabilizing a region plagued by persistent volatility and, in the process, threatening U.S. national security and international stability.

Military action against Iran is an absolute last resort, only after we exhaust all peaceful options. However, it would be irresponsible not to prepare for a worst-case scenario.

This amendment would require the administration to certify that Israel maintains an independent capability to remove existential threats to its own security. Specifically, this report would ensure the smooth transfer to Israel of aerial refueling tankers, advanced bunker-buster munitions, and other capabilities and platforms critical to Israel's self-defense.

This is an important amendment for the security of both the U.S. as well as our ally Israel.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to enable DOD to remove unexploded ordnance from certain areas on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico, which was used as a military training range for decades.

Under the FUDS program, the Army Corps of Engineers is decontaminating limited areas of Culebra. However, DOD asserts that a 1974 law prohibits the use of Federal funds to decontaminate land that constituted the bombardment zone. Approximately 400 acres of this land were conveyed to the government of Puerto Rico in 1982 for use as a public park. DOD contends that the 1974 law has not been superseded by Federal cleanup authorities enacted in 1986.

As a result of this rigid interpretation, Culebra is the only former defense site of several thousand across the United States that

DOD claims it is barred by statute from decontaminating. The resulting state of affairs poses a direct threat to public safety, since this land encompasses popular beaches, campgrounds and a trail. In a congressionally-required study, DOD reported that there have been many incidents where members of the public encountered unexploded munitions that could have caused serious harm.

My amendment would authorize the Corps of Engineers to decontaminate those areas within the 400-acre parcel where the risk to public safety is the greatest. It will ensure that the 1974 Act ceases to serve as an obstacle to implementation of current Federal policy, which provides that the federal government is responsible for cleaning lands that were contaminated as a result of its actions. The amendment ensures that Culebra will be treated the same—no better and no worse—than other formerly used defense sites.

The U.S. citizens living in Culebra sacrificed so that our military could receive the training it required. Congress, in turn, should now take this small step to enable DOD to remove unexploded munitions from the island.

I thank the Committee leadership and, in particular, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, for working with me on this issue.

Mr. CONNELLY. Madam Chair, I want to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee and their staff for working with me on a number of amendments to this bill.

In particular, I am proud to have worked with the Chairman of the Oversight Committee, Mr. ISSA, to co-author the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, or FITARA.

In the 21st century, effective governance is inextricably linked with how well government leverages technology to serve its citizens.

Yet current laws governing Federal IT procurement are antiquated and cumbersome.

Our bipartisan amendment would comprehensively streamline and strengthen the process.

It enhances CIO authorities to ensure agency heads have talented leaders to recruit and retain talented IT staff and to oversee critical IT investments.

It accelerates data center optimization and strengthens the accountability and transparency of Federal IT programs.

If enacted, 80 percent of the approximately $80 billion spent annually on Federal IT investment would be posted online for public review, compared to the 50 percent or less today.

Again, I thank the Chair and Ranking Member for their support.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, this amendment is a modified version of language that was incorporated in the House-passed NDAA authorization bill last year, and that was adopted again by the House earlier this year as a standalone bill, H.R. 1232, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act.

The amendment reforms—Government-wide—the process by which federal information technology is acquired and deployed.

It takes a streamlined and precise approach to solving a huge problem in Federal IT—the broken system by which the government procures and deploys critical IT infrastructure.

President Barack Obama, on Nov. 14, 2013, stated "One of the things [the federal government] does not do well is information technology procurement This is kind of a systematic problem that we have across the board." I agree.

I commend the Administrations' recent steps to strengthen IT management by strengthening the eGov office and focusing on duplications via what is called PortfolioStat reviews.

In its annual reports to Congress, GAO has identified duplicative IT investments as a significant problem. Our oversight hearings confirmed that despite spending more than $600 billion over the past decade, too often Federal IT investments run over budget, become behind schedule, or never deliver on the promised solution or functionality.

Indeed, industry experts have estimated that as much as 25 percent of the annual $80 billion spent on IT is attributable to mismanaged or duplicative IT investments.

In terms of potential cost savings, some in the industry have estimated that more than one trillion dollars could be saved over the next ten years if the government adopted the "proven" IT best practices currently in use by the private sector.

We need to enhance the best value to the taxpayer by aligning the cumbersome federal acquisition process to major trends in the IT industry.

FITARA accomplishes this by—

1. Creating a clear line of responsibility, authority, and accountability over IT investment and management decisions by empowering agency CIOs;

2. Accelerating the consolidation and optimization of the Federal Government's proliferating data centers;

3. Increasing the accuracy and transparency of IT investment scorecards by requiring 80 percent of Government-wide IT spending be covered by a public website called the IT Dashboard; and

4. Ensuring procurement decisions give due consideration to all technologies—including open source—and that contracts are awarded based on long-term best value proposition.

This is a significant and timely reform that will enhance both defense and non-defense procurement. I urge all members to support this amendment.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 98, 107, 108, 109, 111, 116, and 135 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

Page 218, after line 20, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 817. SMALL BUSINESS PRIME AND SUBCONTRACT PARTICIPATION GOALS RAISED; ACCOUNTING OF SUBCONTRACTORS.

(a) PRIME CONTRACTING GOALS.—Section 15(g)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''23 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vi) The Governmentwide goal for participation by small business concerns in subcontract awards shall be established at not less than 40 percent of the total value of all subcontract dollars awarded pursuant to section 8(d) of this Act for each fiscal year.''.

(b) DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) of this section shall take effect only beginning on the date on which the Administrator of the Small Business Administration has promulgated any regulations necessary, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation has been revised, to implement section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and the amendments made by such section.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISION PERTAINING TO ACCOUNTING OF SUBCONTRACTORS.—Section 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 218, insert after line 20 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 817. SMALL BUSINESS CYBER EDUCATION.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, may make every reasonable effort to promote an outreach and education program to assist small businesses (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) contracted by the Department of Defense to assist such businesses to—

(1) understand the gravity and scope of cyber threats;

(2) develop a plan to protect intellectual property; and

(3) develop a plan to protect the networks of such businesses.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 827. INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

Section 9(jj) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)) is amended to read as follows:

''(jj) INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.—

''(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency required by subsection (n) to establish an STTR program shall carry out a grant program to support innovative approaches to technology transfer at institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)), nonprofit research institutions and Federal laboratories in order to improve or accelerate the commercialization of federally funded research and technology by small business concerns, including new businesses.

''(B) AWARDING OF GRANTS AND AWARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency required by subparagraph (A) to participate in this program, shall award, through a competitive, merit-based process, grants, in the amounts listed in subparagraph (C) to institutions of higher education, technology transfer organizations that facilitate the commercialization of technologies developed by one or more such institutions of higher education, Federal laboratories, other public and private nonprofit entities, and consortia thereof, for initiatives that help identify high-quality, commercially viable federally funded research and technologies and to facilitate and accelerate their transfer into the marketplace.

''(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—Activities supported by grants under this subsection may include—

''(I) providing early-stage proof of concept funding for translational research;

''(II) identifying research and technologies at institutions that have the potential for accelerated commercialization;

''(III) technology maturation funding to support activities such as prototype construction, experiment analysis, product comparison, and collecting performance data;

''(IV) technical validations, market research, clarifying intellectual property rights position and strategy, and investigating commercial and business opportunities;

''(V) programs to provide advice, mentoring, entrepreneurial education, project management, and technology and business development expertise to innovators and recipients of technology transfer licenses to maximize commercialization potential; and

''(VI) conducting outreach to small business concerns as potential licensees of federally funded research and technology, and providing technology transfer services to such small business concerns.

''(iii) SELECTION PROCESS AND APPLICATIONS.—Qualifying institutions seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to a Federal agency required by subparagraph (A) to participate in this program at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the agency may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

''(I) a description of innovative approaches to technology transfer, technology development, and commercial readiness that have the potential to increase or accelerate technology transfer outcomes and can be adopted by other qualifying institutions, or a demonstration of proven technology transfer and commercialization strategies, or a plan to implement proven technology transfer and commercialization strategies, that can achieve greater commercialization of federally funded research and technologies with program funding;

''(II) a description of how the qualifying institution will contribute to local and regional economic development efforts; and

''(III) a plan for sustainability beyond the duration of the funding award.

''(iv) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT BOARDS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Successful proposals shall include a plan to assemble a Program Oversight Board, the members of which shall have technical, scientific, or business expertise three-fifths of whom shall be drawn from industry, start-up companies, venture capital or other equity investment mechanism, technical enterprises, financial institutions, and business development organizations with a track record of success in commercializing innovations. Proposals may use oversight boards in existence on the date of the enactment of the Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 that meet the requirements of this subclause.

''(II) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT BOARDS RESPONSIBILITIES.—Program Oversight Boards shall—

''(aa) establish award programs for individual projects;

''(bb) provide rigorous evaluation of project applications;

''(cc) determine which projects should receive awards, in accordance with guidelines established under subparagraph (C)(ii);

''(dd) establish milestones and associated award amounts for projects that reach milestones;

''(ee) determine whether awarded projects are reaching milestones; and

''(ff) develop a process to reallocate outstanding award amounts from projects that are not reaching milestones to other projects with more potential.

''(III) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—Program Oversight Boards shall be composed of members who do not have a conflict of interest. Boards shall adopt conflict of interest policies to ensure relevant relationships are disclosed and proper recusal procedures are in place.

''(C) GRANT AND AWARD AMOUNTS.—

''(i) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Each Federal agency required by subparagraph (A) to carry out a grant program may make grants up to $3,000,000 to a qualifying institution.

''(ii) AWARD AMOUNTS.—Each qualifying institution that receives a grant under subparagraph (B) shall provide awards for individual projects of not more than $100,000, to be provided in phased amounts, based on reaching the milestones established by the qualifying institution's Program Oversight Board.

''(D) AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURES FOR INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(i) PERCENTAGE.—The percentage of the extramural budget for research, or research and development, each Federal agency required by subsection (n) to establish an STTR program shall expend on the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall be—

''(I) 0.05 percent for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015; and

''(II) 0.1 percent for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF EXPENDITURES.—Any portion of the extramural budget expended by a Federal agency on the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall apply towards the agency's expenditure requirements under subsection (n).

''(2) PROGRAM EVALUATION AND DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.—

''(A) EVALUATION PLAN AND DATA COLLECTION.—Each Federal agency required by paragraph (1)(A) to establish an Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall develop a program evaluation plan and collect annually such information from grantees as is necessary to assess the Program. Program evaluation plans shall require the collection of data aimed at identifying outcomes resulting from the transfer of technology with assistance from the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program. Such data may include—

''(i) specific follow-on funding identified or obtained, including follow-on funding sources, such as Federal sources or private sources, within 3 years of the completion of the award;

''(ii) number of projects which, within 5 years of receiving an award under paragraph (1), result in a license to a start-up company or an established company with sufficient resources for effective commercialization;

''(iii) the number of invention disclosures received, United States patent applications filed, and United States patents issued within 5 years of the award;

''(iv) number of projects receiving a grant under paragraph (1) that secure Phase I or Phase II SBIR or STTR awards;

''(v) available information on revenue, sales or other measures of products that have been commercialized as a result of projects awarded under paragraph (1), within 5 years of the award;

''(vi) number and location of jobs created resulting from projects awarded under paragraph (1); and

''(vii) other data as deemed appropriate by a Federal agency required by this subparagraph to develop a program evaluation plan.

''(B) EVALUATIVE REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of each Federal agency that participates in the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate an evaluative report regarding the activities of the program. The report shall include—

''(i) a detailed description of the implementation of the program;

''(ii) a detailed description of the grantee selection process;

''(iii) an accounting of the funds used in the program; and

''(iv) a summary of the data collected under subparagraph (A).

''(C) DATA DISSEMINATION.—For the purposes of program transparency and dissemination of best practices, the Administrator shall include on the public database under subsection (k)(1) information on the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program, including—

''(i) the program evaluation plan required under subparagraph (A);

''(ii) a list of recipients by State of awards under paragraph (1); and

''(iii) information on the use of grants under paragraph (1) by recipient institutions.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Page 370, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 1082. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE TRANSFER OF USED MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should make every reasonable effort, by not later than one year after the date on which a piece of eligible equipment returns to the United States, to transfer such eligible equipment to a Federal, State, or local agency in accordance with subsections (b) and (c) of section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

(b) PREFERENCE.—In considering applications for the transfer of eligible equipment under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may give a preference to Federal, State, and local agencies that plan to use such eligible equipment primarily for the purpose of strengthening border security along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(c) ELIGIBLE EQUIPMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term ''eligible equipment'' means equipment of the Department of Defense that—

(1) was used in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, or Operation New Dawn;

(2) the Secretary of Defense determines would be suitable for use by a Federal, State, or local agency in law enforcement activities, including—

(A) intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance equipment;

(B) night-vision goggles; and

(C) tactical wheeled vehicles; and

(3) the Secretary determines is excess to military requirements.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 827. REQUIREMENT TO BUY AMERICAN FLAGS FROM DOMESTIC SOURCES.

Section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) A flag of the United States of America (within the meaning of chapter 1 of title 4).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY OF NEBRASKA

At the end of subtitle A of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. 910. REPORT RELATED TO NUCLEAR FORCES, DETERRENCE, NONPROLIFERATION, AND TERRORISM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report discussing how the Department of Defense will manage its mission with respect to issues related to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT OF FLORIDA

At the end of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. 923. MODIFICATIONS TO REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCOUNTING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES LISTED AS MISSING.

(a) DESIGNATION OF OFFICER.—Section 1501(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''PERSONNEL'' and inserting ''PERSONS'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by designating the second sentence of paragraph (1) as paragraph (2); and

(4) by striking the first sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(A) The Secretary of Defense shall designate a single organization within the Department of Defense to have responsibility for Department of Defense matters relating to missing persons, including accounting for missing persons and persons whose remains have not been recovered from the conflict in which they were lost.

''(B) The organization designated under this paragraph shall be a Defense Agency or other entity of the Department of Defense outside the military departments and is referred to in this chapter as the 'designated Defense Agency'.

''(C) The head of the organization designated under this paragraph is referred to in this chapter as the 'designated Agency Director'.''.''.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Paragraph (2) of such section, as designated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''the official designated under this paragraph shall include—'' and inserting ''the designated Agency Director shall include the following:''

(2) by capitalizing the first letter of the first word of each of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D);

(3) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting a period;

(4) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting ''responsibility for'' after ''as well as the''; and

(B) by striking ''; and'' at the end and inserting a period; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) The establishment of a means for communication between officials of the designated Defense Agency and family members of missing persons, veterans service organizations, concerned citizens, and the public on the Department's efforts to account for missing persons, including a readily available means for communication of their views and recommendations to the designated Agency Director.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the official designated under paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''the designated Agency Director''; and

(2) in paragraphs (4) and (5), by striking ''The designated official'' and inserting ''The designated Agency Director''.

(d) RESOURCES.—Such section is further amended by striking paragraph (6).

(e) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND OTHER FORMS OF SUPPORT.—Chapter 76 of such title is amended by inserting after section 1501 the following new section:

''§ 1501a. Public-private partnerships; other forms of support

''(a) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary of Defense may enter into arrangements known as public-private partnerships with appropriate entities outside the Government for the purposes of facilitating the activities of the designated Defense Agency. The Secretary may only partner with foreign governments or foreign entities with the concurrence of the Secretary of State. Any such arrangement shall be entered into in accordance with authorities provided under this section or any other authority otherwise available to the Secretary. Regulations prescribed under subsection (e)(1) shall include provisions for the establishment and implementation of such partnerships.

''(b) ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY PERSONAL SERVICES.—The Secretary of Defense may accept voluntary services to facilitate accounting for missing persons in the same manner as the Secretary of a military department may accept such services under section 1588(a)(9) of this title.

''(c) SOLICITATION OF GIFTS.—Under regulations prescribed under this chapter, the Secretary may solicit from any person or public or private entity, for the use and benefit of the activities of the designated Defense Agency, a gift of information and data, books, manuscripts, other documents, and artifacts.

''(d) USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONAL PROPERTY.—The Secretary may allow a private entity to use, at no cost, personal property of the Department of Defense to assist the entity in supporting the activities of the designated Defense Agency.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to implement this section.

''(2) LIMITATION.—Such regulations shall provide that solicitation of a gift, acceptance of a gift (including a gift of services), or use of a gift under this section may not occur if the nature or circumstances of the solicitation, acceptance, or use would compromise the integrity, or the appearance of integrity, of any program of the Department of Defense or any individual involved in such program.''.

(f) SECTION 1505 CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1505(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the office established under section 1501 of this title'' and inserting ''the designated Agency Director''; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking ''head of the office established under section 1501 of this title'' and inserting ''designated Agency Director''.

(g) SECTION 1509 AMENDMENTS.—Section 1509 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''**PREENACTMENT**'' in the section heading;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''PROCESS'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''POW/MIA accounting community'' and inserting ''through the designated Agency Director'';

(C) by striking paragraph (2); and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2):

''(2)(A) The Secretary shall assign or detail to the designated Defense Agency on a full-time basis a senior medical examiner from the personnel of the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System. The primary duties of the medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall include the identification of remains in support of the function of the designated Agency Director to account for unaccounted for persons covered by subsection (a).

''(B) In carrying out functions under this chapter, the medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall report to the designated Agency Director.

''(C) The medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall—

''(i) exercise scientific identification authority;

''(ii) establish identification and laboratory policy consistent with the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System; and

''(iii) advise the designated Agency Director on forensic science disciplines.

''(D) Nothing in this chapter shall be interpreted as affecting the authority of the Armed Forces Medical Examiner under section 1471 of this title.''.

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by inserting ''; CENTRALIZED DATABASE'' in the subsection heading after ''FILES''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain a single centralized database and case management system containing information on all missing persons for whom a file has been established under this subsection. The database and case management system shall be accessible to all elements of the Department of Defense involved in the search, recovery, identification, and communications phases of the program established by this section.''; and

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''establishing and''; and

(ii) by striking ''Secretary of Defense shall coordinate'' and inserting ''designated Agency Director shall ensure coordination'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''staff'' after ''National Security Council''; and

(ii) by striking ''POW/MIA accounting community''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) In carrying out the program, the designated Agency Director shall coordinate all external communications and events associated with the program.''.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CROSS-REFERENCE CORRECTION.—Section 1513(1) of such title is amended by striking ''subsection (b)'' in the last sentence and inserting ''subsection (c)''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 76 of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the item relating to section 1501 the following new item:

''1501a. Public-private partnerships; other forms of support.''; and

(B) in the item relating to section 1509, by striking ''preenactment''.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS OF TEXAS

Add at the end of subtitle A of title X the following new section:

SEC. 1005. REPORT ON AUDITABLE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report ranking all military departments and Defense Agencies in order of how advanced they are in achieving auditable financial statements as required

by law. The report should not include information otherwise available in other reports to Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 1005. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTING AUDIT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the barriers to implementing audit reporting requirements contained in section 1003 of Public Law 111–84 and recommendations to ensure reporting deadlines are met.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 1027. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PERMITTING ACTIVITIES UNDER THE SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT ACT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to issue a regulation for permitting activities set forth in section 1403 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat. 2907; 10 U.S.C. 113 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. ROSS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1034. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide additional or upgraded recreational facilities for individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA

Page 300, line 12, strike ''None of the'' and insert ''Not more than 50 percent of the''.

Page 301, line 2, insert before the period the following: ''until the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary delivers the certification required by subsection (a) to the congressional defense committees''.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BRALEY OF IOWA

Add at the end of subtitle F of title X the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON LONG-TERM COSTS OF OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, with contributions from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to Congress a report containing an estimate of previous costs of Operation New Dawn (the successor contingency operation to Operation Iraqi Freedom) and the long-term costs of Operation Enduring Freedom for a scenario, determined by the President and based on current contingency operation and withdrawal plans, that takes into account expected force levels and the expected length of time that members of the Armed Forces will be deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(b) ESTIMATES TO BE USED IN PREPARATION OF REPORT.—In preparing the report required by subsection (a), the President shall make estimates and projections through at least fiscal year 2024, adjust any dollar amounts appropriately for inflation, and take into account and specify each of the following:

(1) The total number of members of the Armed Forces expected to be deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, including—

(A) the number of members of the Armed Forces actually deployed in Southwest Asia in support of Operation Enduring Freedom;

(B) the number of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces called or ordered to active duty in the United States for the purpose of training for eventual deployment in Southwest Asia, backfilling for deployed troops, or supporting other Department of Defense missions directly or indirectly related to Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(C) the break-down of deployments of members of the regular and reserve components and activation of members of the reserve components.

(2) The number of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components, who have previously served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom and who are expected to serve multiple deployments.

(3) The number of contractors and private military security firms that have been used and are expected to be used during the course of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(4) The number of veterans currently suffering and expected to suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, or other mental injuries.

(5) The number of veterans currently in need of and expected to be in need of prosthetic care and treatment because of amputations incurred during service in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(6) The current number of pending Department of Veterans Affairs claims from veterans of military service in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the total number of such veterans expected to seek disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(7) The total number of members of the Armed Forces who have been killed or wounded in Iraq or Afghanistan, including noncombat casualties, the total number of members expected to suffer injuries in Afghanistan, and the total number of members expected to be killed in Afghanistan, including noncombat casualties.

(8) The amount of funds previously appropriated for the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Department of Veterans Affairs for costs related to Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom, including an account of the amount of funding from regular Department of Defense, Department of State, and Department of Veterans Affairs budgets that has gone and will go to costs associated with such operations.

(9) Previous, current, and future operational expenditures associated with Operation Enduring Freedom and, when applicable, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn, including—

(A) funding for combat operations;

(B) deploying, transporting, feeding, and housing members of the Armed Forces (including fuel costs);

(C) activation and deployment of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

(D) equipping and training of Iraqi and Afghani forces;

(E) purchasing, upgrading, and repairing weapons, munitions, and other equipment consumed or used in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(F) payments to other countries for logistical assistance in support of such operations.

(10) Past, current, and future costs of entering into contracts with private military security firms and other contractors for the provision of goods and services associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(11) Average annual cost for each member of the Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, including room and board, equipment and body armor, transportation of troops and equipment (including fuel costs), and operational costs.

(12) Current and future cost of combat-related special pays and benefits, including reenlistment bonuses.

(13) Current and future cost of calling or ordering members of the reserve components to active duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(14) Current and future cost for reconstruction, embassy operations and construction, and foreign aid programs for Iraq and Afghanistan.

(15) Current and future cost of bases and other infrastructure to support members of the Armed Forces serving in Afghanistan.

(16) Current and future cost of providing health care for veterans who served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom, including—

(A) the cost of mental health treatment for veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, and other mental problems as a result of such service; and

(B) the cost of lifetime prosthetics care and treatment for veterans suffering from amputations as a result of such service.

(17) Current and future cost of providing Department of Veterans Affairs disability benefits for the lifetime of veterans who incur disabilities while serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(18) Current and future cost of providing survivors' benefits to survivors of members of the Armed Forces killed while serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(19) Cost of bringing members of the Armed Forces and equipment back to the United States upon the conclusion of Operation Enduring Freedom, including the cost of demobilization, transportation costs (including fuel costs), providing transition services for members of the Armed Forces transitioning from active duty to veteran status, transporting equipment, weapons, and munitions (including fuel costs), and an estimate of the value of equipment that will be left behind.

(20) Cost to restore the military and military equipment, including the equipment of the reserve components, to full strength after the conclusion of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(21) Amount of money borrowed to pay for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom, and the sources of that money.

(22) Interest on money borrowed, including interest for money already borrowed and anticipated interest payments on future borrowing, for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 1082. METHODS FOR VALIDATING CERTAIN SERVICE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTIVE SERVICE BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of verifying that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman who is recognized pursuant to section 401 of the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95–202; 38 U.S.C. 106 note) as having performed active duty service for the purposes described in subsection (c)(1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall accept the following:

(1) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom no applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record is available, the Secretary shall provide such recognition on the basis of applicable Social Security Administration records submitted for or by the individual, together with validated testimony given by the individual or the primary next of kin of the individual that the individual performed such service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(2) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom the applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record has been destroyed or otherwise become unavailable by reason of any action committed by a person responsible for the control and maintenance of such form, logbook, or record, the Secretary shall accept other official documentation demonstrating that the individual performed such service during period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) For the purpose of determining whether to recognize service allegedly performed during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946, the Secretary shall recognize masters of seagoing vessels or other officers in command of similarly organized groups as agents of the United States who were authorized to document any individual for purposes of hiring the individual to perform service in the merchant marine or discharging an individual from such service.

(b) TREATMENT OF OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—Other documentation accepted by the Secretary of Homeland Security pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall satisfy all requirements for eligibility of service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(c) BENEFITS ALLOWED.—

(1) BURIAL BENEFITS ELIGIBILITY.—Service of an individual that is considered active duty pursuant to subsection (a) shall be considered as active duty service with respect to providing burial benefits under chapters 23 and 24 of title 38, United States Code, to the individual.

(2) MEDALS, RIBBONS, AND DECORATIONS.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to subsection (a) may be awarded an appropriate medal, ribbon, or other military decoration based on such service.

(3) STATUS OF VETERAN.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to subsection (a) shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled by reason of such recognized service to any benefit that is not described in this subsection.

(d) DETERMINATION OF COASTWISE MERCHANT SEAMAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall verify that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman pursuant to this section without regard to the sex, age, or disability of the individual during the period in which the individual served as such a coastwise merchant seaman.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''coastwise merchant seaman'' means a mariner that served on a tug boat, towboat, or seagoing barge that transported war materials to and from ports located in the territorial seas of the United States in support of the war effort during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending December 31, 1946.

(2) The term ''primary next of kin'' with respect to an individual seeking recognition for service under this section means the closest living relative of the individual who was alive during the period of such service.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. 10___. COST OF WARS.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service and the Director of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, shall post on the public Web site of the Department of Defense the costs, including the relevant legacy costs, to each American taxpayer of each of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1046. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 145. Veterans Day

''The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation, beginning at—

''(1) 3:11 pm Atlantic standard time;

''(2) 2:11 pm eastern standard time;

''(3) 1:11 pm central standard time;

''(4) 12:11 pm mountain standard time;

''(5) 11:11 am Pacific standard time;

''(6) 10:11 am Alaska standard time; and

''(7) 9:11 am Hawaii-Aleutian standard time.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''145. Veterans Day.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 10__. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Vietnam Veterans Memorial continues to be a popular and important place of reflection and healing for a generation.

(2) The simple inscriptions of the names of the Nation's dead bear mute testimony to the sacrifice of more than 58,000 Americans, serving as a deep source of comfort and pride for the families of those who were lost.

(3) 74 sailors were lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans, which sank after colliding with the HMAS Melbourne on June 3, 1969, during a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization exercise just outside the designated combat zone.

(4) The Frank Evans had been providing support fire for combat operations in Vietnam before the exercise that resulted in the accident and was scheduled to return after the exercise.

(5) The families of the 74 men lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans have been fighting for decades to have their loved ones added to the Memorial.

(6) Exceptions have been granted to inscribe the names on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial for other servicemembers who were killed outside of the designated combat zone, including in 1983 when President Ronald Reagan ordered that 68 Marines who died on a flight outside the combat zone be added to the wall.

(7) Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus, in a letter dated December 15, 2010, expressed support for the addition of the 74 names of the men lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

(8) The heroism and sacrifice should never go unrecognized because of an arbitrary line on a map.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should order that the names of the 74 military personnel lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans on June 3, 1969, be added to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. __. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO DISRUPT, DISMANTLE, AND DEFEAT AL-QAEDA, ITS AFFILIATED GROUPS, ASSOCIATED GROUPS, AND ADHERENTS.

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

(1) al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents continue to pose a significant threat to United States national security interests;

(2) al-Qaeda continues to evolve and reorganize to adapt to United States counterterrorism measures; and

(3) al-Qaeda has become more decentralized and less hierarchical over the past decade.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the conduct of an independent assessment of the United States efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, including its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents since May 2, 2011.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of al-Qaeda core's relationship with any and all affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(B) An assessment of the aims, objectives, and capabilities of al-Qaeda core and any and all affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(C) An assessment of the Administration's efforts to combat al-Qaeda core and any and all affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(D) An assessment of the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40) and its relevance to the current structure and objectives of al-Qaeda core, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(E) A comprehensive order of battle for al-Qaeda core, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity selected for the conduct of the assessment required by paragraph (1) shall provide to the Secretary and the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing its findings as a result of the assessment.

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

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA

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

SEC. 12_. REPORT ON COLLECTIVE AND NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF CENTRAL ASIAN AND SOUTH CAUCASUS ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Assured access to stable energy supplies is an enduring concern of both the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

(2) Adopted in Lisbon in November 2010, the new NATO Strategic Concept declares that ''[s]ome NATO countries will become more dependent on foreign energy suppliers and in some cases, on foreign energy supply and distribution networks for their energy needs''.

(3) The report required by section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) reaffirmed the Strategic Concept's assessment of growing energy dependence of some members of the NATO alliance and also noted there is value in the assured access, protection, and delivery of energy.

(4) Development of energy resources and transit routes in the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea can diversify sources of supply for members of the NATO alliance, particularly those in Eastern Europe.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the implications of new energy resource development and distribution networks, both planned and under construction, in the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea for energy security strategies of the United States and NATO.

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

(A) An assessment of the dependence of NATO members on a single oil or natural gas supplier or distribution network.

(B) An assessment of the potential of energy resources of the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea to mitigate such dependence on a single supplier or distribution network.

(C) Recommendations, if any, for ways in which the United States can help support increased energy security for NATO members.

(3) SUBMISSION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I concur with the chairman that we should pass the en bloc amendment. I have no speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, it is great to be here. I know it is at the end of the debate.

First, let me thank BUCK MCKEON for doing a great job as the chairman, and I know as Adam will do, will recognize his years of service, and this is a great bill. Adam, thank you for your friendship and support.

Part of this en bloc amendment is the Black Ribbon Day. I worked really closely with Congressman ENGEL to make sure that it was vetted and cleared.

The basic premise is the country has to understand the importance of knowing the past to survive in the world of the present.

Shimkus is ethnically Lithuanian. I deal with the Baltic issues and Eastern European causes, and the world has significantly changed, as I said earlier in this debate, about the threat from Russia.

So the Black Ribbon Day recognizes the victims of communism and the Holocaust and the gulags and the deportation and the Russification. So when Vladimir Putin makes a claim protecting the Russian minority, it is because what they did post-World War II was they removed forcefully to Siberia ethnics and moved in Russians.

The world is not a safer place today. It is important for us to remember the events of the past so we can defend the freedoms of the future.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for including this in your en bloc amendment.

To my friend Adam from Washington State, thank you for your support. I don't get a chance to talk about defense and NDAA. As you all know, I served in the military. I have great respect for what you have done in trying to strengthen the force and protect freedom. So thank you for the work you do. It is just an honor to get a chance to work with both of you.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for supporting my amendment and allowing it to come to the floor.

This Amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to get an independent assessment of U.S. efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, its affiliates, and other associated groups.

Al-Qaeda continues to threaten the security of the U.S. and our allies, both at home and abroad.

Our intelligence services and our military have scored some real gains against al-Qaeda, but al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is still able to provide tactical and ideological direction to its affiliates around the world.

Al-Qaeda has gone from ''on the verge of strategic defeat'' to a serious and growing threat, depending on who you ask in the Administration or intelligence services.

Today al-Qaeda controls more territory than ever. The fight against al-Qaeda is far from over.

This amendment is necessary so we can have outside experts evaluate this Administration's efforts against alQaeda and what we should do about it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, first, I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for supporting my amendment and allowing it to come to the floor.

The amendment is simple, it urges the Secretary of Defense to make a reasonable effort to make excess intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance equipment, night vision goggles, and tactical wheeled vehicles returning from abroad available to State, Federal, and local law enforcement agencies for the purpose of strengthening border security along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

This amendment is common sense—why not allow excess military equipment to be used by state, local, and federal law enforcement for border security?

Our border sheriffs say they are outmanned, outgunned and out-financed by the drug cartels.

This is not a new idea. DOD already has a program for distribution of surplus DOD equipment. This program has transferred 6 used Humvees to Texas Border Sheriffs in 2010. The purpose of this amendment is to urge DOD to make more equipment available through this existing program.

So let's put that veteran equipment to work on the border to help fight the drug cartels. America has done our part over the past 10 years to bring safety and security to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan, and now it is time to bring that same safety and security to Americans living along our southern border.

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

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 128, 136, 145, and 155 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. NUNES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 302, line 22, add the following after the period: ''Such assessment shall address the efficacy of Lajes Air Force Base modifying its United States Air Force mission to support a permanent force structure for the United States Special Operations Command, the United States Africa Command, and other overseas United States forces in both the European and African regions, at a force structure at or above the force structure at such Air Force Base as of October 1, 2013.''

Page 302, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 303, line 7, and insert the following:

(2) The Secretary of Defense includes in the Assessment under paragraph (1) an analysis of how, with respect to the use and force structure of the Lajes Air Force Base, the United States is honoring the goals of the U.S.-Portugal Permanent Bilateral Commission, particularly how the systematic reduction in force structure at such Air Force Base is within the goals of the commission and the bilateral cooperation between the 2 countries in the fight against terrorism.

(3) The Secretary briefs the congressional defense committees regarding the results of the Assessment under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 1051. MODIFICATIONS TO OH–58D KIOWA WARRIOR HELICOPTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 2244A of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may implement engineering change proposals on OH–58D Kiowa Warrior helicopters.

(b) MANNER OF MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out subsection (a) in a manner that ensures—

(1) the safety and survivability of the crews of the OH–58D Kiowa Warrior helicopters by expeditiously replacing or integrating, or both, the mast-mounted sight engineering change proposals to the current OH–58D fleet;

(2) the safety of flight; and

(3) that the minimum requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands are met.

(c) ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSALS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''engineering change proposals'' means, with respect to OH–58D helicopters, engineering changes relating to the following:

(1) Mast mounted sight laser pointer.

(2) Two-card system processor.

(3) Diode pump laser.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF DRONES TO KILL UNITED STATES CITIZENS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No officer or employee of, or detailee or contractor to, the Department of Defense may use a drone to kill a citizen of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to the use of a drone to kill an individual who is actively engaged in combat against the United States.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create any authority, or expand any existing authority, for the Federal Government to kill any person.

(d) DRONE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''drone'' means an unmanned aircraft (as defined in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note)).

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO OF MISSISSIPPI

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

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON FORCE STRUCTURE LAYDOWN OF TACTICAL AIRLIFT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the strategic laydown of tactical airlift forces following the withdrawal of combat forces from Afghanistan is cause for concern.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the five-year plan of the Secretary for the force structure laydown of the tactical airlift.

(c) LIMITATION; REPORT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall brief the congressional defense committees prior to implementing any movements.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON THERMAL INJURY PREVENTION.

The Director of the United States Army Tank Automotive Research, Development, and Engineering Center shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report addressing thermal injury prevention needs to improve occupant centric survivability systems for combat and tactical vehicles against over matching ballistic threat.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. COLE OF OKLAHOMA

Page 340, line 11, insert ''either'' after ''is''.

Page 340, line 14, insert '', or participating in the Robotic Aircraft for Public Safety program or other activities of similar nature conducted by the Department of Homeland Security,'' before ''to allow''.

Page 340, beginning on line 16, strike ''test range program'' and insert in its place ''a program''.

Page 341, beginning on line 5, strike ''test range''.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 1082. REVIEW OF OPERATION OF CERTAIN SHIPS DURING THE VIETNAM ERA.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—By not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review the logs of each ship under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy that is known to have operated in the waters near Vietnam during the Vietnam Era (as that term is defined in section 101(29) of title 38, United States Code) to determine—

(1) whether each such ship operated in the territorial waters of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975; and

(2) for each such ship that so operated—

(A) the date or dates when the ship so operated; and

(B) the distance from the shore of the location where the ship operated that was the closest proximity to shore.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Upon a determination that any such ship so operated, the Secretary of Defense shall provide such determination, together with the information described in subsection (a)(2) about the ship, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make publicly available all unclassified information provided to the Secretary under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA OF OHIO

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10____. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALLIED AMPHIBIOUS LANDING ON D-DAY, JUNE 6, 1944, AT NORMANDY, FRANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) June 6, 2014, marks the 70th anniversary of the Allied assault at Normandy, France, by American, British, and Canadian troops, which was known as Operation Overlord.

(2) Before Operation Overlord, the German Army still occupied France and the Nazi government still had access to the raw materials and industrial capacity of Western Europe.

(3) The naval assault phase on Normandy was code-named ''Neptune'', and the June 6th assault date is referred to as D-Day to denote the day on which the combat attack was initiated.

(4) The D-Day landing was the largest single amphibious assault in history, consisting of approximately 31,000 members of the United States Armed Forces, 153,000 members of the Allied Expeditionary Force, 5,000 naval vessels, and more than 11,000 sorties by Allied aircraft.

(5) Soldiers of 6 divisions (3 American, 2 British, and 1 Canadian) stormed ashore in 5 main landing areas on beaches in Normandy, which were code-named ''Utah'', ''Omaha'', ''Gold'', ''Juno'', and ''Sword''.

(6) Of the approximately 10,000 Allied casualties incurred on the first day of the landing, more than 6,000 casualties were members of the United States Armed Forces.

(7) The age of the remaining World War II veterans and the gradual disappearance of any living memory of World War II and the Normandy landings make it necessary to increase activities intended to pass on the history of these events, particularly to younger generations.

(8) The young people of Normandy and the United States have displayed unprecedented commitment to and involvement in celebrating the veterans of the Normandy landings and the freedom that they brought with them in 1944.

(9) The significant material remains of the Normandy landing, such as shipwrecks and various items of military equipment found both on the Normandy beaches and at the bottom of the sea in French territorial waters, bear witness to the remarkable material resources used by the Allied Armed Forces to execute the Normandy landings.

(10) 5 Normandy beaches and a number of sites on the Normandy coast, including Pointe du Hoc, were the scene of the Normandy landings, and constitute both now and for all time a unique piece of humanity's world heritage, and a symbol of peace and freedom, whose unspoilt nature, integrity, and authenticity must be protected at all costs.

(11) The world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the ''greatest generation'' who assumed the task of freeing the world from Nazi and Fascist regimes and restoring liberty to Europe.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) recognizes the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II;

(2) expresses gratitude and appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the D-Day operations;

(3) thanks the young people of Normandy and the United States for their involvement in recognizing and celebrating the 70th Anniversary of the Normandy landings with the

aim of making future generations aware of the acts of heroism and sacrifice performed by the Allied forces;

(4) recognizes the efforts of the Government of France and the people of Normandy to preserve, for future generations, the unique world heritage represented by the Normandy beaches and the sunken material remains of the Normandy landing, by inscribing them on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage List; and

(5) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and programs to honor the sacrifices of their fellow countrymen to liberate Europe.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY OF FLORIDA

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10___. TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 402 the following new section:

"§ 403. Transportation of supplies from nonprofit organizations

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF TRANSPORTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may transport to any country, without charge, supplies that have been furnished by a nonprofit organization and that are intended for distribution to members of the armed forces. Such supplies may be transported only on a space available basis.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The Secretary may not transport supplies under subsection (a) unless the Secretary determines that—

''(A) the transportation of the supplies is consistent with the policies of the United States;

''(B) the supplies are suitable for distribution to members of the armed forces and are in usable condition;

''(C) there is a legitimate need for the supplies by the members of the armed forces for whom they are intended; and

''(D) adequate arrangements have been made for the distribution and use of the supplies.

''(2) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for making the determinations required under paragraph (1). Such procedures shall include inspection of supplies before acceptance for transport.

''(3) PREPARATION.—It shall be the responsibility of the nonprofit organization requesting the transport of supplies under this section to ensure that the supplies are suitable for transport.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION.—Supplies transported under this section may be distributed by the United States Government or a nonprofit organization.

''(d) DEFINITION OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 402 the following new item:

''403. Transportation of supplies from nonprofit organizations.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle G of title X insert the following new section:

SEC. 1082. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AIR FORCE FLIGHT TRAINING AIRCRAFT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Air Force uses the T–1A aircraft to train Air Force pilots to operate tanker and transport aircraft.

(2) The Air Force is seeking a replacement aircraft for the T–1A which is experiencing obsolescence issues and high costs.

(3) An effective way to mitigate the T–1A's cost, obsolescence, and complexity issues until a permanent replacement aircraft enters service, is to utilize contractor-owned, contractor-operated modern aircraft in the very light jet category.

(4) Conducting very light jet training via a contractor-owned, contractor-operated contract vehicle could provide increased flexibility and reduce unnecessary ownership costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should formally assess the operational feasibility, costs, potential savings, and readiness implications of utilizing contractor-owned, contractor-operated, very light jet aircraft for interim flight instruction until a permanent replacement for the T–1A enters service.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

In section 1216(b), add at the end the following:

(5) A description of efforts of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to engage United States manufacturers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the ANSF.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The people of Afghanistan have taken the lead in providing for the security of their country and the successful elections are a positive step in the self-determination of the future of Afghanistan.

(2) However, no country can be successful in the long-term if a majority of its population is not included in the dialogue and decision-making of such country.

(3) The women of Afghanistan have made historic strides in the last several years and the elections prove that the women need and have a right to have a voice in the future of Afghanistan.

(4) To that end, the women of Afghanistan are vital to the development of Afghanistan and the national security of Afghanistan;

(5) Women are needed to serve Afghanistan in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), not just for the future standing of women in society, but for cultural reasons.

(6) Therefore, it is important that Afghanistan move forward in increasing the number of women in the ANSF with the current facilities and capacity to meet the requirements Afghanistan has proposed to achieve.

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

(1) the allocation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 for the ANSF should be prioritized for the recruitment, retention, and training of women in the ANSF;

(2) current facilities to support women in the ANSF should be fully utilized before additional infrastructure is constructed;

(3) the Government of Afghanistan should ensure that the fund provided prioritize efforts to increase the number of women serving in the ANSF, as proposed in the Master Ministerial Development Plan for Afghan National Army (ANA) Gender Integration;

(4) as part of such plan, the conversion of the 13,000 women that were trained to support the elections is an important step in increasing the number of women in the ANSF;

(5) the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan's report, ''A Way to Go: An Update on Implementation of the Law on Elimination of Violence Against Women in Afghanistan'', should be integrated into efforts to enable women to serve in the ANSF; and

(6) the United States should continue to advocate for the rights and participation of women in Afghanistan in all levels of government and society.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. 12__. LIMITATION ON FUNDS TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR BASES IN AFGHANISTAN.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

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

SEC. __. REVIEW PROCESS FOR USE OF UNITED STATES FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN AFGHANISTAN THAT CANNOT BE PHYSICALLY ACCESSED BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for a construction project in Afghanistan in excess of $500,000 that cannot be audited and physically inspected by authorized United States Government civilian personnel or their designated representatives, in accordance generally-accepted auditing guidelines.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to a project that is initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition in subsection (a) may be waived with respect to a project if not less than 15 days prior to the obligation of funds for the project, the agency responsible for such funds submits to the relevant authorizing committees a plan outlining how the agency will monitor the use of the funds—

(1) to ensure the funds are used for the specific purposes for which the funds are intended; and

(2) to mitigate waste, fraud, and abuse.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. __. ACTIONS TO SUPPORT HUMAN RIGHTS, PARTICIPATION, PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, EXISTING FRAMEWORKS, AND SECURITY AND MOBILITY WITH RESPECT TO WOMEN AND GIRLS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that promoting women's meaningful inclusion and participation in conflict prevention, management, and resolution, as well as in post-conflict relief and recovery, advances core United States national interests of peace, national security, economic and social development, and international cooperation.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote and support the security of women and girls in conflict-affected and post-conflict regions and ensure their protection from sexual and gender-based violence;

(2) to promote and support the security of women and girls in Afghanistan during the

security transition process and recognize that promoting security for Afghan women and girls must remain a priority of United States foreign policy; and

(3) to maintain and improve the gains of women and girls in Afghanistan made since 2002, including in terms of their political participation and integration in security forces.

(c) ACTIONS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure the indicators of success of the security transition process and establishment of an independent Afghanistan as described in paragraph (2) are achieved.

(2) INDICATORS OF SUCCESS.—The indicators of success referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) Support for human rights of women and girls in Afghanistan.

(B) Participation of women in Afghanistan at all levels of decision-making and governance in Afghanistan.

(C) Strategic integration of women in the Afghan National Security Forces.

(D) Support for initiatives to prevent sexual and gender-based violence, including implementation of Afghanistan's Elimination of Violence Against Women law and support for the Ministry of Interior's Family Response Units in the Afghan National Police.

(E) Support for existing frameworks, including the National Action Plan for the Women of Afghanistan, the Afghanistan National Development Strategy, and the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework.

(F) Recognition of the ability of women in Afghanistan to move freely and securely throughout Afghanistan.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on efforts by the United States Government to support the human rights, participation, prevention of violence, existing frameworks, and security and mobility with respect to women and girls in Afghanistan.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

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

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO OF CONNECTICUT

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

SEC. 1228. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS WITH ROSOBORONEXPORT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 may be used to enter into a contract (or subcontract at any tier under such a contract), memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, to make a grant to, or to provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability of subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge, the following:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

(2) The armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation has withdrawn substantially all of the armed forces of the Russian Federation from the immediate vicinity of the eastern border of Ukraine.

(4) Agents of the Russian Federation have ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to which a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) ELEMENTS.—A review conducted under paragraph (1) shall assess the accuracy of the factual and legal conclusions made by the Secretary of Defense in the waiver covered by the review, including—

(A) whether there is any viable alternative to Rosoboronexport for carrying out the functions for which funds will be obligated;

(B) whether the Secretary has previously used an alternative vendor for carrying out the same functions regarding the military equipment in question, and what vendor was previously used;

(C) whether other explanations for the issuance of the waiver are supportable; and

(D) any other matter with respect to the waiver the Inspector General considers appropriate.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) with respect to such waiver.

AMENDMENT 124 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN DEFENSE TRANSFERS TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to oppose the transfer of defense articles or defense services (as defined in the Arms Export Control Act) from any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to, or on behalf of, the Russian Federation, during any period in which the Russian Federation forcibly occupies the territory of Ukraine or of a NATO member country.

(b) NATO POLICY.—The President shall use the voice and vote of the United States in NATO to seek the adoption of a policy by NATO that is consistent with the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DEFENSE TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States to monitor all transfers of defense articles or defense services from NATO member countries to the Russian Federation and identify those transfers that are contrary to the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit a written report to the chairmen and ranking members of the appropriate committees of Congress within 5 days of the receipt of information indicating that a transfer described in paragraph (1) has occurred.

(B) FORM.—The report required under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in classified form.

(C) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(i) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(d) LICENSING POLICY FOR CERTAIN DEFENSE TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a NATO member country transfers, or allows a transfer by a person subject to its national jurisdiction of, a defense article or defense service on or after the date of the enactment of this Act that is contrary to the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a) and is identified pursuant to subsection (c), an application for a license or other authorization required under the Arms Export Control Act for the transfer of any defense article or service to, or on behalf of, that NATO member country shall be subject to a presumption of denial.

(2) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—A presumption of denial shall apply to an application for a license or other authorization under paragraph (1) only during a period in which the Russian Federation forcibly occupies the territory of Ukraine or of a NATO member country.

(3) AMENDMENT TO ITAR.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall amend the International Trafficking in Arms Regulations for purposes of implementing this subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON OF NEW YORK

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against Syria or Iran.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 1266. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Protecting cultural property abroad is a vital part of United States cultural diplomacy, showing the respect of the United States for other cultures and the common heritage of humanity.

(2) Cultural property abroad has been lost, damaged, or destroyed due to political instability, armed conflict, natural disasters, and other threats.

(3) In Egypt, political instability has led to the ransacking of its museums, resulting in the destruction of countless ancient artifacts that will forever leave gaps in humanity's knowledge of the ancient Egyptian civilization.

(4) In Syria, the ongoing civil war has resulted in the shelling of medieval cities, damage to World Heritage Sites, and the looting of museums and archaeological sites. Archaeological and historic sites and artifacts in Syria date back more than six millennia, and include some of the earliest examples of writing.

(5) In Mali, the Al-Qaeda-affiliated terrorist group Ansar Dine destroyed tombs and shrines in the ancient city of Timbuktu, once a major center for Islamic learning and scholarship in the 15th and 16th centuries, and threatened collections of ancient manuscripts.

(6) In Afghanistan, the Taliban decreed that the Bamiyan Buddhas, ancient statues carved into a cliff side in central Afghanistan, were to be destroyed. In 2001 the Taliban carried out their threat and destroyed the statues, leading to worldwide condemnation.

(7) In Iraq, after the fall of Saddam Hussein, thieves looted the Iraq Museum in Bagdad, resulting in the loss of approximately 15,000 items. These included ancient amulets, sculptures, ivories, and cylinder seals. Many of these items remain unrecovered.

(8) The destruction of these and other cultural properties represents an irreparable loss to humanity's common cultural heritage, and therefore to all Americans.

(9) The Armed Forces have played important roles in preserving and protecting cultural property. On June 23, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas to provide expert advice to the military on the protection of cultural property. The Commission formed Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) teams which became part of the Civil Affairs Division of Military Government Section of the Allied armies. The individuals serving in the MFAA were known as the ''Monuments Men'' and have been credited with securing, cataloguing, and returning hundreds of thousands works of art stolen by the Nazis during World War II.

(10) The U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield was founded in 2006 to support the implementation of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, and to coordinate with the Armed Forces, other branches of the United States Government, and other cultural heritage nongovernmental organizations in preserving cultural property abroad threatened by political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters.

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

(1) the Armed Forces play an important role in preserving and protecting cultural property in countries at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters; and

(2) the United States must protect cultural property abroad pursuant to its obligations under the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and customary international law in all conflicts to which the United States is a party.

(c) REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN REGARDS TO PROTECTING CULTURAL PROPERTY ABROAD.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on efforts of the Department of Defense to protect cultural property abroad, including activities undertaken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, other cultural protection statutes, and international agreements, including—

(1) directives, policies, and regulations the Department has instituted to protect cultural property abroad at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters;

(2) actions the Armed Forces have taken to protect cultural property abroad, including efforts made to avoid damage, to the extent possible, to cultural property through construction activities, training to ensure deploying military personnel are able to identify, avoid, and protect cultural property abroad, and other efforts made to inform military personnel about the protection of cultural property as part of the law of war; and

(3) the status and number of specialist personnel in the Armed Forces assigned to secure respect for cultural property abroad and to cooperate with civilian authorities responsible for safeguarding cultural property abroad, as required by existing treaty obligations under Article 7 of the 1954 Hague Convention.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

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

SEC. 1636. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR REMOVAL OR CONSOLIDATION OF DUAL-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT FROM EUROPE.

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used for the removal or consolidation of dual-capable aircraft from the area of responsibility of the United States European Command until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory;

(B) the Russian Federation is no longer violating the INF Treaty; and

(C) the Russian Federation is in compliance with the CFE Treaty and has lifted its suspension of Russian observance of its treaty obligations.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply in instances where a dual-capable aircraft is being replaced by an F–35 aircraft.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a)(1) if—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a notification that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States and a description of the national security interest covered by the waiver;

(B) certification that such consolidation is consistent with the policy established in the NATO Deterrence and Defense Posture Review of 2012 concerning reciprocal non-strategic nuclear weapons reductions by the Russian Federation; and

(C) a report, in unclassified form, explaining why the Secretary of Defense cannot make the certification under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the information in the report under paragraph (1)(C).

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide a report on the cost and burden sharing arrangements of forward-deployed nuclear weapons in place with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its members and any recommendations for changes to these arrangements.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''CFE Treaty'' means the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed at Paris November 19, 1990, and entered into force July 17, 1992.

(2) The ''dual-capable aircraft'' means tactical fighter aircraft that can perform both conventional and nuclear missions.

(3) The term ''INF Treaty'' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987 and entered into force June 1, 1988.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 3134. PLAN FOR VERIFICATION AND MONITORING OF PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND FISSILE MATERIAL.

(a) PLAN.—The President, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall develop an interagency plan for verification and monitoring relating to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons, components of such weapons, and fissile material.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An interagency plan and road map for verification and monitoring, with respect to policy, operations, and research, development, testing, and evaluation, including—

(A) identifying requirements (including funding requirements) for such verification and monitoring; and

(B) identifying and integrating roles, responsibilities, and planning for such verification and monitoring.

(2) An engagement plan for building cooperation and transparency to improve inspections and monitoring.

(3) A research and development program to—

(A) improve monitoring, detection, and in-field inspection and analysis capabilities, including persistent surveillance, remote monitoring, rapid analysis of large data sets, including open-source data; and

(B) coordinate technical and operational requirements early in the process.

(4) Engagement of relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the military departments (including the Open Source Center and the U.S. Atomic Energy Detection System), national laboratories, industry, and academia.

(c) SUBMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 1, 2015, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the plan developed under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term appropriate congressional committees means the following:

(A) The congressional defense committees.

(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

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

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

(E) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2130

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the Committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I concur. We should adopt the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, this en bloc includes two of my amendments. The first amendment provides an incentive for NATO member countries to align their policies on defense exports to Russia with the restrictions that the United States has imposed.

As of March 1st, the United States stopped approving licenses of munitions and dual-use items to Russia if they would be used by the Russian military. The U.S. restrictions would apply to any defense items of other countries if they contain U.S. components.

While several European governments have imposed restrictions similar to ours, neither NATO nor the European Union has moved to restrict defense exports to Russia that are not covered by the U.S. restrictions.

This raises the disturbing prospect that a NATO member could transfer military items to Russia during this dangerous period when Russia forcibly occupies Ukrainian territory in Crimea or, worse, could seize territory in the Baltics, the Balkans or elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

The risk is real. For example, France has a contract to provide Russia with two Mistral-class helicopter assault ships, the first one to be delivered as early as this October. These warships would significantly strengthen Russia's ability to launch an amphibious attack.

Under my amendment, if a NATO member country transfers significant defense items to Russia, inconsistent with the restrictions that the U.S. has imposed, then there would be a ''presumption of denial'' for applications to export U.S. defense items to that NATO country. This policy would be in effect during any period when Russia either occupies Ukrainian territory or the territory of a NATO member.

A ''presumption of denial'' is a well-established concept in U.S. export controls. It provides sufficient flexibility to the Executive Branch to approve defense transfers, if the presumption of denial is over-ridden by U.S. security interests.

If NATO countries continue to arm Russia at this dangerous time, we have to ask ourselves: ''what kind of alliance is NATO?'' My amendment is not a sanction, but it is a warning to our NATO allies that we have to stand together against Russian aggression, or risk arming a country that might become an adversary.

The en bloc also includes my amendment requiring the Secretary of Defense to do a one-time report on activities of the Department of Defense with regards to protecting cultural property abroad, including activities undertaken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

War is inherently destructive, and all too often it results in the ruin of irreplaceable artifacts, monuments, and archeological sites.

In Egypt, political instability has led to the ransacking of its museums and destruction of countless ancient artifacts that will forever leave gaps in humanity's knowledge of the ancient Egyptian civilization.

In Syria, the ongoing civil war has resulted in the shelling of medieval cities, damage to World Heritage Sites, and the looting of museums and archaeological sites. Historic sites and artifacts in Syria date back more than six millennia and include some of the earliest examples of writing.

In Mali, the Al-Qaeda affiliated terrorist group Ansar Dine destroyed tombs and shrines in the ancient city of Timbuktu—once a major center for Islamic learning and scholarship in the 15th and 16th centuries—and threatened collections of ancient manuscripts.

In Afghanistan, the Taliban destroyed the Bamiyan Buddhas, ancient statues carved into a cliff, leading to worldwide condemnation.

In Iraq, after the fall of Saddam Hussein, thieves looted the Iraq Museum in Bagdad, resulting in the loss of approximately 15,000 items. These included ancient amulets, sculptures, ivories, and cylinder seals. Many of these items remain unrecovered.

Threats to cultural property are not new. Just as Adolf Hitler and the Nazis aimed to eliminate entire groups of people from the planet, they also sought to erase culture by stealing or destroying Europe's great works of art and other cultural property.

Protecting cultural property abroad is a vital part of United States cultural diplomacy, showing the respect of the United States for other cultures and the common heritage of humanity.

The Armed Forces have played and continue to play an important role in preserving and protecting cultural property in countries at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters.

On June 23, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas to provide expert advice to the military on the protection of cultural property. The Commission formed Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) teams which became part of the Civil Affairs Division of Military Government Section of the Allied armies. The individuals serving in the MFAA were known as the ''Monuments Men'' and have been credited with securing, cataloguing, and returning hundreds of thousands works of art stolen by the Nazis during World War II.

The amendment included in the en bloc requires the Secretary of Defense to do a one-time report on all Department of Defense activities related to the protection of cultural property abroad—including those taken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

This report will not only highlight the Defense Department's critical role in protecting cultural property and sites, but will also help us determine what more the United States can do to ensure that priceless work produced over the ages will remain with us for generations to come.

I thank the managers for including both of my amendments in the en bloc.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 590, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 7 consisting of amendment Nos. 57, 65, 67, 106, 114, 117, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 134, 137, 142, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 158, 159, and 162 printed in part A of House Report No. 113–460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

At the end of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESERVATION OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED OR RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

(2) Approximately 40,000 servicemen and women across all branches of the Armed Forces either live in or are stationed on active duty within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Unless these individuals are granted a waiver as serving in a law enforcement role, they are subject to the District of Columbia's onerous and highly restrictive laws on the possession of firearms.

(3) Military personnel, despite being extensively trained in the proper and safe use of firearms, are therefore deprived by the laws of the District of Columbia of handguns, rifles, and shotguns that are commonly kept by law-abiding persons throughout the United States for sporting use and for lawful defense of their persons, homes, businesses, and families.

(4) The District of Columbia has one of the highest per capita murder rates in the Nation, which may be attributed in part to previous local laws prohibiting possession of firearms by law-abiding persons who would have otherwise been able to defend themselves and their loved ones in their own homes and businesses.

(5) The Gun Control Act of 1968 (as amended by the Firearms Owners' Protection Act) and the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act provide comprehensive Federal regulations applicable in the District of Columbia as elsewhere. In addition, existing District of Columbia criminal laws punish possession and illegal use of firearms by violent criminals and felons. Consequently, there is no need for local laws that only affect and disarm law-abiding citizens.

(6) On June 26, 2008, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller* held that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm for traditionally lawful purposes, and thus ruled that the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirements that rifles and shotguns in the home be kept unloaded and disassembled or outfitted with a trigger lock to be unconstitutional.

(7) On July 16, 2008, the District of Columbia enacted the Firearms Control Emergency Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Act 17-422; 55 DCR 8237), which places onerous restrictions on the ability of law-abiding citizens from possessing firearms, thus violating the spirit by which the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

(8) On February 26, 2009, the United States Senate adopted an amendment on a bipartisan vote of 62-36 by Senator John Ensign to S. 160, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009, which would fully restore Second Amendment rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that active duty military personnel who are stationed or residing in the District of Columbia should be permitted to exercise fully their rights under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and therefore should be exempt from the District of Columbia's restrictions on the possession of firearms.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

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

SEC. 703. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER TRICARE.—Section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g)(1) Subject to paragraph (4), in providing health care under subsection (a), the treatment of developmental disabilities (as defined by section 102(8) of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002(8))), including autism spectrum disorder, shall include behavioral health treatment, including applied behavior analysis, when prescribed by a physician or psychologist.

''(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that—

''(A) except as provided by subparagraph (B), behavioral health treatment is provided pursuant to this subsection—

''(i) in the case of such treatment provided in a State that requires licensing or certification of applied behavioral analysts by State law, by an individual who is licensed or certified to practice applied behavioral analysis in accordance with the laws of the State; or

''(ii) in the case of such treatment provided in a State other than a State described in clause (i), by an individual who is licensed or certified by a State or an accredited national certification board; and

''(B) applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment may be provided by an employee, contractor, or trainee of a person described in subparagraph (A) if the employee, contractor, or trainee meets minimum qualifications, training, and supervision requirements as set forth in applicable State law, by an appropriate accredited national certification board, or by the Secretary.

''(3)(A) This subsection shall not apply to a medicare eligible beneficiary (as defined in section 1111(b) of this title).

''(B) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting or otherwise affecting the benefits provided to a covered beneficiary under—

''(i) this chapter;

''(ii) title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

''(iii) any other law.

''(4) In addition to the requirement under section 1100(c)(1) of this title, with respect to retired members of the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, or dependents of any such retired members, treatment shall be provided under this subsection in a fiscal year only to the extent that amounts are specifically provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the Defense Health Program Account for the provision of such treatment for such fiscal year.''.

(b) FUNDING MATTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1100 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES.—(1) Funds for treatment under section 1077(g) of this title may be derived only from the Defense Health Program Account. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may not be reimbursed from any account that would otherwise provide funds for the treatment of retired members of the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, or dependents of any such retired members.

''(2) As provided for in paragraph (4) of section 1077(g), with respect to retired members of the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, or dependents of any such retired members, treatment under such section shall be provided in a fiscal year only to the extent that amounts are specifically provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the Defense Health Program Account for the provision of such treatment for such fiscal year.''.

(2) INCREASE AND OFFSET.—

(A) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for Private Sector Care is hereby increased by $20,000,000.

(B) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Line 270) is hereby reduced by $20,000,000.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that amounts should be appropriated for behavioral health treatment of TRICARE beneficiaries, pursuant to the amendments made by this section, in a manner to ensure the appropriate and equitable access to such treatment by all such beneficiaries.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 729. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON USE OF HYPERBARIC OXYGEN THERAPY TO TREAT TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY AND POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder are the signature injuries of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(2) Post-traumatic stress disorder is prevalent throughout the regular component of the Armed Forces.

(3) For example, with respect to Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, which has a base population of 41,753 active duty personnel, including 38,020 marines and 3,533 sailors—

(A) 6,616 patients with a principal diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder had at least one visit for post-traumatic stress disorder between February 2013 and April 2014; and

(B) the Naval Hospital Camp Lejeune, which had a total of approximately 600,000 outpatient visits during 2013, recorded 15,043 outpatient visits for which post-traumatic stress disorder was the primary reason for the visit between February 2013 and April 2014.

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

(1) hyperbaric oxygen therapy is a medical treatment that can be used to treat active duty members of the Armed Forces for traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder if—

(A) such treatment is prescribed by a military medical doctor; and

(B) a hyperbaric chamber that is owned by the Department of Defense and cleared for clinical use is locally available; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense should increase awareness among members of the Armed Forces, including military medical doctors, of hyperbaric oxygen therapy to treat traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY

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

SEC. 1082. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish an Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health, as described in the report of the Comptroller General of the United States titled ''Energy Employees Compensation: Additional Independent Oversight and Transparency Would Improve Program's Credibility'', numbered GAO-10-302, to—

(1) advise the President concerning the review and approval of the Department of Labor site exposure matrix;

(2) conduct periodic peer reviews of, and approve, medical guidance for part E claims examiners with respect to the weighing of a claimant's medical evidence;

(3) obtain periodic expert review of evidentiary requirements for part B claims related to lung disease regardless of approval;

(4) provide oversight over industrial hygienists, Department of Labor staff physicians, and Department of Labor's consulting physicians and their reports to ensure quality, objectivity, and consistency; and

(5) coordinate exchanges of data and findings with the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health to the extent necessary (under section 3624 the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384o).

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 384, line 21, strike ''and''.

Page 385, line 2, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 385, after line 2, add the following:

(3) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) That Pakistan is not using its military or any funds or equipment provided by the United States to persecute minority groups for their legitimate and nonviolent political and religious beliefs, including the Balochi, Sindhi, and Hazara ethnic groups and minority religious groups, including Christian, Hundu, and Ahmadiyya Muslim.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO DR. SHAKIL AFRIDI.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The attacks of September 11, 2001, killed approximately 3,000 people, most of whom were Americans, but also included hundreds of individuals with foreign citizenships, nearly 350 New York Fire Department personnel, and about 50 law enforcement officers.

(2) Downed United Airlines flight 93 was reportedly intended, under the control of the al-Qaeda high-jackers, to crash into the White House or the Capitol in an attempt to kill the President of the United States or Members of the United States Congress.

(3) The September 11, 2001, attacks were largely planned and carried out by the al-Qaeda terrorist network led by Osama bin Laden and his deputy Ayman al Zawahiri, after which Osama bin Laden enjoyed safe haven in Pakistan from where he continued to plot deadly attacks against the United States and the world.

(4) The United States has obligated nearly $30 billion between 2002 and 2014 in United States taxpayer money for security and economic aid to Pakistan.

(5) The United States very generously and swiftly responded to the 2005 Kashmir Earthquake in Pakistan with more than $200 million in emergency aid and the support of several United States military aircraft, approximately 1,000 United States military personnel, including medical specialists, thousands of tents, blankets, water containers and a variety of other emergency equipment.

(6) The United States again generously and swiftly contributed approximately $150 million in emergency aid to Pakistan following the 2010 Pakistan flood, in addition to the service of nearly twenty United States military helicopters, their flight crews, and other resources to assist the Pakistan Army's relief efforts.

(7) The United States continues to work tirelessly to support Pakistan's economic development, including millions of dollars allocated towards the development of Pakistan's energy infrastructure, health services and education system.

(8) The United States and Pakistan continue to have many critical shared interests, both economic and security related, which could be the foundation for a positive and mutually beneficial partnership.

(9) Dr. Shakil Afridi, a Pakistani physician, is a hero to whom the people of the United States, Pakistan and the world owe a debt of gratitude for his help in finally locating Osama bin Laden before more innocent American, Pakistani and other lives were lost to this terrorist leader.

(10) Pakistan, the United States and the international community had failed for nearly 10 years following attacks of September 11, 2001, to locate and bring Osama bin Laden, who continued to kill innocent civilians in the Middle East, Asia, Europe, Africa and the United States, to justice without the help of Dr. Afridi.

(11) The Government of Pakistan's imprisonment of Dr. Afridi presents a serious and growing impediment to the United States' bilateral relations with Pakistan.

(12) The Government of Pakistan has leveled and allowed baseless charges against Dr. Afridi in a politically motivated, spurious legal process.

(13) Dr. Afridi is currently imprisoned by the Government of Pakistan, a deplorable and unconscionable situation which calls into question Pakistan's actual commitment to countering terrorism and undermines the notion that Pakistan is a true ally in the struggle against terrorism.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Dr. Shakil Afridi is an international hero and that the Government of Pakistan should release him immediately from prison.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 1259. COMBATING CRIME THROUGH INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to deploy assets, personnel, and resources to the Joint Interagency Task Force South, in coordination with SOUTHCOM, to combat the following by supplying sufficient intelligence capabilities:

(1) Transnational criminal organizations.

(2) Drug trafficking.

(3) Bulk shipments of narcotics or currency.

(4) Narco-terrorism.

(5) Human trafficking.

(6) The Iranian presence in the Western Hemisphere.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. __. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to undertake a whole-of-government approach to bolster regional cooperation with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere, with the exception of Cuba, to counter narcotics trafficking and illicit activities in the Western Hemisphere.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. __. DECLARATION OF POLICY REGARDING ISRAEL'S LAWFUL EXERCISE OF SELF-DEFENSE.

Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to fully support Israel's lawful exercise of self-defense, including actions to halt regional aggression.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 12__. STATEMENT OF POLICY AND REPORT ON THE INHERENT RIGHT OF ISRAEL TO SELF-DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8601 et seq.) established the policy of the United States to support the inherent right of Israel to self-defense.

(2) The United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8601 et seq.) expressed the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should transfer to the Government of Israel defense articles and defense services such as air refueling tankers, missile defense capabilities, and specialized munitions.

(3) The inherent right of Israel to self-defense necessarily includes the possession and maintenance by Israel of an independent capability to remove existential threats to its security and defend its vital national interests.

(b) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to take all necessary steps to ensure that Israel possesses and maintains an independent capability to remove existential threats to its security and defend its vital national interests.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that air refueling tankers and advanced bunker-buster munitions should immediately be transferred to Israel to ensure our democratic ally has an independent capability to remove any existential threat posed by the Iranian nuclear program and defend its vital national interests.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed four years, the President shall submit to the House and Senate Armed Services committees, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House and Senate Appropriations committees a report that—

(1) identifies all aerial refueling platforms, bunker-buster munitions, and other capabilities and platforms that would contribute significantly to the maintenance by Israel of a robust independent capability to remove existential security threats, including nuclear and ballistic missile facilities in Iran, and defend its vital national interests;

(2) assesses the availability for sale or transfer of items necessary to acquire the capabilities and platforms described in paragraph (1) as well as the legal authorities available for making such transfers; and

(3) describes the steps the President is taking to immediately transfer the items described in paragraph (1) pursuant to the policy described in subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

Add at the end of subtitle F of title XII of division A the following:

SEC. 1266. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NIGERIA AND BOKO HARAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In recent years, Boko Haram has furthered violence and instability in Nigeria and bordering countries.

(2) The terrorist group known as ''Boko Haram,'' which translates to ''Western education is forbidden,'' perpetrates violent attacks in Nigeria and has grown in strength and sophistication since its founding in 2002.

(3) Boko Haram kidnapped over 200 female students on April 14, 2014, killed over 50 male students on February 25, 2014, and continues to violently attack innocent civilians throughout Nigeria.

(4) Boko Haram has previously attacked Western interests, bombing the United Nations building in Abuja on August 26, 2011, and was affiliated with taking Western hostages in Bauchi on February 16, 2013, and later killing seven hostages.

(5) As stated by United States Ambassador to Nigeria Terrence P. McCulley in 2012, the threat of Boko Haram is growing: ''We've seen an increase in sophistication, we've seen increased lethality. We saw at least a part of the group has decided it's in their interest to attack the international community.''.

(6) In June 2012, the Department of State added three leaders of Boko Haram, Abubakar Shekau, Abubakar Adam Kambar, and Khalid al-Barnawi, to the Specially Designated Global Terrorist list.

(7) In November 2013, the Department of State designated Boko Haram and its splinter group, Ansaru, as Foreign Terrorist Organizations.

(8) Boko Haram shares the ideological designs of al Qaeda, and has made public pledges of support to Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda, and al-Shabaab.

(9) Boko Haram poses a broader threat to interests in Nigeria, the Sahel, Europe, and the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings specified in subsection (a), it is the

sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should—

(1) take appropriate action with allies and partners of the United States to fight Boko Haram's violence and ideology;

(2) partner with Nigeria's regional neighbors to counter Boko Haram's cross-border activity and respond to emerging threats; and

(3) develop a long-term, interagency strategy to combat Boko Haram and Ansaru, reassess United States assistance to Nigeria, and brief Congress on this strategy.

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle F of title XII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1266. RECOGNITION OF VICTIMS OF SOVIET COMMUNIST AND NAZI REGIMES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On August 13, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill issued a joint declaration ''of certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they based their hopes for a better future for the world'' and ''the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them'' and that the people of countries may live in freedom.

(2) The United States Government has actively advocated for and continues to support the principles of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations General Assembly resolution 260 (III) of December 9, 1948.

(3) Captive Nations Week, signed into law by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959, raised public awareness of the oppression of nations under the control of Communist and other nondemocratic governments.

(4) The European Parliament resolution on European conscience and totalitarianism of April 2, 2009, and the ''Black Ribbon Day'' resolution adopted by the Parliament of Canada on November 30, 2009, establish a day of remembrance for victims of Communist and Nazi regimes to remember and commemorate their victims.

(5) The extreme forms of totalitarian rule practiced by the Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes led to premeditated and vast crimes committed against millions of human beings and their basic and inalienable rights on a scale unseen before in history.

(6) Fleeing the Nazi and Soviet Communist crimes, hundreds of thousands of people sought and found refuge in the United States.

(7) August 23 would be an appropriate date to designate as ''Black Ribbon Day'' to remember and never forget the terror millions of citizens in Central and Eastern Europe experienced for more than 40 years by ruthless military, economic, and political repression of the people through arbitrary executions, mass arrests, deportations, the suppression of free speech, confiscation of private property, and the destruction of cultural and moral identity and civil society, all of which deprived the vast majority of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe of their basic human rights and dignity, separating them from the democratic world by means of the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall.

(8) The memories of Europe's tragic past cannot be forgotten in order to honor the victims, condemn the perpetrators, and lay the foundation for reconciliation based on truth and remembrance.

(b) RECOGNITION.—Congress supports the designation of ''Black Ribbon Day'' to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. ____. REPORT RELATING TO RESCUE EFFORTS IN NIGERIAN KIDNAPPING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall transmit to Congress a report on the findings of U.S. military personnel assisting in the search and rescue efforts of the more than 200 girls and young women who were abducted from the Government Secondary School in Chibok, Nigeria by Boko Haram. Such report shall include—

(1) the location, health, and safety of the abducted girls, to the extent such information is ascertainable;

(2) recommendations on what the Nigerian government can do to protect the girls and similarly situated girls moving forward;

(3) an assessment of the threat of Boko Haram to Nigeria and other countries in the region;

(4) information regarding efforts by the Department of Defense and Department of State to build the capacity of the Nigerian security forces to combat the threat of Boko Haram;

(5) information regarding efforts underway to address poverty and governance in Nigeria to improve the stability of that nation; and

(6) an assessment of the efforts of the government of Nigeria to address security challenges and the willingness of that government to cooperate with the efforts of the United States, including efforts to address human rights abuses by the security forces of the government of Nigeria.

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO OF KANSAS

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1622. DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CERTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO THE MISSION ANALYSIS FOR CYBER OPERATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 933 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 830) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''before the submittal of'' and all that follows and inserting ''or 2015 before the Secretary submits the report required by subsection (d) and the Director of National Intelligence submits a certification described in subsection (g).''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''and the Director of National Intelligence submits a certification described in subsection (g).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CERTIFICATION.—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the recommendations of the report required under subsection (d) are consistent with the cyber operations capability needs of the United States.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 1643. STUDY ON TESTING PROGRAM OF GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into an arrangement with the Institute for Defense Analyses under which the Institute shall carry out a study on the testing program of the ground based midcourse missile defense system.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of whether the testing program described in subsection (a) has established, as of the date of the study, that the ground-based midcourse missile defense system will perform reliably and effectively under realistic operational conditions, including an explanation of the degree of confidence supporting such assessment.

(2) An assessment of whether the currently planned testing program, if implemented, is sufficient to establish that the ground-based midcourse missile defense system will perform both reliably and effectively against current and plausible near- and medium-term ballistic missile threats under realistic operational conditions, and if any gaps are identified, an evaluation of what improvements could be made to the testing program to achieve reasonable confidence that the system would be reliable and effective under realistic operational conditions.

(3) Any necessary recommendations to improve the effectiveness and reliability of the ground-based midcourse missile defense system.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

In title XXIII, insert after section 2303 the following new section (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 2304. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 992) relating to Saipan for the construction of a maintenance facility, a hazardous cargo pad, or an airport storage facility in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out such construction at any suitable location in the Northern Mariana Islands.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2805. REPORT ON PREVALENCE OF BLACK MOLD IN BUILDINGS LOCATED ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress on the prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military installations.

(b) ACTION REQUIRED.—Based on the report required under subsection (a), buildings identified in such report as containing black mold shall be added to the appropriate branch's construction priority list for building replacement or renovation.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO OF GUAM

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

SEC. 2832. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURFACE DANGER ZONE, RITIDIAN UNIT, GUAM NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH.—In order to accommodate the operation of a live-fire training range complex on Andersen Air Force Base-Northwest Field and the management of the adjacent Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of

1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), may enter into an agreement providing for the establishment and operation of a surface danger zone which overlays the Ritidian Unit or such portion thereof as the Secretaries consider necessary.

(b) ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENT.—The agreement to establish a surface danger zone over all or a portion of the Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge shall include—

(1) measures to maintain the purposes of the Refuge; and

(2) as appropriate, measures, funded by the Secretary of the Navy from funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act and otherwise available to the Secretary, for the following purposes:

(A) Relocation and reconstruction of structures and facilities of the Refuge in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) Mitigation of impacts to wildlife species present on the Refuge or to be reintroduced in the future in accordance with applicable laws.

(C) Use of Department of Defense personnel to undertake conservation activities within the Ritidian Unit normally performed by Department of the Interior personnel, including habitat maintenance, maintaining the boundary fence, and conducting the brown tree snake eradication program.

(D) Openings and closures of the surface danger zone to the public as may be necessary.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 2867. ENSURING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SUMMIT OF RATTLESNAKE MOUNTAIN IN THE HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting as the administrator of land owned by the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy known as the ''Hanford Reach National Monument'', shall provide public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes, including—

(1) motor vehicle access; and

(2) pedestrian and other nonmotorized access.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements to facilitate access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain—

(1) with the Secretary of Energy, the State of Washington, or any local government agency or other interested persons, for guided tours, including guided motorized tours to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain; and

(2) with the Secretary of Energy, and with the State of Washington or any local government agency or other interested persons, to maintain the access road to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Page 649, after line 10, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsection accordingly):

(d) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN OPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The study under subsection (b)(1) and the report under subsection (c)(1) shall not include any assessment or discussion of options that involve moving plutonium to a State where the Federal Government—

(A) is not meeting all legally binding deadlines and milestones required under the Tri-Party Agreement and the Consent Decree;

(B) has provided notification that any element of the Tri-Party Agreement or the Consent Decree is at risk of being breached; or

(C) is in dispute resolution with the State regarding the Tri-Party Agreement or the Consent Decree.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) The term ''Tri-Party Agreement'' means the comprehensive cleanup and compliance agreement between the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Washington entered into on May 15, 1989.

(B) The term ''Consent Decree'' means the legal agreement between the Secretary of Energy and the State of Washington finalized in 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle H—National Commission on the Future of the Army

SEC. 1091. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Commission on the Future of the Army (in this subtitle referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of eight members, of whom—

(A) four shall be appointed by the President;

(B) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(E) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) APPOINTMENT DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) EFFECT OF LACK OF APPOINTMENT BY APPOINTMENT DATE.—If one or more appointments under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in paragraph (2), the authority to make such appointment or appointments shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number of appointments so not made. If an appointment under subparagraph (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in paragraph (2), the authority to make an appointment under such subparagraph shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number otherwise appointable under such subparagraph.

(4) EXPERTISE.—In making appointments under this subsection, consideration should be given to individuals with expertise in reserve forces policy.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.—The Commission shall select a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members.

(e) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its initial meeting.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(g) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROCEDURAL AUTHORITIES.—The following provisions of law do not apply to the Commission:

(1) Section 3161 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 1092. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY ON STRUCTURE OF THE ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army, and policy assumptions related to the size and force mixture of the Army, to—

(A) determine the proper size and force mixture of the regular component of the Army and the reserve components of the Army, and

(B) make recommendations on how the structure should be modified to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements for the Army in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In undertaking the study required by subsection (a), the Commission shall give particular consideration to the following:

(A) An evaluation and identification of a structure for the Army that—

(i) has the depth and scalability to meet current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands;

(ii) achieves a cost-efficiency balance between the regular and reserve components of the Army, taking advantage of the unique strengths and capabilities of each, with a particular focus on fully burdened and lifecycle cost of Army personnel;

(iii) ensures that the regular and reserve components of the Army have the capacity needed to support current and anticipated homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States;

(iv) provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Army to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components of the Army could be recruited; and

(v) maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness.

(B) An evaluation and identification of force generation policies for the Army with respect to size and force mixture in order to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements for the Army in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources, including policies in connection with—

(i) readiness;

(ii) training;

(iii) equipment;

(iv) personnel; and

(v) maintenance of the reserve components in an operational state in order to maintain the level of expertise and experience developed since September 11, 2001.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Commission shall submit to the President and the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission as a result of the study required by subsection (a), together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as the Commission considers appropriate in light of the results of the study.

SEC. 1093. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission shall hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties under this Act.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its duties under this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

SEC. 1094. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chair of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Chair of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(c) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(d) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chair of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 1095. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its final report under section 1092(b).

SEC. 1096. FUNDING.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 and available for operation and maintenance for the Army may be available for the activities of the Commission under this subtitle.

AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 1643. BUDGET INCREASE FOR AEGIS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aegis BMD (Line 030) is hereby increased by $99,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aerial Common Sensor (Line 003) is hereby reduced by $75,300,000; and

(2) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, Marine Corps, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for RQ–21 UAS (line 023) is hereby reduced by $23,700,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF INDIANA

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

SEC. 28___. INDEMNIFICATION OF TRANSFEREES OF PROPERTY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED SINCE OCTOBER 24, 1988, THAT REMAIN UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 330(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (4)''; and

(B) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (2) contributed to any such release or threatened release, paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3) contributed to any such release or threatened release, paragraph (1) or (2)''; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) The responsibility of the Secretary of Defense to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify in full certain persons and entities described in paragraph (3) also applies with respect to any military installation (or portion thereof) that—

''(A) was closed during the period beginning on October 24, 1988, and ending on the date of the enactment of this paragraph, other than pursuant to a base closure law; and

''(B) remains under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph.''.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 134 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1266. RECOGNITION OF VICTIMS OF SOVIET COMMUNIST AND NAZI REGIMES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On August 13, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill issued a joint declaration ''of certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they based their hopes for a better future for the world'' and ''the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them'' and that the people of countries may live in freedom.

(2) The United States Government has actively advocated for and continues to support the principles of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations General Assembly resolution 260 (III) of December 9, 1948.

(3) Captive Nations Week, signed into law by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959, raised public awareness of the oppression of nations under the control of Communist and other nondemocratic governments.

(4) The European Parliament resolution on European conscience and totalitarianism of April 2, 2009, and the ''Black Ribbon Day'' resolution adopted by the Parliament of Canada on November 30, 2009, establish a day of remembrance for victims of Communist and Nazi regimes to remember and commemorate their victims.

(5) On the 70th anniversary of the formal adoption by the Nazi leadership of the ''Final Solution of the Jewish Problem'', members of the European Parliament and the national parliaments of the European Union rejected attempts to obfuscate the Holocaust by persons who sought to diminish the uniqueness of the Holocaust by deeming the Holocaust to be equal, similar, or equivalent to Communism.

(6) Extreme forms of totalitarian rule have led to premeditated and vast crimes committed against millions of human beings and their basic and inalienable rights on a scale unseen before in history.

(7) The Nazi regime committed mass genocide during the Holocaust, killing millions of Jews, political opponents, and minority populations.

(8) August 23 would be an appropriate date to designate as ''Black Ribbon Day'' to remember and never forget the terror millions of citizens in Central and Eastern Europe experienced for more than 40 years by ruthless military, economic, and political repression of the people through arbitrary executions, mass arrests, deportations, the suppression of free speech, confiscation of private property, and the destruction of cultural and moral identity and civil society, all of which deprived the vast majority of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe of their basic human rights and dignity, separating them from the democratic world by means of the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall.

(9) The memories of Europe's tragic past cannot be forgotten in order to honor the victims, condemn the perpetrators, and lay the foundation for reconciliation based on truth and remembrance.

(b) RECOGNITION.—Congress supports the designation of ''Black Ribbon Day'' to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes.

Mr. MCKEON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 159 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment as modified is as follows:

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

SEC. 1643. BUDGET INCREASE FOR AEGIS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aegis BMD (Line 030) is hereby increased by $99,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aerial Common Sensor (Line 003) is hereby reduced by $75,300,000; and

(2) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for operation and maintenance pertaining to implementation of benefit reform proposals, is hereby reduced by $23,700,000.

Mr. MCKEON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I concur in support for the en bloc amendments. This is the last amendment, and I just want to say thank you again to Chairman MCKEON. I think it is right that this bill is named after him. As I have said, he has done a fabulous job on our committee. I appreciate his hard work and for, once again, putting together this product.

I also want to thank the staff. This is a very large bill. Lots of amendments are offered both on the committee level and on the House level. Staff has to pour through all of that and make sense of it and keep us informed. They do an incredible job and an incredible service to our country and to the men and women who serve in the military by making sure that this bill gets done every year, so I very much appreciate that.

I want to particularly recognize Debra Wada from the HASC staff, who will soon be leaving us. She has been promoted to be the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Debra has served for 15 years as staff on this committee and as an invaluable source of knowledge on personnel and on many, many other issues. It has been great working with her. We congratulate her on her appointment and wish her the best. Again, she is but one example of an absolutely fantastic staff and of the great work that they do to put this product together every single year.

So we thank you.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my simple amendment to ensure fairness in how we treat military installations after they are closed.

Most military installations are closed through the BRAC process. As such, they are granted certain legal protections, including indemnification from claims arising from environmental hazards created by previous DOD operations. However, some installations can be closed unilaterally by the Defense Secretary outside of the normal BRAC process. In these instances, the facilities are not granted the same protections. As it turns out, many former Army ammunition plants were closed outside the normal procedure. As you might imagine, facilities where chemicals for ammunition production were once mixed and discarded tend to pose some risk to the environment, and yet, merely because of the way they were closed down, cities and towns which later try to redevelop that property must assume the risk for any lingering environmental hazards.

My amendment would simply extend the same protection enjoyed by most closed installations to all closed installations.

Two years ago, I offered a similar amendment that was added to the House-passed NDAA, but it was not included in the Senate-passed version nor was it included in the conference report. That version would have retroactively applied this protection to properties which have already been transferred.

I have heard the concerns from the DOD and from others about adding this benefit on top of previously negotiated contracts. I am sensitive to those concerns, so this updated language only applies to those properties which are still under DOD's control today. I think this adequately addresses those concerns, and it still ensures that there is equity in how we handle these properties in the future.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman MCKEON, for his work once again in putting together this NDAA. I would also like to thank him and his staff for working with our office to draft this amendment and include it as part of this amendment package.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Mr. GRAVES from Missouri for taking the lead on this amendment, and I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for including this amendment in this en bloc package.

After 12 years of combat coming to a close and shifting security priorities, a commission to evaluate Army force structure is, indeed, appropriate. The Pentagon is still operating with assumptions, metrics and policies from the early 2000s. What we need to be doing is looking at shaping the force of the future. What the future missions and force mixture between active-guard-reserve should be is a question that should be thoroughly assessed.

To determine how the future of our total Army will be shaped for decades to come, we should select the more comprehensive commission and take the additional few months to do a comprehensive analysis with the best personnel and minds available.

Madam Chairman, the security of the Nation depends upon it.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I think we are about done.

At this time, I would like to thank my partner. For 4 years, we have had the opportunity of leading this committee, and I could not have had a better person to be working with than Mr. SMITH from Washington. He is straightforward; he is honest; he is hard-working, and we just, I think, have had a really good working relationship. I consider him—and I will always consider him—a friend.

Likewise, I want to echo the things he said about the committee. I want to thank them. We get all of the plaudits. People get up and thank us and say we have done a great job, but it is these people behind us—our committee, our staff—that make it easy to do this. I mean, we could have been here until 1 or 2 o'clock this morning, but to make it look kind of easy, kind of smooth, they have been working on it for hours, for days, for weeks, and for months leading up to this point.

I don't know much more to say other than ''thank you.'' You are great Americans.

People like to beat up on government workers. All I can say is that they are not paid enough for what they do. They can't be paid enough. They are patriots. They are dedicated to this work and to our men and women in uniform and their families, and I thank them for that.

With that, Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc

amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which requires a report to Congress on the prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military installations. Additionally, once the report is complete, buildings identified as containing black mold shall be added to the appropriate branch's construction priority list for building replacement or renovations. I would like to thank Mr. NUGENT and Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their support and agreeing to include my language in an en bloc amendment.

Taking care of our troops is one of our country's top priorities. After these brave men and women have put themselves in harm's way on the battlefield, it is essential that we ensure once they are back on base they are living and working in a safe nonhazardous environment. We must root out dangerous health hazards—like black mold—on military instillations to protect the health of military personnel on base.

One example of where this is an issue is at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida. MacDill is home to the 6th Air Mobility Wing and 39 Mission Teammates, including the United States Central Command, United States Special Operations Command. MacDill is home to over 13,000 military and civilian personnel and approximately 170,000 retirees live in the Tampa area and depend on the base for many necessary services. Black mold has been found on the first floor of the Mission Support Facility located on base. This building houses the mission support squadron and the ID services. Employees working in the Mission Support Facility supply all employees—military, civilian and contractor—and veterans with their ID credentialing and they assist veterans with additional paperwork that will help them obtain the benefits they have earned during service. Imagine how many of our active duty personnel, military retirees and civilians have visited this facility over the years. The Defense Department must keep a critical eye out not only for this facility at MacDill, but on all bases so we can maintain a high standard for our military men and women.

In addition to being a health hazard, the mold in the Mission Support Facility takes up valuable workspace and is cordoned off. Base personnel are doing the best they can and they have found a way to ensure that no service member or their family member has suffered, but they should not have to.

As you may know, black mold thrives in indoor spaces where there is moisture and humidity. As any tourist or native Floridian, like me, can tell you, Florida is well known for its humidity. It likely is happening at other bases located in humid areas. If we do not maintain these facilities defense-wide, issues like black mold can lead to expensive and harmful consequences down the road. We have seen examples over the years of black mold being found in homes where military families live and the horrendous stories centered around mold that came out of Walter Reed less than 10 years ago. We need to make certain our servicemembers, veterans, their families and civilians live and work in a healthy environment and that is why I have introduced my amendment to NDAA.

I would like to thank my friend and fellow Tampa Bay member, Representative RICH NUGENT, for his partnership on this amendment. His tireless dedication to the men and women serving in the Armed Forces at MacDill and around the globe are laudable. Active duty personnel and veterans throughout the Tampa Bay area are fortunate to have such a strong leader serving on the House Armed Services Committee and I am fortunate to call him a colleague.

Madam Chair, again, I would like to thank Mr. NUGENT, Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their hard work on this legislation and for including my amendment en bloc. Protecting the health of our servicesmembers and all individuals who work, live or visit any military instillations is imperative. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Graves Amendment to the National Defense Authorization bill.

My home state of Pennsylvania is proud of its National Guard—the fourth largest in the country and part of the fabric of our community.

We need the Guard—particularly in times of disaster.

After Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee in 2011, many of our citizens simply would not have made it without the help of our National Guard.

I support ensuring that the National Guard is appropriately protected in any force restructuring.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment number 129 as part of en-bloc package 7. The overall intent of this amendment is to address potential legal impediment of allowing a surface danger zone (SDZ) over the Ritidian unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge. My amendment would allow the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Interior to enter into agreement over the establishment of an SDZ over the refuge. It would also outline areas that would need to be mitigated if an SDZ were located over the Ritidian Unit. The amendment is similar to compromise language developed by Navy and Fish and Wildlife Service following an April 29, 2014 hearing in the House Committee on Natural Resources on this bill.

I believe this amendment will keep the Navy and the Fish and Wildlife Service talking about the potential impacts of a firing range on Northwest Field. In fact, I believe this amendment is important to keep the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process on track so that these two agencies can discuss potential mitigations should this location ultimately be chosen as the location for a firing range on Guam. The Navy has just commenced the draft supplemental environmental impact statement hearings (SEIS) so there is ample time to review all alternatives. The amendment does not prejudge the outcome of this NEPA process, indeed it is intended to keep the process on track so we do not suffer any unnecessary delays in the realignment of Marines from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. As the Navy has testified and stated publicly, without H.R. 4402 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 the military buildup would likely suffer significant delays and could significant consequences for our bilateral relationship with Japan.

I fully respect and appreciate the Guam community's close engagement on these issues and their participation during the draft SEIS public meetings this past week. I was able to hear directly from our community on this amendment over the past week, and community feedback is absolutely critical to the process. It provides the Navy and other stakeholders with important viewpoints to consider when final decisions are made for the Record of Decision.

I would also like to underscore the importance of training to the overall readiness of Marines in the Asia-Pacific region. This importance is highlighted by Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel in a letter to Congress, stating a live-fire training range is critical to, "maintain the military training and readiness of Marine Corps personnel relocating to the island". I have been and remain a staunch advocate for the military build-up on Guam. I believe that this bill keeps the process moving forward and ensures that we have no further unnecessary delays. The bottom line and undeniable fact is that without a live-fire training range on Guam, we will not have a military build-up.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for agreeing to put this amendment in en-bloc package 7 and urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment, which directs the Department of the Interior to provide the American public with reasonable motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain, located in the Hanford Reach National Monument. This 195,000-acre monument, designated by President Clinton in 2000, is near the Hanford Nuclear Site and is the only one in the continental United States managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Although administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the site itself remains under the ownership of the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management.

At 3,600 feet, Rattlesnake Mountain is the highest point in the region, and it provides unparalleled views for miles around the monument, including the Hanford Site, the Snake River, the Columbia River, and the Yakima River. Unfortunately, it took the Fish and Wildlife Service eight years to write a management plan that effectively closed Rattlesnake Mountain to public access, despite the vast majority of public comments favoring just the opposite.

After I first introduced this bill in 2010, the Fish and Wildlife Service offered two public tours for selected individuals and then suddenly reneged on the offer just days before the tours were to occur. During a 2011 committee hearing on the bill, the Interior Department's testimony suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports tours of Rattlesnake, but very carefully didn't go the extra step of ensuring the Service would allow public access to the summit.

Finally, last summer, the Fish and Wildlife Service granted a few dozen people the opportunity to access the Rattlesnake Mountain summit over two tours. These were the first two public tours offered since the monument was designated. The seats for the 2013 tours were snapped up online in just 21 seconds of being made available.

This year, the Fish and Wildlife Service is proposing tours on six days, and used a lottery system to distribute the tickets. While I appreciate the Interior Department's tentative steps in recent years toward allowing the public access to this area, it's clearly not enough, and even the limited opportunities being offered now can be reversed at any time.

My amendment is necessary to ensure reasonable and regular public access can be guaranteed by law to the citizens of that area. This language is supported by many stakeholders in the local area including the Benton County Commissioners, the Tri-Cities Development Council (TRIDEC), the Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau, and the Back Country Horsemen of Washington.

I would also note that this amendment has passed this chamber previously as standalone legislation. Last year, and in the previous Congress, this body approved this language on strong bipartisan votes with no votes in opposition.

I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee and their staff for allowing this amendment to be adopted en bloc today. Hopefully, this will move us closer to ensuring the American people have access to special places on their public lands, like Rattlesnake Mountain.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERRY) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S DEFENSE POLICY

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we just heard an extensive debate about the future of America's defense policy. I want to commend the chairman for including an important amendment that I offered that does address a serious, serious issue.

It is very hard to react to something that has not happened yet. Frankly, we are in a race between collaboration or catastrophe in regards to nuclear security and the threat of nuclear proliferation around the world. This technology is spreading very, very rapidly.

With the Department's effort at cost savings and reorganization, it is important that our nonproliferation efforts not slip, not become a second priority. It may be easy to do that because, again, when things don't happen, it appears that we are secure. This is one of the most grave difficulties facing not only the United States, but all of humanity.

So I am very grateful that in this bill we now have an effort to demand that the Department explain its important reorganization efforts and how it is going to address the future of nonproliferation issues as we work toward nuclear security, robust force strength, and deterrence. Nonproliferation goes hand-in-hand with those important national security elements.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUELSKAMP (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a family obligation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1209. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the ''Doolittle Tokyo Raiders'', for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

H.R. 685. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 309. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 21, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 685. American Fighter Aces Congressional Gold Medal Act To award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5727. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0093; FV14-945-1 FR] received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5728. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Cape Gooseberry From Colombia Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0038] (RIN: 0579-AD79) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5729. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Washington: Puget Sound Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2008-0122; FRL-9910-02-Region 10] received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5730. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenoxaprop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0588; FRL-9909-72] received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5731. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Identification of Nonattainment Classification and Deadlines for Submission of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Provisions for the 1997 Fine Particle (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0694; FRL-9909-93-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS12) received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5732. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0546; FRL-9910-18-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS21) received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5733. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tebuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0653; FRL-9909-31] received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5734. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter informing the Congress that approximately 80 U.S. Armed Forces personnel were deployed to Chad as part of the U.S. efforts to locate and support the safe return of over 200 schoolgirls who are reported to have been kidnapped in Nigeria; (H. Doc. No. 113–115);

to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5735. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Naval Base Point Loma; Naval Mine Anti Submarine Warfare Command; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0580] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5736. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Patapsco River, Northwest Harbor (East Channel) Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0236] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5737. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Giants Enterprises Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0174] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5738. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile 803.5 to 804.5 Henderson, KY [USCG-2014-0186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5739. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Eighth Coast Guard District Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1060] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5740. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Xterra Swim, Myrtle Beach, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0161] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5741. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; BWRC West Coast Nationals; Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0140] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5742. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lucas Oil Drag Boat Racing Series; Thompson Bay, Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0153] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5743. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Lucas Oil Drag Boats Racing Series; Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0058] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5744. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; The Boat Show Marathon; Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0102] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5745. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World San Diego Fireworks, Mission Bay; San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5746. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones, Delaware River, Pea Patch Island Anchorage No. 5 and Reedy Point South Anchorage No. 3 [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0051] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5747. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Helicopter Lift Operations, Main Branch Chicago River, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0128] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5748. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., transmitting proceedings of the 114th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Louisvile, Kentucky, July 21-24, 2013, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 118 and 44 U.S.C. 1332; (H. Doc. No. 113–114); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4121. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers; with an amendment (Rept. 113–461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 776. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to revise requirements related to assets pledged by a surety, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–462, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 776. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to revise requirements related to assets pledged by a surety, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–462, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with eligible Indian tribes to manage land buy-back programs, to require that certain amounts be deposited into interest bearing accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add sleep apnea screening to the initial preventive physical examination under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for startup businesses to use a portion of the research and development credit to offset payroll taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 4697. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a well-known seasoned issuer to reduce the worldwide market value threshold under the definition; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 4698. A bill to prohibit recovery of damages in certain wrongful birth and wrongful life civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of Commerce to prepare and submit to Congress a report and recommendations to promote the sustained economic development of Indian tribes and Indian lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for scientific frameworks with respect to vector-borne diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4702. A bill to extend until 2030 the time period required to be covered by the United States Space Protection Strategy; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 relating to

determinations with respect to efforts of foreign countries to reduce demand for commercial sex acts under the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4704. A bill to expand the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 to include combating the transfer of permanent custody or control of a minor in contravention of a required legal procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 to authorize the Secretary of Defense to decontaminate certain portions of the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 4706. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs and activities that connect Americans, especially children, youth, and families, with the outdoors; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 4707. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 4708. A bill to provide for the establishment of an office within the Internal Revenue Service to focus on violations of the internal revenue laws by persons who are under investigation for conduct relating to the promotion of commercial sex acts and trafficking in persons crimes, and to increase the criminal monetary penalty limitations for the underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 4709. A bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program to include all lands owned by the United States Government that are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense within the definition of entitlement lands for which payments are made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 4711. A bill to establish a regulatory framework for the comprehensive protection of personal data for individuals under the aegis of the Federal Trade Commission, to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to improve provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 4712. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide priority for the establishment of new national cemeteries by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to exempt school-based enterprises from nutrition standards; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 115. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give States the right to repeal Federal laws and regulations when ratified by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. DUFFY):

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a ''National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H. Res. 591. A resolution commending the Government of Afghanistan for certifying the results of the national election held on April 5, 2014, and urging the Government of Afghanistan to continue to pursue a ''transparent, credible, and inclusive'' run-off presidential election on June 14, 2014, while ensuring the safety of voters and candidates; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H. Res. 592. A resolution calling for free and fair elections in Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representative; the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 4696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 4697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) Article I Section 8—The Commerce Clause, granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several States;

(2) Article I, Section 8—The Necessary and Proper Clause, granting Congress the power to make all laws which are necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers vested by the Constitution of the United States; and

(3) The 14th Amendment, granting Congress the power to ensure equal protection under the laws.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GIBSON:
H.R. 4701.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause I, of section 8, of article I.
By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 4702.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 4703.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
''clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution''—to regulate Commerce with Nations and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.
and
''clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution''—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers. . .
By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 4704.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution
By Mr. PIERLUISI:
H.R. 4705.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.
By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 4706.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 4707.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 4708.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which provides Congress with the power to lay and collect taxes and regulate commerce among the several states.
By Mr. MARINO:
H.R. 4709.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.
By Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD:
H.R. 4710.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Consitution.
By Mr. SIRES:
H.R. 4711.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 4712.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution
By Mr. WOMACK:
H.R. 4713.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.J. Res. 115.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment X:
The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 259: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 269: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 401: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 447: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 702: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 708: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO AND MR. ELLISON.
H.R. 920: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 956: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 988: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 997: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1125: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1250: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1317: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1515: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1527: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1566: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1617: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1761: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1767: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1771: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1801: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1812: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1840: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1861: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1915: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1998: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2000: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2366: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2415: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2417: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2607: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2652: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2663: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2673: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2827: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2933: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2945: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2959: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 2994: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 3116: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 3135: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3137: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3382: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3426: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3707: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 3709: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3722: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3740: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 3747: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3774: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3877: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3905: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3929: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 3935: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3982: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3991: Mr. LATTA, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4031: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4060: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 4079: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4086: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4119: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4158: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4187: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4200: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 4205: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4221: Mr. LANCE and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4236: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4351: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 4365: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4383: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 4387: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 4395: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4399: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4406: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 4411: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MICA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO, MR. STEWART, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HALL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BARBER, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BARR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. NUNES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. YODER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HANNA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4421: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4430: Mr. ENYART and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4447: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4498: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4510: Mr. HURT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4511: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4515: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4521: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4526: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4569: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4571: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HURT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4577: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 4582: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4590: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4612: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 4619: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. REED.
H.R. 4622: Mr. ENYART, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4630: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4631: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4635: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4636: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4641: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 4647: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4653: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 4664: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.J. Res. 24: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.J. Res. 40: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 72: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H. Res. 112: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 153: Mr. JORDAN.
H. Res. 169: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 190: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Res. 456: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. MCCAUL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4286: Mr. CRAMER