United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

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

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 2015.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

TSA REPORT CARD IS A GRADE 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

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

And that is just the way it is.

CHANGE THE CONVERSATION TO HELP AMERICA'S CHILDREN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE TITUSVILLE HERALD ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

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

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

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

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

HUNTINGDON POST OFFICE CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

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

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE AND HEALTH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONGRATULATING CANON HUTCHESON

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1030

PROFESSIONAL'S ACCESS TO HEALTH WORKFORCE INTEGRATION ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH, NOT PEACE THROUGH ENDLESS WAR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

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

JOIN ME IN OPPOSING THE INNOVATION ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES NEED THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICANS DESERVE TO KNOW WHO RAISED THEIR FOOD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

ISRAEL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In God we trust.

REAUTHORIZE THE ESEA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECESS

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

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

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

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ZINKE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI CLAUDIO KOGAN

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. PALAZZO,
Member of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 304

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

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Kelly of Mississippi.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DAY OF PORTUGAL

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

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

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

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

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

I wish everyone celebrating today a Happy Day of Portugal.

CELEBRATING BULGARIAN DEMOCRACY

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

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

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

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

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

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

God bless Bulgaria.

REMEMBERING JOHN GRANVILLE

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

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

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

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

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

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

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING

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

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

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

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1215

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE TIM COLE EXONERATION REVIEW COMMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

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

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

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

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

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

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SALVATION ARMY

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

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

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

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

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

Happy anniversary.

NEGOTIATION WITH IRAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TIME TO MAKE PROTECTING THIS NATION A PRIORITY

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

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

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

TIME TO MAKE PROTECTING THIS NATION A PRIORITY

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

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

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

EQUAL PAY ACT

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

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

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

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

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

CLEARWATER, FLORIDA'S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of one of our Nation's most beautiful communities—the city of Clearwater, Florida.

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

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

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

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

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

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

What is your addiction to shutting things down?

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

ELIZABETH BARTA WIDEL

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

BOKO HARAM

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

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

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

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

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

THE INNOVATION ACT STIFLES INNOVATION

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

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING LG ELECTRONICS' COMMITMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND RECYCLING

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

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

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

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

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

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JOHN J. DEARBORN

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

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

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

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

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARISSA BARTELS

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

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

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

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

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

LET'S DELAY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW CFPB RULE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING ALL THE ROSIE THE RIVETERS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Mae Krier of Levittown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was a young woman

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 303

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

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But my question is, what are we waiting for?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We need to support this rule and the bill.

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

JUNE 8, 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(By Robert Burns and Lolita C. Baldor)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(By Michael R. Gordon)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Helene Cooper contributed reporting from Jerusalem.

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—244

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

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—2

Adams
Flores

□ 1411

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from yea to nay.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—421

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

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

NAYS—6

Harris
Nugent
Palazzo
Perry
Rooney (FL)
Ross

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Jolly

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Byrne
Flores
Messer
Webster (FL)

□ 1421

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 332]

YEAS—256

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

NAYS—168

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

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert	Tonko

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Pitts	Sires
Flores	Quigley	
Grijalva	Reichert	

□ 1433

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

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

That the Senate passed S. 653.

That the Senate passed S. 611.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

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

SECTION 1. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 292

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 2393

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(C) by striking clause (viii); and

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

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

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

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

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

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

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

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

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1445

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The FY 2015 exploratory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriation bill directed the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a report with his recommendation for establishing a trade-compliant country of origin labeling program. In his response, repeal of this provision was a clear solution.

I know that there are some here in the Chamber this afternoon that will not agree with the answer, but there have been ample opportunities to craft another labeling program that meets our trade responsibilities.

This could have been addressed in the farm bill, or those individuals wanting a labeling program could have been working on it since last October, when the WTO ruled again that this law violated our trade obligations.

We are out of time, and the repeal is the only option that we have at hand. I urge my colleagues to support the bill that is before us today in order to prevent harm to U.S. jobs, to prevent harm to the United States economy, and to protect the trading relations with our Nation's strongest partners.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time and for taking up this important issue and helping us to better understand the importance of it.

In my opinion, we shouldn't even be here today debating a repeal of this important consumer protection law. I don't know if this bill is a huge overreaction to the WTO decision or it is just an excuse to gut these commonsense country of origin labeling requirements.

For years, we have required labels on virtually everything imported into the United States. Every piece of clothing you wear has to have a label showing where it was made. Your smartphone has to have a label showing where it was manufactured. Even umbrellas and tablecloths have to list their country of origin.

But for some reason we are here considering a bill that would make it impossible for parents to know whether the chicken they are serving their family came from the United States or China. Think about that. What consumer, what parent would tell you they don't care what country the food came from that they are about to serve their children?

Let's just talk about the WTO ruling for a minute. First of all, the World Trade Organization ruling said that the

labels for ground beef were acceptable but doesn't even consider any complaints from Canada or Mexico about chicken. So why are we voting on a repeal of the labeling requirement for those products?

Secondly, the WTO has not even ruled about the extent to which country of origin labeling affects exports from Canada and Mexico. And it can't be much, since Mexico exports more beef into the United States than before this law went into effect.

We do not have to give in to the WTO this easily. These kinds of disputes are frequently settled by negotiations with Canada and Mexico, not by giving up and throwing out an entire set of consumer protections.

We don't back down this easily, and we shouldn't back down this easily.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. PINGREE. So maybe the powerful special interests behind this repeal are really using this WTO ruling as an excuse to roll back basic right-to-know for American consumers. I don't think we should let them get away with it.

I doubt there is a single consumer in America who says, ''I want to know less about the food I am eating.'' In fact, the opposite is true.

Now more than ever, Americans want to know where their food comes from, and they want to buy local food when they can. Buying local has created huge new markets for American farmers, great economic growth in States like mine, like Maine.

If this bill passes, it will be harder to know if the pork chop or hamburger you are buying came from around the corner or around the world.

Country of origin labeling is good for consumers; it is good for our farmers and ranchers. Please don't gut these commonsense requirements.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify. We do not import chicken from China, period. And the economic impact estimated for the State of Maine will be something on the order of $74 million every single year in imports that won't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee, I rise in support of this bill, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which repeals the country of origin labeling law, also known as COOL.

After numerous failed attempts to make COOL compliant with the World Trade Organization, it has become apparent that full repeal of COOL is unquestionably the right thing to do.

That said, I am sure there are some who are concerned that repeal of COOL may compromise food safety. America had the safest, most trusted food supply in the world before COOL and, let me assure you, we will continue to have the safest food supply after this law is repealed.

□ 1500

Let me explain why. Regardless of origin, if an animal is imported as a live animal, it is harvested in USDA-inspected facilities. Additionally, cattle, hogs, and poultry are inspected prior to harvesting as live animals and throughout processing as a meat product.

If the animal originates and is harvested in a different country, the plant has to have equivalent U.S. safety inspection standards and must be regularly audited by the USDA. The U.S. only imports meat products from countries that meet our standards. Furthermore, a foreign plant that does not fully comply with our standards is not permitted to ship meat into this country.

In short, the fundamental protocols ensuring food safety are apart and separate from country of origin labeling. Suppliers in foreign countries will still be expected to comply with the same inspection standards as they have now.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY, subcommittee Ranking Member COSTA, and the committee staff for their tremendous help and guidance on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues and appreciate their support.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and the former co-chair of the Congressional Chicken Caucus, I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

More importantly, as a Congressman for a heavily rural district, with lots of poultry and beef production in middle and southwest Georgia, I rise to support ending this failed experiment and repealing this harmful government mandate.

Since its passage in 2002, the country of origin labeling law has caused severe tension between the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Canada and Mexico argue that country of origin labeling has hurt their livestock industries, and they have taken their argument to the World Trade Organization, which has ruled in their favor and against the United States four times. We are now out of appeals.

Because of the WTO rulings, Canada and Mexico can now request authorization to retaliate against the United States in order to repair the damages they claim our labeling law has caused to their economies.

Therefore, we must act decisively to repeal the current COOL regulations on beef, pork, and chicken. If we fail to do so, Canada and Mexico have made clear that they will retaliate against a range of U.S. products within a matter of months by imposing onerous tariffs, resulting in higher costs and lost market share for U.S. producers up to $3.5 billion a year. A hit of that magnitude would be devastating to the U.S. pork, beef, and chicken industries.

While some say we need to hold out for arbitration, I believe we need to repeal this harmful law and correct the situation ourselves before facing overwhelming retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico.

By the way, it should be noted that this bill will not entirely undo the country of origin labeling law, only parts of it.

I urge support for H.R. 2393 because it will safely remove unnecessary burdens on our beef, pork, and poultry industries; bring us into compliance with our trade obligations; and ensure that we avoid damaging retaliatory tariffs.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 2393.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member on the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's make no mistake about it. I will just tell you this retaliation situation is real from Canada and from Mexico.

The question is: Why should we here put our agriculture foundation at such a tremendous risk? Canada and Mexico are right now moving to institute retaliatory tariffs against U.S. exports.

It is critical that Congress also take this corrective legislation and act on it right away before the August recess—it is just that important—so we can send a powerful, quick message because Canada has already issued a preliminary retaliation list, targeting our commodities and our manufactured products not just in one State, not just in two States, but in every State in the United States of America, totaling over $3.5 billion in the first year alone. My own State of Georgia will have an impact of losing $180 million.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with this right. This country of origin labeling is not about food safety. Let's not scare the American people into thinking that; we don't need to make the American people confused or feel that we are doing something to make the food unsafe.

What we are doing is protecting our American economy. We are protecting our agricultural interests. More than anything else, at a time when America needs it the most, we are standing up for America for a change. Protect our farmers. Protect our agricultural economy. Protect our people.

Make sure we pass H.R. 2393. Send a powerful message that we are not going to stand for Mexico and Canada putting their tariffs on us. We are going to stand firm and protect American interests.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for yielding and for all of his work on this issue. He has been great at trying to mitigate the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of the idea of country of origin labeling, and I think it is a good idea.

I refute what some have said, that there is no benefit to this. There is great benefit to this. Area of origin labeling allows people to get to know from where their food comes, and that is, I think, incredibly important.

I don't think that repeal is the number one preference here. I don't think that is what we should be doing; we should be fixing the problem, but, because the majority hasn't been willing to work to fix the problem, we are in a real catch-22.

I rise today in support of this bill because, if it is not repealed, we are going to face tremendous retaliatory acts from both Mexico and Canada, and these are going to be of great fiscal impact to our economy.

My home State of California, for instance, it is estimated that we will be hit by $1.8 billion worth of retaliatory action. A good part of that comes from my home industry, the wine community; they will be hit heavily. We know what happens. We have seen this movie before, and the end is not good.

When Congress put in place the trucking program to deal with the Mexican trucking problems, we were sued. The wine industry was hit with retaliatory actions, and we saw a 25 percent reduction in our business. That was financially devastating not only to California, but this is an industry that puts $160 billion a year into the national economy. This hurt us all. That was bad enough, but it took us 3 years to get back that market share that we had lost.

It is important that we repeal this and then get on to fixing it right away. I ask that we vote in favor of this bill today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who has worked really hard on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding and for leading on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just would remark that wine has informed the meat debate several times here today, and I am glad of that.

I rise in support of this legislation to repeal these components of country of origin labeling. I have long held the position that this is a North American market. We don't treat our best trading partners as well as we should, Mr. Speaker, and that includes Mexico, and it especially includes Canada.

I often have to go through the list of things we have done that turn out to be something that looks like trade protection at least to them. We have done it with steel. We have done it with softwood timber. We have done it when we have BSE circumstances with beef, which did originate in Canada, spilled over to the United States, and they opened up their foreign trade before we did.

This is one of these examples of what happens when you go a little overboard in an effort to try to establish some trade protectionism. This was driven by the people, especially in the Northwest, that thought that they would get an advantage on their cattle industry in that part of the country.

Now, we are looking at these sanctions which, by my numbers, likely go to somewhere in the area of $3.15 billion in sanctions between Canada and Mexico. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of our consumers don't even look at the label to see where that comes from.

Consumers still have a choice. There is nothing that would prohibit in the aftermath of this legislation. The consumer is saying: I would like to know if this pig was born in Canada and fed in the United States.

To give you an example of how this is, there is a lot of U.S. capital that is invested also, especially in farrowing operations in Canada. When the exchange rate was even more advantageous than it is today, a lot of U.S. dollars went into Canada to establish farrowing operations to raise pigs up there because they could isolate in order to do disease prevention and because it was a good investment; then those isowean pigs came down to the United States.

The numbers that I had was 6 million pigs coming down; 4 million of them came to Iowa. A third of the pork raised in the United States is from my State, and they are at a disadvantage because of this country of origin labeling. It penalizes, Mr. Speaker, the very people we are trying to help.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

As it has been discussed in this debate, the WTO has made its fourth and final ruling against the United States. Farmers and ranchers in my district in Texas will be hit with tariffs if we don't act right away. COOL has already put a burden on the beef, chicken, and pork producers in the State of Texas.

For example, Texas cattlemen are required to spend another $35 to $45 per animal just to comply with complex cattle identification requirements mandated by COOL. This cost will only get worse if retaliatory tariffs are implemented on our exports, tariffs which are completely legal under the World Trade Organization agreement that we have.

For example, I have spoken to my friends on the other side of the river, on the Mexican side, and they said that the American products that will be hit by tariffs include beef, wine, corn, corn syrup, furniture, dairy products, machinery, and a range of fruits and vegetables. That doesn't even include the tariffs that the Canadians will put, which probably includes jewelry, bread, beef, tomato products, and other goods.

Again, we cannot afford these tariffs, and we should pass the amendments to this COOL bill that we have to remove the threat of those tariffs completely.

In Texas, we raise beef, chicken, and pork that is ''made in the U.S.'' We only ask that this be voluntary labeling. We should act quickly to avoid those tariffs, so we don't punish those farmers and ranchers in the State of Texas.

I thank the ranking member and the chairman for all the good work they have done.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership in bringing the repeal of the COOL amendments to the House floor so quickly.

I would like to thank my fellow Ag Committee colleagues for their bipartisan support in passing the repeal of the COOL amendments out of the committee.

The COOL amendments, or country or origin labeling, has nothing to do with food safety. It is a mandatory marketing program. The USDA stamp of inspection ensures consumers the meat we eat is safe and wholesome, not COOL.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. The U.S. has lost its last three appeals in the WTO to Canada and Mexico regarding COOL. Both countries are ready to retaliate against us, as we have heard, to the tune of billions of dollars, thus hurting our ag sector and American jobs.

Agriculture Secretary Thomas Vilsack has said that only a legislative fix of COOL would bring the U.S. back into compliance.

Again, I thank and congratulate Chairman CONAWAY and urge all of my fellow colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1515

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Let me first point out the irony that we are considering this bill in what

could be a matter of days before we will vote on the administration's request for trade promotion authority.

Last month, President Obama said in his speech at Nike: ''Critics warn that parts of this deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, would undermine American regulation—food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They're making this stuff up. This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws.''

Country of origin labeling was passed by the Senate, passed by the House. It is the law of the land. Yet today, the House of Representatives is getting ready to repeal country of origin labeling. Why? Because the World Trade Organization ruled against it, a trade agreement ruled against it.

Contrary to what the President has said, trade agreements have a direct effect on our sovereignty. They have the ability to uproot domestic laws here in the United States. Members and the public need to know what we are opening ourselves up to when we sign these trade agreements. Literally no area of United States law is safe: food safety, drug safety, consumer protection, environmental protection, health care, label rights, Dodd-Frank, even the minimum wage.

In fact, today's trade agreements, including the TPP, go further than the WTO rules. They allow challenges to U.S. laws not only by governments, but also by foreign and domestic multinational corporations who can circumvent U.S. courts and seek a remedy in an independent tribunal.

Today, the casualty is country of origin labeling. I was conferree on the farm bill in 2008 with my colleague Ranking Member PETERSON. I helped to work to author the language that expanded the country of origin labeling. I have worked on this issue for many years as a member and a former chair of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee. I am proud of that record.

People deserve to know where their food comes from. American farmers and ranchers deserve the opportunity to distinguish their products. It is an economic truism that complete and accurate information is one of the cornerstones of a free market. More than a decade of polling data proves that American consumers consistently and overwhelmingly want country of origin labeling, and frequently by majorities of more than 90 percent.

The World Trade Organization itself has repeatedly ruled provision of information to consumers to be a legitimate goal for domestic regulations. In light of that ruling, I agree that we should seek to protect American exporters by avoiding retaliatory sanctions, but that has not yet become necessary. It has been less than a week since Canada and Mexico filed their retaliatory tariff requests. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body will not consider it for another week.

We do not know whether retaliation will be approved. Canada and Mexico have asked for $3 billion, but they must prove that they have been harmed, and that could be difficult.

A study by Dr. Robert Taylor of Auburn University found that in the case of Canada, COOL had no significant negative impact on either imports of cattle or the price of imported cattle relative to domestic cattle. Instead, Dr. Taylor concluded the decrease in exports was likely the result of the global recession and a weak recovery. Even if harm is found and retaliation is approved, it will probably not go into effect for several months.

There is plenty of time to look for a reasonable resolution, as we have done previously. More than 60 other countries have mandatory labeling requirements. So it seems there is a scope to find an acceptable way forward without compromising U.S. sovereignty. It is much too early for outright appeal, but that is what this bill does. Indeed, it is unprecedented for Congress to intervene so early in the WTO process.

Moreover, this bill goes well beyond the scope of the WTO ruling. It would repeal country of origin labeling on chicken, which is not addressed in the ruling, and on ground beef and ground pork, which the tribunal explicitly found compliant.

Why are we rushing to judgment on this issue? I am forced to conclude that this bill is, in fact, a veiled attempt by the meatpacking industry to deny consumers their right to know where their meat and poultry is coming from. Is it coming from China? Is it coming from Australia? Is it coming from New Zealand? Where is it coming from?

Earlier this week, a broad coalition of 283 agricultural organizations wrote to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON urging them to reject the repeal of country of origin labeling. Farmers, rural advocates, faith groups, environmentalists, labor unions, farmworkers, manufacturers, consumer groups all oppose this ill-conceived and premature repeal. Why are we not listening to them?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. As I mentioned at the outset, the context for this bill is a failure of U.S. trade policy. The administration tells us that trade agreements do not alter domestic laws. Clearly, this is false.

I admonish my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, beware of the road that you go down today. Beware of a trade agreement that puts American sovereignty at risk.

I hope that Members will bear that in mind and in that context as we vote on this bill today and, in addition to that, when we come to debate the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and grant fast-track authority on that agreement.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlewoman referenced a letter opposing what we are trying to do here today. As you look through that list of organizations that is cited, it is not surprising to find that several have consistently advocated for policies that are intentionally destructive to animal agriculture. So it is no wonder that these groups support a policy that imposes a heavyhanded financial burden on livestock producers, processors, and, ultimately, consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

In my home State of Illinois, we are a rich agricultural State, and we have a rich agricultural heritage. Illinois is a national leader in corn and soybean, but also beef and pork production. If Congress does not act to address this issue of labeling, products in my State could face higher tariffs from Canada and Mexico to the tune of $880 million worth of goods.

I urge my colleagues to stand with American agriculture and support the underlying legislation in order to avoid this harmful measure.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PETERSON for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of maintaining food labeling for the American people.

Polls show 9 out of 10 Americans overwhelmingly support country of origin labeling. I certainly look for those labels when I go to the store. It ensures that the public knows the source of their food. What could be more important? In fact, American producers want to share that information because it is a way to differentiate their products in an increasingly international marketplace.

Country of origin labeling is strongly supported by America's farmers and ranchers, who are proud of what they produce. Restoring local food markets, in fact, is a growing trend across the Midwest and the whole country. Farmers and ranchers know that people are demanding more and more information about their food. Restaurateurs are putting on their menus ''local beef,'' ''local pork,'' and ''local chicken.''

COOL allows farmers and ranchers the ability to market their products with pride because the label has integrity. The widespread support for country of origin labeling is what led to its enactment and implementation in the 2002, 2008, and 2014 Farm Bills. The trend is very clear.

Current efforts in Congress to repeal country of origin labeling are simply veiled attempts to gut these laws for meat—for beef, for pork, for chicken, three arenas that are completely controlled by a few processing companies. It is just like the book that Upton Sinclair wrote at the beginning of the 20th

century. We are back to the jungle. We are back to the jungle.

Opponents are pressing for less information for consumers, not more. They want to hide the product's origin.

H.R. 2393 is a premature attempt to undermine food labeling. They argue it is necessary because of the World Trade Organization decision that puts Canada and Mexico at a disadvantage. Well, this bill, as such, was never even raised in the WTO dispute, and labeling is supported by the WTO. The WTO dispute never addressed chicken. It has explicitly ruled U.S. labeling requirements for pork and beef are legal. And more importantly, Canada's claims of $3 billion in economic loss due to COOL are absolutely unfounded. The data is not even publicly available, and they are unsubstantiated.

The bottom line is the rationale behind this bill is a clear example of what is wrong with our trade policy. Congress should not let a few meatpacking companies use trade disputes as an excuse to gut important consumer protections and the rights of farmers in this country. It is our duty to protect American consumers, American farmers, and American ranchers, not the trade interests of any other country. Our people deserve a right to know where their food is produced and where it comes from.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The previous speaker made reference to the current animal agriculture businesses as being associated with those horrible circumstances of the Upton Sinclair book. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is they would be vehemently opposed to that comment because their practices today do not remotely reflect those in Upton Sinclair's book.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Agriculture is the backbone of many communities in Michigan's Fourth Congressional District. With over 10,000 farms and 15,000 farm operators, approximately $1.7 billion in products from our area are sold across the country and around the world.

The law on the books right now that mandates country of origin labeling threatens the success of agricultural exports. It is unnecessary. It imposes a heavy burden on our farmers. It puts our agricultural exports at risk, and it needs to be repealed.

Recently, based on the ruling from the World Trade Organization, it is apparent that severe consequences could result and that our trading partners and neighbors could penalize American-made products sold in those countries with steep tariffs.

Already, Canada has announced that it will put tariffs on beef, pork, and cherries if the current labeling law is not repealed. Manufactured goods, including office furniture, would also be subjected to tariffs.

H.R. 2393 passed the Agriculture Committee on a bipartisan vote of 38–6. It is a good bill, and it repeals the current labeling law. It will eliminate the possibility of steep tariffs and let Michigan farmers and manufacturers focus on creating jobs and growing their businesses without worrying about more regulations or retaliation.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

□ 1530

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

COOL was perhaps a worthwhile effort at the time but, unfortunately, has outlived its usefulness and its appropriateness. Country of origin labeling, well intended, has started to cause irreparable harm to producers in the Pacific Northwest. Beef and hog producers are facing serious problems trying to work things through the packing plant.

We have international trade now; we have a global market. That needs to be recognized. It is harming not just Canada and Mexico, but Pacific Northwest producers. That point has to be driven home.

We are now facing huge retaliatory tariffs in the Pacific Northwest. Some of our premier crops are wine, cherries, apples, cheese, potatoes.

COOL may have been well intended, but we lost four times at the WTO. We tried to fix it. We worked on it in the farm bill last go-around last year—couldn't get it done. We are facing these retaliatory tariffs right now. Let's repeal it, and let's move on.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM).

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and your committee for your hard work on this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the passage of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This important legislation repeals country of origin labeling requirements for muscle cuts of beef and pork. Unfortunately, the World Trade Organization issued the final judgment of a long-running case brought by Canada, ending all doubt that COOL violates U.S. trade obligations.

Now, America's two largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, are moving to institute retaliatory duties against U.S. products, including $1.3 billion of products from Iowa. Canada has published their list of retaliatory targets, including those aforementioned meat cuts, but also corn, fructose, cereals from my district, along with products from districts all across the United States.

Mexico has not yet published their list, but is likely to include some of the same corn-based products and perhaps even include ethanal.

It is critically important that COOL requirements be repealed to comply with existing trade obligations as soon as possible. Implementations of these tariffs would negatively affect a great deal of farmers and processors in my district and across Iowa.

I urge the House to pass this legislation today and the Senate to act swiftly to avoid these potentially devastating economic consequences.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to join my colleagues in rising in opposition to this important consumer and farmer protection legislation. Someone said it earlier; knowledge is power. When people know where something comes from, it gives them some very clear ideas about what the content of it may be.

Furthermore, the legislation, as has been pointed out here, is really quite, quite, quite premature. We need to let this process play itself out. There may very well need to be a fix here on this whole matter, but right now, it hasn't really been conclusively proven that the Canadian and the Mexican claims are valid. There has been some suggestions that perhaps they are not. Of course, this legislation goes way beyond the scope of the dispute at hand here.

I want to thank my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, and all my other colleagues for standing up in opposition to this legislation. Let's let the process play itself out, and then, when and if it is necessary, we can fix things at that time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I don't think anybody on our side wants to have retaliation, but, again, we believe this is premature right at this moment.

We don't know how much damages are going to be found, if any. We just feel that repeal is not where we are going to end up and where we should end up. We understand this needs to be fixed, but I think there is another way to do it short of repeal.

At this point, because of that, I encourage people to vote against the bill. I kind of understand where this is going, but, as it gets over to the Senate, we will figure out a way to work through this so that we end up not having any retaliation.

We still have a system where people can figure out where their food is coming from. It would be ironic, if this repeal would happen to get through the Senate and signed by the President, you wouldn't be able to find out where your chicken or beef or pork came from, as I said earlier, but you will be able to find out where all the other ag products come from, which I think most consumers would see as kind of ridiculous.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that no one wants the retaliatory measures to be put into place. A ''yes'' vote on this bill that we will take up on the floor here shortly will assure that of happening.

Arguments that it is premature fall on deaf ears. Four years of arguing with the Canadians and the Mexicans in the world court in this deal has left ample time to have come to some sort of conclusion if, in fact, there was a deal out there.

Quite frankly, if we had won a trade issue as decisively and resoundingly as Canada and Mexico did, we wouldn't negotiate either. We have no leverage; we have none to leverage against Mexico and Canada to get some sort of a deal that might fix this without the repeal.

Frankly, this is not about the merits of country of origin labeling; it is not about the merits of people knowing where their food comes from. We are beyond that point. We lost four straight times.

If those merits or those arguments upheld in the court in our trade obligation, then it would have prevailed, but it didn't. This isn't about people knowing where their food comes from. This is about avoiding the retaliatory measures that will be implemented by Canada and Mexico.

The argument that folks want to know where their food comes from, if you walk up to a normal person on the street and ask them that question, I am surprised it is not 100 percent of Americans who would say: Yes, I want to know where that food comes from.

But, if you follow that person into the grocery store and they go up to the meat counter, they buy based on price and quality of the meat and what it looks like. They are not looking at the label; 85 percent of them couldn't care less.

If you go into every single restaurant and you order chicken or beef or pork or fish or whatever, you have no clue where that came from. You trust the safety network that we have in place at USDA to make sure that that beef or that chicken, that pork, that whatever, is, in fact, safe for you.

The argument that we are somehow depriving the American people of information that they desperately need in order to make informed consumer decisions, again, falls on deaf ears.

Mexico is not a stranger to retaliatory measures. As my colleague from California mentioned earlier, they implemented those measures in 2011 as a result of a trucking case that we also lost in that regard, and it took the wine industry 3 years to recoup and get back to where they were when those retaliatory measures went in.

If you are not a wine connoisseur, pork rinds were also targeted. We had testimony from an individual from New Mexico that said they lost 15 percent of their business as a result of Mexico including pork rinds on the retaliatory measure. Somewhere between pork rinds and wine, you have got some products that are going to be impacted by this.

These retaliatory threats that are going to come happen are already having a chilling effect on commerce between our three countries. If you are a wine distributor in Canada, you are not going to make any kind of long-term deals with the United States until you know whether or not what the impact is going to be. Commerce right now is being affected; hence, time is of the essence to get this behind us and move forward.

I would also argue that most Members down here would be very quick to argue and demand, quite frankly, that our trading partners around the world live up to their obligations, and we demand that. We get on our high horse, and we thump our chest like crazy, demanding that other folks live up to their agreements. That is what this is.

We have lost the appeals every step of the way. We have an agreement that says we will treat our trading partners certain ways. We crafted a law that broke that deal. We are now being demanded and required to live up to our trade obligations. This is no different than us trying to force all the other countries around the world to live up to their obligations as well.

This is about protecting American exports from these retaliatory measures that are unnecessary to happen. If consumers want their business and want to know where their food comes from, we can certainly craft a voluntary program that allows the market to exploit that information if, in fact, consumers want that.

Nothing that we are doing today will prevent us from creating some sort of a voluntary program that would, in fact, give consumers that information without being in violation of our trade agreements with our partners.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, avoid these retaliatory measures, which are totally unnecessary, if we would, in fact, do the work we are supposed to do.

I also want to thank my team that put together the work on this. They have been incredibly diligent. I know the folks on the other side as well have worked hard on this.

We have tried to come to a bipartisan agreement; we just couldn't get there, but I want to thank my team for the great work that they have done in getting us to that point.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, consumers deserve greater access to information about where their meat comes from, which is why I have always believed Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) is a critical tool for American families and ranchers.

I join many South Dakotans in being deeply disappointed by the World Trade Organization's recent ruling against COOL. While I don't necessarily concur with the WTO's conclusions, I agree with my colleagues that something ought to be done to make COOL workable and prevent any damages against our agriculture industry. After all, it is essential that South Dakota farmers and ranchers can continue to be competitive in the export market.

The COOL repeal bill that the House is considering today, however, is premature. By moving on this legislation just weeks after the WTO ruling, we do not have the time necessary to explore what other options may be available. We owe it to consumers and producers to thoroughly consider alternatives. For these reasons, I am voting against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE BELARUS'S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 2015*.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2685 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1545

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I rise to present the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation for the fiscal year 2016 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, there are nearly 200,000 servicemen and -women serving abroad, doing the work of freedom on every continent, and there are many more at home who are serving in every one of our States—Active, Guard and Reserve—all volunteers. We are grateful to them and their families.

They are certainly not all experts in some of the language and terms that will be part of our vocabulary during this debate over the next 24 hours—phrases like ''sequester'' and ''continuing resolution,'' ''Budget Control Act,'' ''overseas contingency account,'' and the ''global war on terrorism account''—but they have every expectation that they will have our united, bipartisan support for this bill whether they serve aboard a ship, fly through airspace, or provide overwatch on land to support a military mission. This legislation was developed after 12 hearings, many briefings, travel to the Middle East and Europe, and countless staff hours, with those who serve us, military and civilian, very much in mind.

This is a product of a very bipartisan and cooperative effort, for which I thank my good friend, the ranking member, PETE VISCLOSKY. It has been a pleasure to work with him. We are both fortunate to have committee members who are engaged and committed so much to this product. We are grateful for the support of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY.

In total, the bill provides just over $578 billion in discretionary spending, an increase of $24.4 billion over the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. This topline includes $88.4 billion in the global war on terrorism funding for war efforts, and it is at the level assumed in the House-Senate budget conference agreement. I would point out that our House total is very close to the number President Obama submitted in his fiscal year 2016 budget request for national defense. Of course, the base funding recommendation is just over $490 billion, which reflects the budget caps enacted in 2011 as part of the Budget Control Act, signed by President Obama.

To reach our reduced allocation, we reviewed in detail the President's submission and found areas and programs where reductions were possible without harming military operations, warfighter readiness, or critical modernization efforts. Please be assured we made every dollar count. To do so, we have taken reductions from programs that have been restructured or terminated, subject to contract or schedule delays, contain unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need, or because of historical underexecution and rescissions of unneeded funds.

Of course, our bill keeps faith with our troops and their families by including a 2.3 percent pay increase, a full percentage above the President's own request. It also provides general funding to their benefits and critical defense health programs. In another key area, this package contains robust funding to counter serious worldwide cyber threats—now an everyday occurrence.

But I think we would all agree that the world is a much more dangerous, unstable, and unpredictable place than it was in 2011 when the Budget Control Act was signed into law by President Obama. The budget caps developed back then could never have envisioned the emerging and evolving threats that we are seeing today in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

So, to respond to current and future threats and to meet our constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common defense, we developed, in a bipartisan way, a bill that adheres to the current law and provides additional resources to end catastrophic cuts to military programs and people. These additional resources are included in title IX, the global war on terrorism account. That account has been carefully vetted to assure its war-related uses.

Our subcommittee scrubbed the President's base budget for this year and past budget requests, and it has identified those systems and programs that are absolutely connected to our ongoing fight against threats presented by ISIL, al Qaeda, al-Nusrah, the Khorasan Group, Boko Haram, and other radical terrorist organizations, including the Iranian Quds Force.

We also projected what resources the military and intelligence community will need to meet ongoing challenges of nation-state aggressors like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and others. Not surprisingly, we have heard objections about the use of title IX to boost our topline national security spending in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the Capitol who believes this should be our first go-to option. Rather, it is a process we undertake as a last resort to make sure our troops can answer the call amid a worsening threat environment around the world.

Again, we have been very careful about what went into this global war on terrorism account. We resisted the temptation to simply transfer large portions of the base bill's operations and maintenance accounts into the global war on terrorism account. We painstakingly worked to provide needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field whenever a crisis may exist or develop in the future, like the current unfolding disaster which is Iraq.

In a recent Statement of Administration Policy, the White House asserted that the global war on terrorism funding—the old OCO account, the overseas contingency account—in their words is a ''funding mechanism intended to pay for wars.'' I could not agree more, and that is why we enforce that account to provide President Obama with the funding resources he needs to lead us as Commander in Chief. Within that

account, I want to highlight two areas of critical importance—ISR and readiness.

We believe that a strong intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—ISR—capability is a critical component of the global war on terror; yet a succession of combatant commanders has testified before our committee that only a fraction of their ISR requirements is being met, in essence, leaving them blind to the enemy's activities, movements, and intentions. Accordingly, the global war on terrorism account contains an additional $500 million above the President's 2016 request to improve our ISR capabilities: the procurement of additional ISR aircraft and ground stations, the training of ISR pilots and other personnel, and the processing of that type of derived data.

Likewise, we share the concern of the Army, Air Force, and Marines about the overall erosion of readiness in the force. So, to begin to reinvest in readiness, title IX includes an additional $2.5 billion above the President's request for this purpose to be distributed to all of our services and to the Guard and Reserves. I would add that this sum must be detailed and justified to Congress 30 days before it is spent.

Again, this bill is structured to give the President the tools he needs to act. For example, when he finally does develop a long-awaited, complete, and comprehensive strategy to combat ISIL and other terrorist groups, we have provided in this bill the resources he will need to execute his plans. I think we would all agree that America must lead, and this bill enables leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I will allow myself a closing thought:

The Washington Post recently editorialized on the defense authorization bill: ''There isn't much bipartisan governance left in Washington, but if anything fits that description, it's probably the annual defense bill.''

Mr. Chairman, this bill deserves bipartisan support, and after many hours of productive debate, I look forward to a bipartisan vote. Our troops deserve it. Our national security requires it. Our adversaries need to see it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army	41,116,129	41,130,748	37,295,571	-3,820,558	-3,835,177
Military Personnel, Navy	27,453,200	28,262,396	26,711,323	-741,877	-1,551,073
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	12,828,931	13,125,349	12,586,679	-242,252	-538,670
Military Personnel, Air Force	27,376,462	27,969,322	26,226,952	-1,149,510	-1,742,370
Reserve Personnel, Army	4,317,859	4,550,974	4,463,164	+145,305	-87,810
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,835,924	1,884,991	1,866,891	+30,967	-18,100
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	660,424	706,481	705,271	+44,847	-1,210
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	1,653,148	1,696,283	1,689,333	+36,185	-6,950
National Guard Personnel, Army	7,643,832	7,942,132	7,980,413	+336,581	+38,281
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	3,118,709	3,222,551	3,202,010	+83,301	-20,541
Total, Title I, Military Personnel	128,004,618	130,491,227	122,727,607	-5,277,011	-7,763,620
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	31,961,920	35,107,546	28,349,761	-3,612,159	-6,757,785
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	37,590,854	42,200,756	40,548,338	+2,957,484	-1,652,418
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,610,063	6,228,782	5,338,793	-271,270	-889,989
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	34,539,965	38,191,929	36,094,484	+1,554,519	-2,097,445
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	30,824,752	32,440,843	30,182,187	-642,565	-2,258,656
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,513,393	2,665,792	2,644,274	+130,881	-21,518
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,021,200	1,001,758	999,621	-21,579	-2,137
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	270,846	277,036	276,761	+5,915	-275
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,026,342	3,064,257	2,815,862	-210,480	-248,395
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,175,951	6,717,977	6,731,119	+555,168	+13,142
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,408,558	6,956,210	6,605,400	+196,842	-350,810
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	13,723	14,078	14,078	+355	---
Environmental Restoration, Army	201,560	234,829	234,829	+33,269	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy	277,294	292,453	300,000	+22,706	+7,547
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	408,716	368,131	368,131	-40,585	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	8,547	8,232	8,232	-315	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	250,853	203,717	228,717	-22,136	+25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	103,000	100,266	103,266	+266	+3,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account	365,108	358,496	358,496	-6,612	---
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund	83,034	84,140	84,140	+1,106	---
Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance	161,655,679	176,517,228	162,286,489	+630,810	-14,230,739

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,216,225	5,689,357	5,336,971	+120,746	-352,386
Missile Procurement, Army	1,208,692	1,419,957	1,160,482	-48,210	-259,475
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,722,136	1,887,073	1,805,773	+83,637	-81,300
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,015,477	1,233,378	1,007,778	-7,699	-225,600
Other Procurement, Army	4,747,523	5,899,028	5,230,677	+483,154	-668,351
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	14,758,035	16,126,405	16,871,819	+2,113,784	+745,414
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,137,257	3,154,154	2,998,541	-138,716	-155,613
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	674,100	723,741	559,141	-114,959	-164,600
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	15,954,379	16,597,457	16,852,569	+898,190	+255,112
Other Procurement, Navy	5,846,558	6,614,715	6,696,715	+850,157	+82,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	935,209	1,131,418	973,084	+37,875	-158,334
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,067,703	15,657,769	14,224,475	+2,156,772	-1,433,294
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,629,662	2,987,045	2,334,165	-2,295,497	-652,880
Space Procurement, Air Force	---	2,584,061	1,935,034	+1,935,034	-649,027
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	659,909	1,758,843	253,496	-406,413	-1,505,347
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,781,266	18,272,438	15,098,950	-1,682,316	-3,173,488
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,429,303	5,130,853	5,143,095	+713,792	+12,242
Defense Production Act Purchases	51,638	46,680	76,680	+25,042	+30,000
Total, Title III, Procurement	93,835,072	106,914,372	98,559,445	+4,724,373	-8,354,927
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	6,675,565	6,924,959	7,372,047	+696,482	+447,088
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	15,958,460	17,885,916	17,237,724	+1,279,264	-648,192
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	23,643,983	26,473,669	23,163,152	-480,831	-3,310,517
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	17,225,889	18,329,861	18,207,171	+981,282	-122,690
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	209,378	170,558	170,558	-38,820	---
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	63,713,275	69,784,963	66,150,652	+2,437,377	-3,634,311
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,649,468	1,312,568	1,634,568	-14,900	+322,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	485,012	474,164	474,164	-10,848	---
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds	2,134,480	1,786,732	2,108,732	-25,748	+322,000

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program					
Operation and maintenance	30,030,650	30,889,940	29,489,521	-541,129	-1,400,419
Procurement	308,413	373,287	373,287	+64,874	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	1,730,709	980,101	1,577,201	-153,508	+597,100
Total, Defense Health Program 1/ 3/	32,069,772	32,243,328	31,440,009	-629,763	-803,319
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance	196,128	139,098	139,098	-57,030	---
Procurement	10,227	2,281	2,281	-7,946	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	595,913	579,342	579,342	-16,571	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/	802,268	720,721	720,721	-81,547	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	---	---	---	---	---
Counter-narcotics support	669,631	739,009	616,811	-52,820	-122,198
Drug demand reduction program	105,591	111,589	113,589	+7,998	+2,000
National Guard counter-drug program	175,465	---	147,898	-27,567	+147,898
Total, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense 4/	950,687	850,598	878,298	-72,389	+27,700
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	---	99,701	---	---	-99,701
Support for International Sporting Competitions 1/	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Office of the Inspector General 1/	311,830	316,159	316,159	+4,329	---
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs	34,144,557	34,230,507	33,355,187	-789,370	-875,320
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA)	507,600	530,023	507,923	+323	-22,100
Total, Title VII, Related agencies	1,021,600	1,044,023	1,021,923	+323	-22,100

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005)	(4,500,000)	(5,500,000)	(4,500,000)	---	(-1,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec.8017)	175,000	---	---	-175,000	---
FFRDC (Sec.8023)	-40,000	---	-88,400	-48,400	-88,400
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec.8028)	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec.8040)	-1,228,020	---	-869,429	+358,591	-869,429
National grants (Sec.8046)	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8050)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
Global Security Contingency Fund (O&M, Defense-wide transfer)	(200,000)	---	---	(-200,000)	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec.8067)	4,000	---	5,000	+1,000	+5,000
Revised economic assumptions (Sec.8074)	-386,268	---	-1,152,206	-765,938	-1,152,206
Fisher House O&M Army Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec.8090)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec.8094)	(146,857)	(121,000)	(121,000)	(-25,857)	---
Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund	540,000	---	---	-540,000	---
Basic allowance for housing (Sec.8114)	88,000	---	400,000	+312,000	+400,000
Military pay raise (Sec.8124)	---	---	700,000	+700,000	+700,000
Working Capital Fund excess cash balances (Sec.8125)	---	---	-359,000	-359,000	-359,000
Revised fuel costs (Sec.8126)	---	---	-814,000	-814,000	-814,000
John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&M, Navy transfer authority)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	(-1,000)	(-1,000)
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions	-803,288	1,000	-2,133,035	-1,329,747	-2,134,035

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IX					
GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM (GWOT)					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (GWOT)	3,259,970	1,828,441	5,664,570	+2,404,600	+3,836,129
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT)	332,166	251,011	1,643,136	+1,310,970	+1,392,125
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)	403,311	171,079	555,998	+152,687	+384,919
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)	728,334	726,126	2,376,095	+1,647,761	+1,649,969
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT)	24,990	24,462	24,462	-528	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT)	13,953	12,693	12,693	-1,260	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)	5,069	3,393	3,393	-1,676	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)	19,175	18,710	18,710	-465	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT)	174,778	166,015	166,015	-8,763	---
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)	4,894	2,828	2,828	-2,066	---
Total, Military Personnel	4,966,640	3,204,758	10,467,900	+5,501,260	+7,263,142
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT)	18,108,656	11,382,750	18,910,604	+801,948	+7,527,854
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT)	6,253,819	5,131,588	6,747,313	+493,494	+1,615,725
Coast Guard (by transfer) (GWOT)	---	(160,002)	(160,002)	(+160,002)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT)	1,850,984	952,534	1,871,834	+20,850	+919,300
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT)	10,076,383	9,090,013	10,799,220	+722,837	+1,709,207
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT)	6,211,025	5,805,633	7,559,131	+1,348,106	+1,753,498
Coalition support funds (GWOT)	(1,260,000)	(1,260,000)	(1,260,000)	---	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT)	41,532	24,559	124,559	+83,027	+100,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT)	45,876	31,643	34,187	-11,689	+2,544
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT)	10,540	3,455	3,455	-7,085	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT)	77,794	58,106	209,606	+131,812	+151,500
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT)	77,661	60,845	160,845	+83,184	+100,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT)	22,600	19,900	225,350	+202,750	+205,450
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	42,776,870	32,561,026	46,646,104	+3,869,234	+14,085,078
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT)	1,300,000	2,100,000	2,060,000	+760,000	-40,000
European Reassurance Initiative (GWOT)	175,000	---	---	-175,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT)	4,109,333	3,762,257	3,762,257	-347,076	---
Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT)	1,618,000	715,000	715,000	-903,000	---
Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT)	---	600,000	600,000	+600,000	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance	49,979,203	39,738,283	53,783,361	+3,804,158	+14,045,078

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT)	196,200	164,987	759,073	+562,873	+594,086
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT)	32,136	37,260	572,735	+540,599	+535,475
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT)	5,000	26,030	647,630	+642,630	+621,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT)	140,905	192,040	431,640	+290,735	+239,600
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT)	773,583	1,205,596	1,648,312	+874,729	+442,716
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT)	243,359	217,394	722,274	+478,915	+504,880
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT)	66,785	3,344	---	-66,785	-3,344
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT)	154,519	136,930	105,459	-49,060	-31,471
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT)	123,710	12,186	12,186	-111,524	---
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT)	65,589	48,934	234,741	+169,152	+185,807
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	481,019	128,900	1,297,726	+816,707	+1,168,826
Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	136,189	289,142	773,638	+637,449	+484,496
Space Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	---	---	452,676	+452,676	+452,676
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT)	219,785	228,874	1,673,358	+1,453,573	+1,444,484
Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)	3,607,526	3,859,964	7,045,550	+3,438,024	+3,185,586
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT)	250,386	212,418	217,701	-32,685	+5,283
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)	1,200,000	---	1,500,000	+300,000	+1,500,000
Total, Procurement	7,696,691	6,763,999	18,094,699	+10,398,008	+11,330,700
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWOT)	2,000	1,500	1,500	-500	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)	36,020	35,747	217,647	+181,627	+181,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT)	14,706	17,100	1,366,242	+1,351,536	+1,349,142
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (GWOT)	174,647	137,087	199,264	+24,617	+62,177
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	227,373	191,434	1,784,653	+1,557,280	+1,593,219
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT)	91,350	88,850	88,850	-2,500	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT)	300,531	272,704	272,704	-27,827	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT)	205,000	186,000	275,300	+70,300	+89,300
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (GWOT)	444,464	493,271	443,271	-1,193	-50,000
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT)	10,623	10,262	10,262	-361	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	960,618	962,237	1,001,537	+40,919	+39,300
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec.9003)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	---	---
Rescissions (GWOT)	-1,236,580	---	---	+1,236,580	---
Unexploded ordnance (GWOT)	250,000	---	---	-250,000	---
Assistance to Ukraine (GWOT) (Sec. 9014)	---	---	200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (GWOT) (Sec.9016)	---	---	500,000	+500,000	+500,000
Readiness (GWOT) (Sec.9017)	1,000,000	---	2,500,000	+1,500,000	+2,500,000
Total, General Provisions	13,420	---	3,200,000	+3,186,580	+3,200,000
Total, Title IX	63,935,295	50,949,561	88,421,000	+24,485,705	+37,471,439
TITLE X					
EBOLA RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Procurement, Defense-wide (emergency)	17,000	---	---	-17,000	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide (emergency)	95,000	---	---	-95,000	---
Total, Title X	112,000	---	---	-112,000	---
(Emergency)	(112,000)	---	---	(-112,000)	---
Grand Total	547,753,288	571,719,613	572,498,000	+24,744,712	+778,387
Appropriations	(484,934,013)	(520,770,052)	(484,946,429)	(+12,416)	(-35,823,623)
Emergency appropriations	(112,000)	---	---	(-112,000)	---
GLobal War on Terrorism (GWOT)	(65,171,875)	(50,949,561)	(88,421,000)	(+23,249,125)	(+37,471,439)
Rescissions	(-1,228,020)	---	(-869,429)	(+358,591)	(-869,429)
Rescissions (GWOT)	(-1,236,580)	---	---	(+1,236,580)	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent)	31,000	33,000	33,000	+2,000	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent)	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund (permanent):					
Defense function	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---	---
Non-defense function	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (Sec.8102):					
Defense function	-146,857	-120,000	-120,000	+26,857	---
Non-defense function	146,857	120,000	120,000	-26,857	---
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to Department of State:					
Defense function	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Non-defense function	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
Navy transfer to John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund:					
Defense function	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Non-defense function	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Title IX O&M, Navy transfer to Coast Guard, Op.Exp (By transfer)	---	(160,002)	(160,002)	(+160,002)	---
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 5/	6,963,000	6,631,000	6,631,000	-332,000	---
(GWOT)	64,700	---	---	-64,700	---
Less emergency appropriations	-112,000	---	---	+112,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	6,954,700	6,672,000	6,672,000	-282,700	---

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel	128,004,618	130,491,227	122,727,607	-5,277,011	-7,763,620
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	161,655,679	176,517,228	162,286,489	+630,810	-14,230,739
Title III - Procurement	93,835,072	106,914,372	98,559,445	+4,724,373	-8,354,927
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	63,713,275	69,784,963	66,150,652	+2,437,377	-3,634,311
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	2,134,480	1,786,732	2,108,732	-25,748	+322,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	34,144,557	34,230,507	33,355,187	-789,370	-875,320
Title VII - Related Agencies	1,021,600	1,044,023	1,021,923	+323	-22,100
Title VIII - General Provisions (net)	-803,288	1,000	-2,133,035	-1,329,747	-2,134,035
Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT)	63,935,295	50,949,561	88,421,000	+24,485,705	+37,471,439
Title X - Ebola Response and Preparedness	112,000	---	---	-112,000	---
Total, Department of Defense	547,753,288	571,719,613	572,498,000	+24,744,712	+778,387
Scorekeeping adjustments	6,954,700	6,672,000	6,672,000	-282,700	---
Total mandatory and discretionary	554,707,988	578,391,613	579,170,000	+24,462,012	+778,387

1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
3/ Budget request assumes enactment of DoD's pharmacy/Consolidated Health Plan proposals.
4/ Budget request does not break out total recommended in bill language
5/ Contributions to Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375). Amount does not include Budget proposals to amend TRICARE

NOTE: In FY 2015, the amount provided for Space Procurement, Air Force was included in the appropriation for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The House reported table counts the FY 2015 amount for Space Procurement, Air Force ($2,658,789) twice--as part of Missile Procurement, Air Force and as a separate appropriation

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and to congratulate him on the collegial and the transparent manner in which he has crafted this legislation.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the efforts of Chairman HAL ROGERS, Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, and of all the members of the Defense Subcommittee.

This bill, obviously, could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, discerning judgment, and thoughtful input of our committee staff and personal staffs. I thank them very much.

The chairman has fully and fairly described the bill we are considering today. I believe he has accurately described the very dangerous and unpredictable world in which we live. As such, I will enter my detailed comments on the bill for the RECORD. Instead, I want to use my time during general debate to discuss the albatross around Congress' neck—the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Despite near universal disdain and plenty of buyer's remorse from the 187 current House Members who voted in favor of the Budget Control Act, it has proven to be an extremely resilient—yet utterly ineffective—piece of law. We have seen short postponements of sequestration. We have seen 2-year alleviations of the budget caps. Yet we find ourselves nearly 5 years since its enactment far from the consensus needed to repeal the law. Further, the continued halfhearted attempts to fix the Budget Control Act are almost as detrimental to the law, itself, as they add to the Nation's uncertainty.

Additionally, it is becoming increasingly difficult to point to any positive changes in our fiscal situation as a result. While intended to reduce the budget deficit through spending limits and reductions, our national debt has increased by 24.5 percent since the enactment of the legislation, mainly because the committees that are not truly constrained by discretionary spending caps continue to push politically popular legislation with little regard for its impact on the Federal budget.

For example, in April of this year, Congress passed legislation that permanently fixed the longstanding issues with Medicare's payment rates for physician services. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this fix will result in a $141 billion increase in Federal budget deficits over the next 10 years; yet the measure sailed through both Houses of Congress with very little opposition, and it was greeted by a cheerful signing statement at the White House. After 17 temporary measures, it is clear that a permanent doctor fix was long overdue. However, I believe it illustrates my larger point that we are nowhere close to having a sincere conversation about our deficits while nondiscretionary spending and a lack of revenue continue to, largely, get a free pass.

Until the President and Congress stop whistling past the graveyard and confront the continued growth and mandatory spending, while simultaneously increasing revenues, our committee—the Appropriations Committee—has no choice but to carry out the implausible mandate contained in the Budget Control Act and try to control deficits with jurisdiction over only 34 percent of one half of the Federal Ledger.

It does not help, I fear, that a majority of our colleagues have no idea when the fiscal year starts except that that is when you shut the government down. I despair that most think continuing resolutions are the norm and that sequestration is not all that bad, and that there is some delight every time a civilian Federal employee is furloughed. To me, all are symptoms of failure.

□ 1600

The time we have caused people to waste by not finishing Congress' work on time, enacting innumerable continuing resolutions, and vacillating from one top line to another is deplorable. Whether it is a Federal agency, a State, other political subdivisions, a nonprofit organization, contractors, or an allied nation all have been less efficient in recent years because of the constant uncertainty surrounding the Federal Government's finances.

To illustrate, in nearly every fiscal year since the Budget Control Act's enactment, there have been attempts to alter the caps on defense and nondefense spending. Two years ago, the House and Senate had allocations that were $91 billion apart, yet the suballocation for defense was only about $4 billion as far as a difference. Both were in excess of the caps. Needless to say, we ended up at a point somewhere between the two, but only after we wasted an incredible amount of time, and shut down the Federal Government.

While not a mirror image of 2 years ago, the fiscal year 2016 process is careening toward a similar fate. This fiscal year, the President got the process started by submitting a budget request that did not comply with the limitations mandated by the Budget Control Act across all budgeted fiscal years. The majority party's response to the President was to pass a budget resolution that purports to abide by the caps for fiscal year 2016 for defense and nondefense discretionary spending, yet evades the defense cap by proposing $38 billion above the President's budget request for overseas contingency operations—for purposes of this act, the global war on terror. Despite the objections of the Secretary of Defense, this additional funding was further entrenched by the recently passed fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

There is no question that Presidents Bush and Obama, the Department of Defense, and Congress have been complicit since 2001 in using emergency war funding to resource enduring requirements for the military. For the past few years, despite the constraints of the Budget Control Act, the Defense Subcommittee, led by my good friend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, has begun to make strides in limiting what is an eligible expense for OCO and shift activities to the base budget; and he is doing exactly the right thing. This was done because it is increasingly difficult, after 14 years, to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our great Nation and our interests.

Needless to say, I find the increased reliance on contingency funding very troubling—and not because I object to providing additional funds for the Department of Defense. I agree with the Department, and I agree with the chairman that sticking to the caps for defense spending would necessitate our forces assuming unreasonable risk in carrying out our national defense strategy.

But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we need a strong nation as well as a strong defense. We cannot continue to let our country deteriorate, with interstate bridges that collapse and kill our citizens, meaningful scientific research that atrophies, and a population whose educational attainment falls further and further behind.

Looking ahead, only the most Pollyannaish among us fails to see that we will be in the throes of another crisis in December. Our time, our staff's time, Congress' time, the country's time should not be wasted any longer. The President of the United States and the leaders of both parties of both Houses ought to start meaningful negotiations now so that they can conclude before October 1 to allow this great committee, the Committee on Appropriations, to again do the business of the country in an orderly, thoughtful, and timely fashion.

I stress, this is not an issue of process. Congress should not be searching for ways to alter the process in order to avoid making hard decisions on an annual basis. This is a matter of will, and we need to use the power of the purse to its fullest.

I expressed a number of concerns, but I would close, relative to the legislation before us, given the constraints that this committee faces, by observing that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the subcommittee have done an exceptional job in putting this bill together. In particular, the chairman has been meticulous with the $37.5 billion added to title IX of this bill. He has avoided the easy path. Rather, he has painstakingly worked to provide the needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field. Further, the chair was very thoughtful in his construction of the base portion of the bill, and

I believe it and the report provide the stability needed for our military personnel—as the chairman emphasized, its readiness—and it preserves our industrial base.

I close by indicating I look forward to the debates on the amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Defense Appropriations bill.

The demands on our military are high. We are confronted with escalating Russian and Chinese aggression, threats from ISIL and other Islamic terrorist groups, burgeoning nuclear programs in countries like North Korea, and ongoing war in Syria, Yemen, Libya, and other places. We just don't know what may sprout up next.

But in the face of this uncertainty, we can ensure that our military forces are ready and able to meet whatever challenges may arise. We can make very sure that our troops and commanders have the tools and support that they need to protect this great Nation and our way of life.

To this end, the bill provides $578.6 billion in discretionary funding. That is $24.4 billion above last year's level and includes $88.4 billion to ensure that we can meet the needs of our military as they fight the global war on terrorism.

This level of funding complies with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, as well as the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. Within this total, the bill prioritizes military readiness, providing $219 billion for operation and maintenance programs that keep our troops trained and prepared to respond quickly and decisively.

The bill also provides priority funding to ensure that our Armed Forces are supplied with the equipment and the weapons that they need to conduct successful military operations.

Mr. Chairman, our military is the best in the world, and this bill ensures that it stays that way. We invest $67.9 billion in research and development that will keep us on the cutting edge of defense technology and enable us to meet a wide range of future threats to our security.

But our military is nothing without the brave men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much in their service to this Nation. We must keep morale high and provide for the health and well-being of our warfighters and their families. So the bill includes a 2.3 percent pay raise for our troops. That is more than the President requested.

The bill contains $31.7 billion for the Defense Health Program to meet all estimated needs this year. This funding includes important increases above the President's request for things like cancer research, traumatic brain injury and psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriations bill accomplishes all of this but also takes important steps to streamline spending at the Pentagon, ensuring that no dollar goes to waste and that we live within our means.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee staff and members and his very trusted ranking member for their good bipartisan teamwork on this bill. The chairman and ranking member demonstrated ironclad commitment to our troops and to the security of this Nation with this bill. I would also like to acknowledge the hard-working staff, Mr. Chairman. They spent many, many hours preparing this bill for consideration by us today.

Mr. Chairman, above all else—above all else—we must provide for the national defense of the United States. Nothing can exist—not our domestic government, not our private enterprise, not our freedoms—without ensuring that that basic need is met.

Our national security is far too important to fall victim to political games. We can't risk having an underfunded military during these uncertain times, and our troops deserve unfailing, unanimous support as they lay their lives on the line. No political games on this bill, Mr. Chairman. This is for real.

I urge Members to support this bill. These are bipartisan priorities addressed in a bipartisan way, and I want to see that our colleagues send a strong message to our military showing our support and our willingness to sacrifice for them. I urge support of this bill on this floor.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and Chairman ROGERS for their efforts. I particularly want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for working in such a cooperative manner.

However, the two parties remain very far apart in their approach to the appropriations process. Our differences were plainly evident during consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. Not one of my Democratic colleagues supported the majority's budget because it maintained sequestration levels. As the President said: the majority has returned our economy to the same top-down economics that has failed us before and slashes investments in the middle class that we need to grow the economy.

During debate on the previous five appropriations bills, my majority colleagues argued strenuously that allocations at the sequester level were nonnegotiable. They argued our committee was hamstrung by the Budget Control Act and that we were powerless to renegotiate another sequester relief package, as had been done under the Murray-Ryan agreement 2 years ago. At the same time, others on our committee told the press that ''pressure would build'' to address sequestration or pass a continuing resolution because sequester-level bills cannot be enacted.

The Defense bill before us appears to be operating under a different set of rules, with funding over the magical sequester level, a level we were told was the law of the land. It was not cut below the President's request, as were all the other nondefense bills. By using $38 billion in overseas contingency operations funding to plug the hole created by the budget caps, this bill fully funds defense programs and avoids the inadequacies facing the other bills.

Let me be very, very clear. I am not making a case that the Defense bill is too high or advocating that it should be reduced. We live in a very dangerous world. We need to attend to our defense, but we should do so in a responsible fashion.

□ 1615

Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department's ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon's regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.

This practice irresponsibly addresses only one of the budget imperatives, creating clear losers in most of the other appropriation bills.

If this bill were to move forward as is, I fear my majority colleagues would mentally move on; the urgency facing the entire appropriations process would fade because we have ''taken care of'' our national security needs.

That, my friends, is a dangerous strategy, especially given that we know none of these bills are likely to be signed into law by the President as they are currently written.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. We can deal with that fact now or deal with it again over the holidays, but we are going to have to deal with it.

Members of the armed services and their families live in every one of our communities. They drive on crowded highways and over crumbling bridges. Most of them send their kids to public schools.

These families expect the meat and products they buy to be safe and the airplanes in which they fly to be protected. If they should ever get sick, they need to have the biomedical research in place so that safe and effective treatments are available to them.

These are reasonable expectations. What is not reasonable is to put forward several annual spending bills that mindlessly cut these priorities simply because we can't agree on a reasonable budget.

National security and economic strength are inextricably linked. Let's get back to the table and set realistic spending caps to provide what is needed both for our national security and to create jobs, improve infrastructure, fund biomedical research, and grow the economy.

Let's get together. Let's vote ''no'' on this bill and move on.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee and a member of my subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for yielding.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for the hard work they have put into bringing the bill before us today. I think, arguably, this is the most important issue we face every year.

Last year, I pointed out the fact that I think the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and we work to do that every day. We talked about the fact that the best way to keep America safe is to keep America strong. I think that, if you look back, here we are a year later, and not much has changed.

National security is still a critical element of what we do here. Back home in northeast Florida, the constituents that I represent are greatly concerned about national security. They are greatly concerned about the men and women in uniform and greatly concerned that they will have the necessary resources to accomplish their mission successfully and return home safely.

They are also concerned that we don't get caught up in the politics of the moment and lose sight of the fact that we have a constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I just want to say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that, when we look at the ever-increasing dangerous world that we live in, I think we have to meet these challenges head on.

I want to remind my colleagues that most of everything that we have accomplished as a great nation, we have accomplished with the foundation built on national security. This bill moves us forward down that path.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill.

Please allow me to acknowledge the tremendous work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and the Appropriations staff in moving this Defense bill forward.

This bill deserves better treatment by the leadership of this House than to have it cloaked in unfinished budget wrangling that could force future changes harmful to the defense of our Nation.

The bill before us funds key priorities, such as assuring the strongest, most agile and resilient military on Earth; securing base and operational independence through energy innovation; improving defense health for the lives of our military and civilian forces; advancing cutting-edge research at our defense labs to improve efficiency on the battlefield and drive technology transfer to the private sector to grow our economy; and maintaining and upgrading essential defense facilities across our Nation and globe.

Moving forward, our Nation must still address lingering veteran unemployment of over half a million Americans, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. A majority are 45 years of age or older, but over 200,000 are between the ages of 18 and 44.

The capabilities of our National Guard can be leveraged to address this imperative, engaging their talents to meet domestic needs.

Globally, too, as leader of the free world, the United States holds a special responsibility to uphold commitments made in the Budapest Memorandum to Ukraine and our allies in Central Europe. This was recently reaffirmed by President Obama and German Chancellor Merkel at the G7 summit.

A threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere. Russia's invasion of Ukraine cannot be tolerated. Tough sanctions on Russia and enforcement of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act lay the base for liberty's advance.

Those Members who in good conscience ultimately will vote ''no'' on this measure will do so to fight for a responsible budget plan that not only meets the needs of our men and women in unform, but builds up the Nation and citizenry they are fighting to protect.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a member of the Appropriation Committee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PALAZZO. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I would like to thank you and your staff for all your hard work in crafting this Defense Appropriations bill.

As a marine veteran, a current member of the Mississippi National Guard, and a former member of the House Armed Services Committee, I fully understand the importance of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the United States Navy and Marine Corps are the Nation's forward-deployed, fast-response force in times of crisis. The ability to respond to all types of conflict, as well as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, is what separates the United States Navy and the Marine Corps team from the rest of the world.

However, as a result of declining resources, the Navy has struggled to reach its own stated goal of 306 ships. A not-insignificant portion of this fleet consists of amphibious ships to support the requirements of the Marine Corps.

The current number of amphibious ships in the fleet does not meet validated national requirements to accomplish the tasks the Marine Corps is responsible to carry out in time of war or national emergency; this is the very Marine Corps that is tasked to be the most ready when our Nation is the least ready.

I know this issue also concerns you, and I request your thoughts on how we might get our Navy shipbuilding program back on track.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and concerns and for his own military service. I share his concern.

The gentleman is correct. The Navy has been struggling to maintain its shipbuilding program for many years. Despite a requirement for 306 ships, the Navy's fleet has seemed to reach a plateau of about 285 ships for the last several years.

It is our responsibility to work with you and the Navy to ensure that our sailors and marines have the finest ships and equipment this Nation can provide.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working closely with you on this important issue. I can tell you I know where the finest warships are built by the finest craftsmen, that is right there in Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his passion and his remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, for more than a decade, this House has been committed to providing our troops with the body armor they need. Body armor is essential to our deployed troops.

In order to provide our troops with modern, lightweight body armor, the Department requires a viable industrial base to produce the body armor and to continually work to improve it.

The fiscal year 2015 NDAA Defense Appropriations bill sustaining the industrial base was prioritized; $80 million was appropriated to the Army to

specifically sustain the industrial base for body armor.

Those FY15 funds have not been obligated, and as a result, the industrial base for body armor is laying off workers and about to go out of business. The Army has ignored Congress' directions and put this industry at risk.

The FY16 Defense Appropriations report makes a commitment to body armor, saying:

> The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue to develop and manufacture more advanced body armor.

Unfortunately, the supplier of boron carbide power to make armor plates will be out of business before this bill is enacted. Furthermore, this bill provides zero funds for the procurement of body armor, another blow to the industrial base.

We all share a strong commitment to our troops, fully understanding how important body armor is to soldier protection.

To the chairman and ranking member, I would like to work with you to ensure that the existing body armor industrial base is not driven out of business by the Army's inability to follow directions from Congress and mismanagement of this vital supply chain.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today to echo the concerns expressed by my colleague across the aisle from Minnesota in concern for our Nation's warfighters and our military base.

As you know, the FY15 NDAA authorized and the FY15 Defense Appropriations bill provided $80 million for a body armor industrial base initiative in the Army's operations and maintenance program. However, the U.S. Army is not properly utilizing the appropriated funds in the manner Congress intended.

Congress has been clear on this matter. Report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measure demonstrates that the importance of body armor is critical to protecting our soldiers in combat.

Because of the Army's repurposing of these funds at odds with congressional intent and the safety of our troops, the Army and the U.S. body armor industry will lose the unique capability critical for meeting high-tech U.S. lightweight body armor standards.

After the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we must rehabilitate and replace used body armor to ensure the readiness and the safety of our troops in the field if they are called to serve in another conflict.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BARR. If we do not act now to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacturing of more advanced lightweight body armor, there will not be a capable body armor industrial base left in the future to fund.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for giving me the opportunity to discuss something that will assist in our natural disaster response.

The Air National Guard employs advanced capabilities to assist in civil search and rescue operations during natural disasters and is capable of locating and rescuing people where civilian authorities cannot.

The Air National Guard uses sophisticated technology to assist in time-sensitive emergency operations, including the AS–4 Pod, which includes wide-area infrared sensors optimized for survivor detection, integrated communications, and specialized radar for maritime, flood, and swift water recovery.

Lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina, the California wildfires, and Superstorm Sandy highlight the need to outfit the Air National Guard with this important capability. I hope you will consider adding this vital piece of equipment to the list of equipment considered for priority purchasing with the use of the National Guard and Reserve equipment account, which is governed by this legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention. We look forward to working with you on this important issue as we move forward with the legislation.

□ 1630

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for the purpose of a colloquy. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, for his work to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, this legislation includes billions of dollars to programs that are vital to the Nation's security and the men and women who have volunteered to serve our Nation.

However, I do have a question regarding a recommended reduction of $61 million from the Missile Defense Agency request for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle.

Does the gentleman share my belief that this is a critically important program, and that it, and the 2020 goal for deployment of this capability, are vital to a robust and reliable national missile defense system, which is paramount to the defense of the Nation against ever more capable adversary ballistic missiles?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman, and I know the gentleman from Alabama will agree that the oversight of scarce defense dollars is important. The request for this program has spiked significantly between fiscal years 2015 and 2016. Yet, there is no real acquisition plan.

The Department owes us this information if we are to be responsible stewards of these taxpayer dollars

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for that explanation, and I hope he will let me know if there is anything the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces can do to make sure that the Department knows that the acquisition strategy needs to be delivered to the Congress without further delay.

Can the gentleman also assure me that the deployment of the Aegis Ashore site in Poland remains a priority of his and that its deployment by not later than December of 2018 will not be affected by any of the marks in the bill before the House today?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Alabama that this deployment is vital to our missile defense, and the United States should be grateful for strong allies like Poland.

Nothing in the bill today will in any way impact the one-time deployment of the European Phased Adaptive Approach Phase III.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to supporting the bill today and urge the House to do the same to get this vital bill passed and to the President for his support of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask how much time remains for both sides, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for yielding, and for your tremendous leadership on this subcommittee.

I also want to thank the ranking member and our chair for including report language on the Department of Defense's efforts to achieve auditability by the end of fiscal 2017.

Ensuring that the Pentagon is auditable is common sense, and it is something that Congress mandated, mind you, 25 years ago. It is long past time to address the culture of unlimited spending and zero accountability at the Pentagon, and I know this issue has strong bipartisan support.

Yet, there are many provisions of this bill which I cannot support. The appropriations bill includes an additional $38 billion over budget caps in the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and that is what it is; it is a slush fund. This is simply outrageous and this fund, quite frankly, in my opinion, it should be eliminated.

We should have transparency, and the public should know how much it is costing to fight these wars.

This bill also includes $1.3 billion for DOD operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant. Mr. Chair, it has been 10 months since the war started and 4 months since the President submitted his draft authorization to Congress, and Congress has yet to act. Now we see additional troops being sent into this war zone. Again, no congressional debate, no vote.

Congress cannot continue to fund a war—and that is what this is—without a robust debate on an ISIL-specific authorization. That is why I offered an amendment in committee, which was adopted on a bipartisan basis, that simply reaffirms that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force.

It is also why I am offering two amendments to this bill that would prohibit funding for the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force. With these authorizations still on the books, Congress is allowing this President—and any President really—to wage war against anyone, at any time, anywhere.

I hope we defeat this bill because we have got to stop this policy of endless wars.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to express my support for the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill and my appreciation for the hard work of the chairman in drafting this very good bill, which will provide essential funding to our national security.

However, I have a serious concern with the proposed reduction of funding in this bill for an existing weather collection satellite called the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, or DMSP.

As early as 2017, our military is facing a critical capability gap in the Department of Defense's two highest priority weather requirements. As the Air Force continues to work through its plan for addressing weather requirements, launching DMSP will help address these issues.

Much has been spent on DMSP already, and it would be a shame to waste those dollars when the satellite could be put to good use.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that the Air Force has not properly managed the space weather program, and they must submit a better plan. However, I ask for your support in working with me in conference to ensure that our military and intelligence professionals have the tools they need to safely prosecute our missions.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And congratulations on producing a very good bill that will provide the necessary funding to properly defend our Nation.

And let me express my appreciation for providing $26 million in your bill to fund an Air Force pilot program for the acquisition of commercial SATCOM services.

Aligned with the House-passed fiscal year 2016 NDAA, the program has the potential to lower costs and increase utilization of commercial satellites.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss military satellite communications, or SATCOM. As you are aware, the demand for SATCOM has increased by a factor of 10 since the outset of our simultaneous commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it continues to grow.

Further, the need for protection against jamming, spoofing, and other interference has also increased as our adversaries deploy more sophisticated countermeasures to deny and degrade communications to our warfighters.

The government-owned, government-operated SATCOM system, Wideband Global Satellite Communications System, or WGS, cannot keep up with demand—not even close. As a result, the Air Force has sought less expensive, more protected SATCOM solutions from the commercial sector to augment national capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, the military needs more SATCOM capacity, and it needs SATCOM that is better protected. Congress can help by restoring $32.8 million for development and testing activities associated with the Protected Tactical Testbed.

We also need additional funding for the Protected Tactical Wave Form itself. This effort will help make both commercial and WGS satellites more robust and protected against jamming. Alongside the Air Force's pilot program I referenced earlier, the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form may begin to give warfighters access to a global architecture of protected commercial SATCOM.

That said, I understand the Air Force has programmatic challenges with the Protected Tactical Testbed that must be addressed. However, I urge the committee to keep an open mind in conference. If the Air Force addresses your concerns, then I hope the committee will consider restoring funding for the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form.

I thank you again for this opportunity to speak on such an important issue to our military servicemen and -women.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen from Alabama and Oklahoma, both veterans, for bringing these matters to our attention, and we look forward to working with you on these important issues.

However, in both instances you both highlight important warfighter capabilities that are stymied by poor program planning and execution by the Air Force. Their lack of programmatic and financial discipline has led directly to these weather collection and satellite communications issues.

Consequently, our appropriations bill highlighted each of these concerns and strongly encouraged the Air Force to make adjustments. None, unfortunately, were made in a timely manner.

Based on existing capability, I see no evidence that launching the DMSP is part of that plan, but I am willing to work with both gentlemen in conference if things change. I thank the gentlemen for their support and work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

I have been working to provide our World War II merchant mariners the thanks they deserve. I would prefer to offer an amendment to the Defense bill which would have provided a token thank you, but it would have been the subject of a point of order.

These brave men suffered the highest losses of any military branch in World War II and did not receive veterans benefits under the GI Bill.

Moving forward, I look forward to working with the ranking member to give our brave merchant mariners the recognition they rightly deserve. It is unfathomable that these merchant mariners who served this Nation so valiantly have never had full veterans benefits.

They were not eligible for tuition subsidies, home loan guarantees, or other provisions of the GI Bill that helps millions of veterans transition seamlessly into civilian life.

Time is running out. These merchant mariners are now in their eighties and nineties, and there are only 5,000 left. Let's act now to right this wrong.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentlewoman from California for bringing this to our attention and, particularly, given the fact that my father is a Naval veteran and 99 years old. So I understand the circumstances of what you speak, and we do look forward to working with you on this issue as we move forward with the legislation. Thank you very much.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH),

the dean of the New Jersey delegation, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding, and I rise to raise an issue of particular importance to my constituents in New Jersey.

Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst was created by the 2005 BRAC round. And while joint basing has been successfully implemented at MDL, there remains an outstanding issue of gross unfairness for some employees.

The overwhelming majority of employees at the joint base are included in the New York pay locality area; yet, the wage grade employees on the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix remain in the Philadelphia locality area. These employees work on the same installation, but they are paid 7 percent less than their counterparts for the same work.

Joint Base MDL made a formal request for realignment of the Philadelphia to New York wage survey area to OPM's Advisory Committee, FPRAC, in 2010, and the base leadership continues to believe pay parity should be a priority.

Mr. Chairman, the joint base is a critical asset to DOD and our National security. Their missions could not be carried out effectively without the skills of the men and women stationed there and those working in civilian support roles across the base.

Joint Base MDL is one installation, and the men and women who work there are part of the same workforce. It is timed to fix this outdated policy.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that you will work with me to bring about fairness to the roughly 20 percent of the workforce that does not receive equally earned pay.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank my colleague for his leadership and for bringing my attention to this important issue. And I can assure him we will look forward to working with him as we move forward with our bill into conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the chairman, for your commitment to the men and women who support our warfighters. I look forward to working with you to move the pay parity for all joint base employees forward.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

As you are aware, our Nation's Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, or FFRDCs, play a critical role in advancing national security goals and ensuring that our Nation stays at the cutting edge of technological innovation.

Mr. Chair, I wanted to engage in this colloquy to clarify Congress' intent in section 802(3)(c), which states:

''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC through a fee or other payment mechanism for construction of new buildings.''

□ 1645

Mr. Chair, I am concerned that some could take an expansive interpretation of this provision and view it as preventing the execution of critical facilities modernization projects, even when authorized by Congress through military construction projects.

I am also concerned about the provision's medium-and long-term implications for building maintenance and facility modernization projects that are necessary to continue important innovation programs for decades to come.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, is it the committee's understanding that this provision is not intended to apply to military construction projects or to advanced planning and design funds that are authorized by Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. TSONGAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. TSONGAS, yes, that is my understanding.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with you, and I appreciate that construction.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee. Is that your understanding?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is my understanding as well.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you both, and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, could you give us the time that we each have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the Vets4Warriors program, a program in my district that is operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care. This successful program has provided invaluable assistance to the military in their efforts to prevent suicide among veterans. The program ensures that those veterans who are struggling with depression or psychological concerns get the support they need: peer-to-peer.

Sadly, the Department of Defense has terminated this program without any public notice. Our nation is now faced with a crisis: since the start of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, more than 3,000 active-duty personnel have taken their own lives. Programs like Vets4Warriors help us to combat this troubling trend.

The Vets4Warriors program is unique and will be difficult to replace. It allows veterans a safe space in which they can find help apart from the DOD structure. Service members are often hesitant to reach out to their superiors regarding personal concerns like mental health. By integrating these programs into the Department's Military OneSource program, many service members will lose the sense of confidentiality provided by Vets4Warriors.

We must fulfill our responsibility to care for those who put themselves in harm's way to protect our nation. It is my hope that the DOD will reconsider their decision so that we can assure our veterans have access to the best mental health resources possible.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2685

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $37,295,571,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for

members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,711,323,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to encourage the Secretary of Defense to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking, and their impact on women and girls across the globe.

Let me thank the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense for the work they have done in the backdrop of the very overwhelming sequester, which I certainly oppose so that all of the appropriators will have the ability to provide the resources that they need.

In particular, my amendment is recognizing the new face of war and the new fight of terrorism.

I hold up these pictures of the numbers of countries who are adding women to their forces. America, of course, has had women in different parts of its military for a number of years, going back to nurses in World War I and II and in the various types of work that have been done recently in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the women are enormously proud and very effective.

My amendment simply says that, in this new war on terrorism and human trafficking, we would have the opportunity to use the women in the United States military who have achieved levels of rank that are extremely important to be able to train and to provide technical assistance to those who are just adding women to their military.

The United States Armed Forces possesses an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists, who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons—especially women, girls, and the elderly—but we must also recognize that, notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality: the Caliphate, ISIL, ISIS, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, al Qaeda, all. We are also finding that these organizations are using women, but then, of course, the institutionalized militaries are also putting more women in.

What better interface than that of the United States military and women, in particular.

I have an article that I would like to submit into the RECORD, ''Turkey's Women Expand Role in Military.''

TURKEY'S WOMEN EXPAND ROLE IN MILITARY

At the 24th International Defence Film Festival in Rome, a documentary by film director Elif Ovar of the Turkish Army's Photo-Film Center was selected for the Jury's Award.

Her documentary ''Light of Hope''—about Senay Haydar, Turkey's first female gendarmie commander and senior noncommissioned officer (NCO), against the backdrop of gender discrimination and violence against women in the small Anatolian town of Mesudiye—attracted much interest.

Haydar works closely with local officials and families and has been credited for eradicating violence against women among the 40,000 residents of Mesudiye. Thanks to Haydar's actions, there hasn't been a single case of violence against women in the last nine months in Mesudiye.

Ovar told Al-Monitor that as a woman she has been much impressed with Haydar's accomplishments in a small Anatolian town where traditional culture prevails. ''NCO Senay's success, as much as this is due to [her own accomplishments], is also the success of the commanders who believed in her,'' Ovar said. ''Appointing a female NCO as a representative of law and order to a town with 40,000 residents is truly a revolution for the Turkish army.''

Over the last three years, there have been extensive changes in the personnel policy of the Turkish army with the increase of the number of female officers and NCOs and, as was the case with Haydar, in assigning women to active field positions instead of just to administrative work at the headquarters.

In an interview with Al-Monitor Haydar said: ''I always wanted to be a field commander who takes decisions instead of working at a desk. I was encouraged by the Gendarmerie General Command. When the results [of my employment] turned out to be positive, scores of female officers and NCOs followed in my footsteps.'' According to a source at the Gendarmerie School in Beykent, Ankara, in October alone, 67 female NCOs have been assigned to Gendarmerie General Command field posts after they completed their basic training; another 90 female NCOs and 30 officers will follow.

Capt. Hulya Ercan, an instructor of the UH–60 Sikorsky helicopter at Ankara's Gendarmerie Aviation School, is the first female gendarmerie pilot in Turkey. In an interview with Al-Monitor she said: ''My husband is a captain. I raised my daughters Bensu and Beren without giving up my profession. I actually flew until the third month of my pregnancy with my youngest. My most memorable moment was one time when my husband was away on a mission and I was ordered to fly an urgent mission. I had to leave my 1½-year-old daughter with the duty officer at the base. When I returned five hours later, I found the duty officer and many soldiers entertaining my daughter. That was memorable and funny.''

A source at the Turkish General Staff who works on planning of the personnel policies told Al-Monitor that today there are 1,350 female officers in the Turkish army, which is 3.3% of the total number of officers. The target is to increase this to 5% in the next three years. The Turkish army wants to further increase the number of female NCOs, which today stands at 843 (0.9%). The aim is to also increase this to 5% by 2018, which means the employment of an additional 4,000 female NCOs. To achieve these objectives, the Turkish army has been trying to embrace more female-friendly personnel policies.

The Turkish army employs 96 female colonels, 140 female lieutenant colonels and 360 female majors.

Colonels generally work at headquarters while majors are usually unit commanders. Staff Maj. Bilgehan Bulbul is the commander of the largest transport fleet of the Air Force Command in Ankara and is also the first female fleet commander. There is a noticeable increase of Turkish female staff officers in important headquarter posts in the army and NATO. For example, naval staff officer Maj. Yasemin Bayraktutan is Turkey's current naval attache in London. Within six-seven years, she may well become the first female admiral of the country. In an email to Al-Monitor, she said she wants to return home after excelling in her current position and before becoming an admiral she wants to command a frigate.

What is behind the Turkish army's decision to increase the number of female officers and NCOs?

There are two practical reasons and one ideological one.

The first practical reason is the relative reduction in the number of personnel called up for compulsory military service, as the Turkish army is moving toward becoming a professional entity—increasing the number of females in the army makes up for this loss in man power.

The second practical reason is a need for female personnel because of a change in security issues the Turkish army is dealing with—notably, the shift from rural to urban areas of the Kurdistan Workers Party violence in Turkey's southeast. In addition, there is a need for female personnel in international missions that the Turkish armed forces are undertaking in Afghanistan, Kosovo and Bosnia, among others.

To have ranking female officers provides significant advantages in communicating with the local population, especially with women, and carrying out civil-military cooperation projects effectively in the health care and education sectors. Thus, the Turkish army is determined to establish more effective links with local populations in low-intensity conflict areas and peace support missions.

The ideological reason for increasing the number of females in the Turkish army is that the latter has always been the leading cause of modernization and Westernization of the republic. The army sees itself as a pioneer in all transformation processes in society, and more females and an increase in the visibility of their presence in the Turkish army delivers crucial messages—especially to the rural population—on equality for women and a more active participation of women in society.

A female in uniform backed by the Turkish army can better dissuade a man in rural Turkey, for instance, inclined to violence against his wife. ''Because of my uniform and as stipulated by law, I will go after anyone committing violence against his wife or any other female,'' Haydar said.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So my amendment, of course, is to provide that

pathway for the collaboration of U.S. military women with other excellent forces to be able to help these women and to be able to fight the global war on terrorism through technical assistance, counsel, and advice, which I think will add to the expertise of those militaries but, more importantly, to the work of the United States military.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe and for their work in ensuring that they have resources needed to keep our Armed Forces the greatest fighting force for peace on earth.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth.

The purpose of the Jackson Lee amendment is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Armed Forces possess an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons, especially women, girls, and the elderly.

But we must recognize that notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality and decency.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai peninsula which poses a threat to Egypt.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technologies and resources that promote the security of the American people and nation states.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as weapons of war, affecting over twenty thousand women and girls.

Looking at the history of terrorism alone highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this enables us to chip at terrorism which has plagued us here in the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical military expertise to military in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists in their country and to keep those terrorists out of our country.

Time and again American lives have been lost at the hands of terrorists.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers, schoolchildren, and members of the diplomatic corps and the Armed Services.

This is why the technical assistance offered by our military personnel is integral to promoting security operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions to empower local forces to combat terrorism.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot not be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

Mr. Chairman, from the United States to Africa to Europe to Asia and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of highest national priorities.

Collectively, through every action and effort towards empowering our neighbors and their military to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe is in our national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would like to take this moment to thank the chairman and the ranking member and their staff for working with me on this matter. I am hoping to be able to revise or to resubmit this.

At this time, if the chairman would allow me, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the withdrawal.

I thank the gentlewoman for her advocacy.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $12,586,679,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,226,952,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,463,164,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,866,891,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $705,271,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,689,333,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under sections 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,980,413,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under sections 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,202,010,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law, $28,349,761,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, providing science, technology, engineering, and math education to America's youth is critical to the global competitiveness of our Nation. The STARBASE program engages local fifth-grade elementary students by exposing them to STEM subjects through an inquiry-based curriculum and is currently active in 56 congressional districts throughout the Nation.

Today I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their strong leadership in reestablishing funding for the program over the past 2 years. I am respectfully requesting an additional $5 million to help expand the program nationwide.

Today I am offering STARBASE amendment No. 18 to H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. My amendment increases funding to the STARBASE Youth Program by $5 million, and while providing support for the program, it also reduces spending by $1 million.

The STARBASE program is carried out by the military services because the lack of STEM-educated youth in America has been identified as a future national security issue by the Department of Defense. Two years ago, both the House and Senate rejected the Office of Management and Budget's, the OMB, proposal to terminate this critical program.

As a Member of Congress, I appreciate OMB's desire to consolidate STEM's programs across the spectrum into one funding line. However, this is a national defense item and has been identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as such. STARBASE was created under the auspices of the Department of Defense to meet its critical needs in STEM-related fields.

Regrettably, the funding uncertainty caused by OMB's action during that time resulted in the elimination of all programs operated by the Navy and reduced in fiscal year 2014 the number of DOD STARBASE programs from 79 to 56. DOD currently has 25 sites on the waiting list for a program, and that is why we need a small increase in funding for a number of STARBASE programs. It is one of the most cost-effective programs across the Federal Government, costing an average of $343 per student.

Last year, 3,062 classes were conducted in 1,267 schools in 413 school districts across the country. More than 70,000 students attended the programs, bringing the total to 825,000 students since its inception in 1993.

It is one of the most effective STEM programs as well. The students demonstrate undisputed improvement in STEM.

I will conclude by reading Warrant Officer Stacey Hendrickson of the California State Military Reserve and director of the STARBASE program at the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base in my district, who said:

''Congressman LOWENTHAL, I wanted to let you know that one of our schools, 96th Street Elementary in Watts, earned their highest science standardized test scores ever last year. This is significant because the class is second-year remediation and has English language learners and special needs students. Every student's score went up, so this is a class that was very special to us. We were all very excited to hear that, as those students had all shown a big increase in our own pre and post test scores. We were happy to see that the improvement was seen on their Academic Performance Index scores as well.''

Mr. Chair, STARBASE inspires America's youth to discover technical career fields that are imperative. During this time of economic recovery we cannot lose this battle and concede our technical edge to the rest of the world. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know the gentleman is a strong supporter of it. Indeed, it is a program that does incredible things for students that has a proven record.

Unfortunately, once again, the President's fiscal year 2016 budget did not support the program. There were no funds requested. As a result, the committee provided an additional $25 million in fiscal year 2016 to restore funding for the program.

However, I can't support an amendment that would cut the Army's operations, the maintenance accounts, to pay for it. This account provides funding for critical training, operations, maintenance, and readiness programs. After over a decade of war, restoring readiness is one of the key objectives of our bill this year.

We need to have soldiers who are ready and able to respond to contingency. It is a top priority in our bill for the Army and for us. While I appreciate the gentleman's intent, I cannot support his amendment, reluctantly.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $40,548,338,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,055,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $5,338,793,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance

of the Air Force, as authorized by law, $36,094,484,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $30,182,187,000: *Provided*, That not more than $15,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $35,045,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That $9,031,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment with the intent of bolstering funds for a worthwhile program in the National Guard that assists with securing our southwest border.

In my State of Arizona, we are under attack. The Arizona border is a main thoroughfare for the black market and trafficking. Guns, money, drugs, and people are smuggled over the border at an alarming rate. Once the smugglers make it to Interstate 10 in Tucson, they can make easier runs to Phoenix, Los Angeles, and beyond.

Let's be clear, the Guard's southwest border mission has bipartisan support. Even President Obama supported this program during his time in the White House. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois seek recognition?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise to ask which of the three amendments I have before me is the one that we are now considering in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOSAR. 107.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I have got it.

Thank you very much.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment once again.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies, and those narrow authorizations are prescribed in title 10, chapter 18 of the United States Code. In sum, they act to support law enforcement efforts, but they do not direct them.

Finally, I will remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was offered last year by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), and the amendment was accepted by voice vote. This amendment today seeks to achieve the same goal. The amendment is offset by a reduction to the defensewide operations and maintenance account, $30.2 billion account.

Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas are all struggling. We are in desperate need of expertise and support at our southwestern border. If you support efforts to secure the border and interdict illegal trafficking in guns, money, drugs, and humans, including sex slaves, then you should support this amendment.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their tireless efforts to prioritize resources in this bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time, but I am in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the Representative from Arizona has firsthand knowledge of the value of the southwest border mission, and I support his amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman for accepting my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,500,000) (increased by $5,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for providing $212 million for suicide prevention outreach programs, $20 million above the President's request.

I am offering this amendment with my colleagues, Representatives PALLONE, SMITH, LOBIONDO, GARRETT, LANCE, SIRES, PAYNE, MACARTHUR, NORCROSS, and WATSON COLEMAN, to continue support and funding for the successful confidential peer-to-peer Vets4Warriors program, a Pentagon-funded call center operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care that provides troops struggling with depression and other psychological or emotional concerns support by veterans.

Despite the troubling increase in Active Duty military suicides after 9/11, the Defense Department announced last month it would stop funding the Vets4Warriors program, which has provided valuable assistance to reduce these incidents.

Through Vets4Warriors, servicemembers have been able to find confidential assistance from peers who share lived experiences and who can quickly connect and listen in highly effective ways. Since December 2011, the program has had over 130,000 contacts.

The Defense Department's plan to integrate these services into the Military OneSource without a public process is concerning because we know that many servicemembers are reluctant to contact superiors for assistance with mental health needs. Military OneSource is only billed as available to veterans and their families within 180 days after leaving the service.

Vets4Warriors provides a deep place for veterans to seek help outside the Defense Department. We believe removing funding for this program is shortsighted. This move will also result in the layoff of approximately 30 well-trained, talented veterans who have been providing support services around the clock. We want the Defense Department to use this funding to fully fund the Vets4Warriors program, ensuring our troops receive the best mental health resources available.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to support your amendment.

I think all of us are particularly shocked that they would shut something down in our home State that actually serves the rest of the Nation. They enjoy a good reputation. It sort of falls into the category of ''what were they thinking?''

We appreciate your standing for the Vets4Warriors.

Mr. LANCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. PASCRELL for his leadership on this issue, as he has led on so many other issues. I also thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN. It is due to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's leadership on this legislation that we stand well-equipped to keep our Nation safe and secure.

The Vets4Warriors program has saved lives in New Jersey. It has made a great difference during very challenging times for servicemen and servicewomen. Their peers offer support and a friendly ear at a time when it matters most. Their voices of encouragement, friendship, and support on the other end of the telephone remind our brave heroes of their great potential, the love of a grateful nation, and what they can accomplish in their lives.

The program has been proven effective. Thousands of veterans have received critical care and assistance. It works and it should be maintained. The statistics on veterans' suicides are heartbreaking, but programs like Vets4Warriors are the types of efforts that we can implement to make a lasting difference.

I thank Lloyd Deans of Bridgewater, New Jersey, and the district I serve for his support and leadership in this area, and for fighting for this program and for being a great friend and resource to other veterans.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Page 36, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I too am offering an amendment to bolster suicide prevention programs. I rise to offer an amendment which would provide additional resources for mental health programs for our Nation's servicemembers. Traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder have been consistently contributing to behavioral issues with our veterans, and all too often these ongoing mental health issues result in suicide. With an average of 18 to 20 veteran suicides per day, more resources are desperately needed.

The DOD is already an expansive bureaucracy, and I appreciate the work of the committee to prioritize resources and to provide appropriation levels for the defensewide operations and maintenance that are actually lower than those in fiscal year 2015.

My amendment takes a relatively small amount from that account—$1.5 million out of a $30.2 billion budget. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the amendment would have no impact on budget authority or outlays.

Too many of our men and women in uniform are struggling with traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of serving in combat. If you support improved mental health for our servicemembers, you should support this amendment. Let's prevent future suicides amongst our troops and ensure they are getting the help they need. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I strongly admire the advocacy on behalf of suicide prevention by the gentleman from Arizona. It is very needed, but I insist on my point of order because the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the level of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,463,000)''.

Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Maryland and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for their unwavering support of our national defense and our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the funding for a program called Fisher House from $5 million to $10 million, and it funds that increase by reducing the amount in the operation and maintenance account by $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Fisher House is a very successful and very well-regarded nonprofit with a single mission, which is to provide free housing and lodging to families of veterans. The facilities are located near veterans hospitals and military hospitals in VA facilities.

The purpose of this housing is to allow the families of veterans to be with their loved ones, the servicemen or -women who have served our country and are receiving medical care at one of these facilities. Mr. Chairman, we know how important that is for the families and for the loved ones, but we know in particular how important that is for our veterans when they are receiving care incurred in the service to our great Nation for them to have their families with them.

The Fisher House program has been in business for 25 years, and they have been a proven and exceptional steward of taxpayer money. They operate 65 facilities all around the country. Again, these facilities are near military hospitals or a veterans facility.

They operate to a very high standard. They have a deep pipeline of new facilities that they want to build. Unfortunately, there is a great need for these facilities, which is why we are proposing to increase their funding from $5 million to $10 million.

I have introduced this amendment for the past 3 years. It has enjoyed bipartisan support. This year, it also has the support of the gentlewoman from Michigan.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and for his leadership on this critically important issue. I rise in very strong support of this amendment.

For many years, I have worked with hospitalized veterans and their families who have often had to travel far from home to get treatment and have seen what the Fisher House has done. The Fisher House Foundation does wonders in being a home away from home during very difficult times for our veterans and their families.

As Congress continues to address veterans issues, it is critical that their families also have support systems in place and a safe place to stay while the veterans are receiving treatment.

We should be building more Fisher House facilities across the country. We are currently trying to put one in Michigan and, as I explored that public-private partnership, discovered that there is more than a 5-year wait in that pipeline. This bill isn't a silver bullet, but it would help reduce that timeline.

I want to thank my good friend Congressman DELANEY for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition and will use that time to say that I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Fisher House Foundation does incredible work. Both my predecessors, Mr. Murtha and Mr. Young, were strong supporters.

Just for the record, my bill already includes an additional $5 million for the Department as a grant to the Fisher House Foundation and allows each service to transfer up to $11 million for Fisher House operations, so each of our services recognizes the incredible private contribution and also the U.S. taxpayer contribution.

I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his support and, once again, thank him for his singular leadership and for his insights into the importance of the Fisher House program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can build, as the gentlewoman from Michigan said, more Fisher House facilities to allow the family members of our veterans to be with them at this great time of need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000) (increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me to offer this amendment to this year's Defense Appropriations bill to establish and reestablish the Commission to assess the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attack, which was authorized in the House-passed FY16 NDAA.

Mr. Chairman, as your committee knows so very well, the United States faces many threats and challenges today, perhaps more than ever before in her history. One of those threats is the reliance across all critical infrastructure sectors on an aging and highly vulnerable electric grid.

As the GAO reported, the Department of Defense relies upon that very same electric grid for 99 percent of its electricity needs within the continental United States without which it cannot effect its mission.

The previous EMP Commission stated that a collapse of large portions of the electrical system will result in significant periods of power outage and loss of significant portions of that system.

Should the electrical power system be lost for any substantial period of time, the consequences are likely to be catastrophic to civilian society. They concluded that negative impacts on the electrical infrastructure are certain in an EMP event unless practical steps are taken to provide protection for critical elements of the electrical system.

The Commission must be established, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that research into addressing these vulnerabilities continues within the Department of Defense to enable practical steps to actually secure and harden the grid. The House Armed Services Committee has already acted this year and authorized $2 million to reestablish the Commission.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that these funds are appropriated as well.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman brings up a huge issue, EMP, electromagnetic pulse. I accept the amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my amendment would transfer $1 million from the Secretary's some $30 billion general operation and maintenance fund to lung cancer research under the Defense Health Program.

I would like to begin by thanking Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for the additional funds that have already been placed into the legislation for cancer research. My amendment is presented out of the hope that we can still do better and get us back to a point where we were some years ago.

I know $1 million won't make but a dent in the Secretary's general operating fund, but it would make an enormous difference—an enormous difference—in battling lung cancer, a disease that already affects many of our military men and women and kills over 159,000 Americans every year.

As many of you know, my daughter, Katherine, a young mother of four, ages 9 to 16, was diagnosed with nonsmoking lung cancer earlier this year. I would be remiss if I didn't thank my many colleagues for their prayers and their good will and all their expressions of hope and concern and thank the committee for the money that they have provided here for medical research because, make no mistake about it, the combined prayers, good will, and medical research have provided Katherine and her family and her friends and many people throughout this country with hope for their recovery.

We have come a long way, and we are getting very close to discovering a cure for this and many of the other cancers that so tragically take the lives of our loved ones.

It is my hope that with this amendment, we can do a little bit better, get us a little bit closer to that cure, and give people going forward the same hope that my daughter, Katherine, has been able to receive as a result of these prayers and this research.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and ask for its support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, formed in 1993, the Youth ChalleNGe is a 17-month program run by individual State National Guards. Its mission is to give troubled youth a second chance and addresses our Nation's dropout rate by providing them the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma.

Youth ChalleNGe has transformed the lives of over 120,000 young people since 1993 and has expanded to 35 sites in 27 States, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—young people like Tatiana Zambrano, a 2011 Puerto Rico ChalleNGe Academy graduate, who with the help of Youth ChalleNGe overcame much adversity to gain admission to Valparaiso University from which she graduated last month. Society may have given up on these young people, but Youth ChalleNGe hasn't.

Along with my colleague, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, we have written letters and offered amendments in support of Youth ChalleNGe and have been buoyed by its successful intervention over the last number of years, the program seeks now to expand its help into California, Georgia, North Carolina, and Texas, but that requires $25 million above the funding level.

□ 1730

Our amendment doesn't go to that level. Instead, we hope that we can ask for just a modest $5 million amount for Youth ChalleNGe to carry out its modest expansion of this program to reach at-risk children. It has proven to be a cost-effective investment.

We thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his staff for their efforts and their interest in this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), my co-chair of the Youth ChalleNGe Caucus.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my colleague who is the co-chair on the Congressional National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Caucus—bipartisan, may I add—to help our throwaway kids. They are 16- to 18-year-olds who have fallen through the cracks, so we work in a bipartisan manner to ensure that some of these youngsters have a second chance.

We thank the Appropriations Committee for the funding increase over President Obama's 2016 request of $145 million.

The 2016 Defense Appropriations will fund the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program at $150 million, with the current funding of $135 million. As my colleague has stated, this amendment increases by $5 million the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program to $155 million, and it reduces the operation and maintenance, defensewide account by the same amount. It helps to start new programs in four States. Each new program is $4 million. The California third program will cost $10 million to $15 million due to the Superfund site.

It is critical for hundreds of youth who are dropouts to have the same options to be able to have a second chance. The ChalleNGe program has graduated, as was stated, over 120,000 nationally. It is voluntary, free, with no cost to the child or to his or her family. It is a 22½-week residential boot camp program that is led by the National Guard cadre. It also prepares them to reenter society and to be successful, to build employment potential, and to return to school. A 2012 RAND study finds, for every dollar spent, it results in a return of $2.66 to the taxpayer.

It is rated as the best youth program in the Nation. It effectively addresses part of our Nation's dropout epidemic on a small level. It is beneficial to business, communities, and the Nation's ability to compete in our future economy. We need more programs, not fewer. More than 12,000 applicants are rejected due to no space, so we ask our colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is all about just trying to help these young kids get a second chance. By expanding this program as we are doing, which is a modest expansion to reach into some other States, we know we are going to reach some other lives that society has given up on. I don't want to give up on them, and I don't think our Nation wants to give up on them. This is a chance to do it, and I thank the committee for its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I would just point out to all of my colleagues that we are on page 9 of a 163-page bill. This bill deals with the national security of this country. It contains $578,656,000,000, and we have already received two amendments that have been offered on the floor that were not made available to us. I would hope that this does not continue to be a practice during the coming debate on the remainder of the bill given the gravity of the bill, the subject matter, and the amendments, themselves.

I would ask all of the Members to have the courtesy to make sure both the majority and the minority have their amendments in a timely fashion and, certainly, before we begin 5 minutes of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. I would ask for that civility on behalf of all of the Members.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,300,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $21,300,000)''.

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, we all agree that the Department of Defense has the responsibility to defend our Nation, but the Department also has a responsibility to clean up after itself when it contaminates our environment or threatens public health, and we in Congress have a responsibility to give the military the money it needs for that cleanup.

The amendment I offer adds $21.3 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program.

I plan to withdraw the amendment out of respect for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee, which actually added $25 million to the FUDS program above the President's budget request. Yet I want to make the point that we ought to keep the funding at the same level we appropriated in fiscal year 2015, which was $250 million, and that is what my amendment would do, because now is not the time for the military to backslide on its cleanup.

There are 5,000 sites—in every State and territory—that we know are contaminated, and these sites are not in someone else's backyard. There are 87 of the Formerly Used Defense Sites in Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's State of New Jersey, and there are 42 FUDS sites in Ranking Member VISCLOSKY's State of Indiana.

In the district I represent, which is the Northern Mariana Islands, there are 24 contaminated areas, dating back to World War II, that are still waiting to be cleaned up. For example, there are 17 rusted fuel tanks in the little village of Tanapag that have been leaking oil into the ground since Harry Truman was President, and, every day, there are kids who are walking by on their way to school; there are fishermen in the lagoon just a few feet away; and there are families who are living with the smell of oil in their homes.

This is not just an environmental issue. This unfinished cleanup damages our military's ability to defend our Nation. Let me explain.

In the Northern Mariana Islands today, the Defense Department wants to expand training activities—using live fire, running pipelines, building more fuel tanks—doing the very things we know contaminate the environment and threaten public health. The people I represent are saying ''no'' to this expanded military activity.

Now, restoring FUDS funding will not change anyone's mind about the military's proposed buildup in my district, but at least the military will have a little more credibility when it promises that it will clean up after itself because, if the people I represent see Congress cutting funding for FUDS, then the military's promise has no credibility at all.

This is not just about the Northern Mariana Islands. This is a national issue. We have 5,000 sites currently identified for cleanup nationwide and another 10,000 on the list of potentially contaminated sites. Even if we appropriate $250 million for 2016, it is not enough. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates a full cleanup cost of $14 billion. So, at $250 million a year, we will still be having this same discussion 50 years from now.

Again, I commend the chairman and his subcommittee for adding the $25 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program, but, ultimately, we all have to do better.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement before the floor and for his bringing the issue to the Members' attention.

As you frankly point out, not only for the constituency you represent but whether it was in any of our districts, as you also rightfully point out, this is a national problem. It tends to be forgotten because it is not seen visually by the average constituent. It is a very serious health and environmental problem, and I do appreciate your raising it during this particular debate.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote.

Veterans of the first gulf war suffered from persistent symptoms, including chronic headaches, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, debilitating fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medicine or by psychiatric diagnoses.

Research shows that, as veterans from the first gulf war age, they are twice as likely to develop Lou Gehrig's disease as are their nondeployed peers. There also may be connections to multiple sclerosis and to Parkinson's disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for this lifelong pain and affliction that these veterans must endure through this disease.

For decades, the Veterans Health Administration has downplayed any neurological basis for the disease, but recent research has shown unequivocally that this disease is biological in nature. The time has come for us to right the wrong that our servicemen and -women have had to live with now for over 20 years. In this Department of Defense Appropriations bill, we allocate more money for breast cancer, orthopaedic, and prostate cancer research than we do for finding a cure for Gulf War Illness. Equivalent funds are appropriated for ovarian cancer research.

I think if we are going to spend money on medical research within the Department of Defense, which I am in favor of, the Department must adequately fund research on those diseases that originate in war and wholly affect our servicemen and -women. Over a quarter of a million veterans display symptoms of this disease, and the time has come to find and to fund a cure for it.

The offset for my amendment today comes from the $30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the gulf war veterans, who put it all on the line and are paying for that with a lifetime of pain, are not left behind. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help find a cure for the Gulf War Illness.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for prostate cancer research by $10 million under the Defense Health Program.

Prostate cancer is the second-most commonly diagnosed cancer in men and is the second-most common cause of a man's death. In 2015, approximately 220,800 men in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer, and an estimated 27,540 will die from it.

The Prostate Cancer Research Program is a unique research program in that it prioritizes research that will lead to the elimination of death from prostate cancer while enhancing the well-being of men who are experiencing the impact of that disease.

To date, the Prostate Cancer Research Program has resulted in a total appropriation of over $1.3 billion, including $80 million last year. This unique partnership among the military, prostate cancer survivors, clinicians, and scientists has changed the landscape of biomedical study, energizing the research community in conducting high-risk investigations that are more collaborative, innovative, and impactful on prostate cancer.

This increase would result in a total funding level of $90 million, which is still $10 million below what this account was funded at in 2001, more than a decade ago. The offset for my amendment comes from the $30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account.

This amendment passed the House by a voice vote last year and as part of an en bloc amendment the year before. I hope that we will all agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his previous amendment, which I supported,

and also for this amendment, which supports greater funds for prostate cancer research.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of history, my predecessor died from prostate cancer, and, of course, around this room and around the country, we know too many men who haven't done what they should do to look after their health and, therefore, the welfare of their families.

□ 1745

I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy in this area and also remind those who are on the Hill that I think next week the House will be sponsoring a screening for all men here. It is a good way not only to look after yourself, but the people who love you. I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy on an annual basis and thank him for yielding the time. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I reclaim my time.

I want to thank the chairman for his kind and insightful words, and I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in making sure that the healthcare needs of those who serve are met.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Alzheimer's disease is a threat to our country—not a direct threat like ISIS or al Qaeda, but it is an insidious, persistent threat to the minds and bodies of our family members and to the fiscal health of our country.

The Alzheimer's Association estimates that the cost of caring for people with Alzheimer's right now through the Medicare system is $226 billion. By the year 2050, it will be $1.1 trillion. This is a genuine budgetary threat. If it grows unchecked, the cost to Medicare from a single disease will zap our ability to pay for national security. Interestingly enough and timely enough, on the front page of USA Today is a story that reads how 15 percent of seniors account for nearly one-half of Medicare spending.

We also have an epidemic among our soldiers. It is called traumatic brain injury, known as the signature wound of veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq. It affects our soldiers at a much higher rate than the civilian population, and the VA projects its 10-year costs at $2.2 billion.

TBI is also closely linked to Alzheimer's. For 30 years, we have known about a clear correlation between TBI and the risk of developing Alzheimer's disease and other types of dementia. By researching the link between TBI and Alzheimer's, we can help cure both.

I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the funding for the Peer Reviewed Alzheimer's Research Program from $12 million to its presequestration levels of $15 million, but the funding for Alzheimer's research in the United States is still underresourced.

Today, I am offering this amendment to increase the funding for the Peer Reviewed Program by $5 million, which would take it up to $20 million. This modest investment on the front end in research can eventually yield billions in savings in the future on the cost of care. That is why I urge my colleagues to support our servicemembers with TBI and Alzheimer's and vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKAI

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000) (increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Hawaii and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would first like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Our bipartisan amendment would increase DOD's supplemental impact aid to $55 million, $25 million more than appropriated in the bill currently. This would benefit schools in almost every school district that hold a military installation. Schools that had 20 percent average daily attendance of military-dependent students in the preceding year as counted on their Federal impact aid application are eligible to receive funding on an annual basis.

Congress has recognized the needs faced by many school districts educating a large number of military children and has consistently provided increases in this aid; yet last year, in fiscal year 2015, this funding was dropped from $45 million to $25 million. This is not enough. With the stress put on military kids throughout the past years, this aid should be increasing, not decreasing.

The education of a military child is a military readiness issue. The men and women serving in the military today have to rely on local school districts to provide quality education and counseling programs for their students and children.

Earlier this year, a letter signed by many Members of this Congress and endorsed by multiple organizations asking for this critical program to be fully supported at $50 million for DOD impact aid, with $5 million for children of military families with severe disabilities, was sent to the House Committee on Appropriations. As we know, we have to offset any funding increase for one program with another if we play by the rules, and I have done so with this amendment.

Our amendment is fully offset by using funding from an Office of the Secretary of Defense servicewide administration account, O&M defensewide. The children are our future, and many that grow up in our military families today will be the military leaders of our future. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment is designed specifically to support the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and to dramatically improve their quality of life while they are deployed.

On a daily basis, the United Service Organizations, USO, reaches United States military members in numerous ways. They provide calling cards at deployed locations for servicemembers to call their families. They provide toiletries and necessities for deployed servicemembers and those in austere locations. They are the first persons to

welcome back redeploying servicemembers. They volunteer to run morale and welfare tents offering Internet connectivity for deployed locations. Connecting troops to their families through calling cards and the Internet is just part of the USO's 40-plus program repertoire, but it is incredibly important to our deployed men and women and to their spouses, parents, siblings, and children.

In an era where our servicemembers are fighting prolonged wars, connecting them to their families and friends back home is a service to our military that we cannot afford to underfund. In fact, 93 percent of troops surveyed in 2012 agreed that USO services boost morale, ease separation from friends and family, and convey a feeling of support to the servicemember. Unfortunately, however, our deployed servicemembers too often go to the USO tent only to find that USO provisions, including supplies and calling cards, have run out. Increasing funding to the USO will help alleviate this unacceptable problem.

In the proposed fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill, the USO is funded at just $20 million. This amendment will reduce the operations and maintenance defensewide account by less than one two-thousandths, while having an immeasurable impact on the quality of life of our servicemen and -women.

It is past time that we direct sufficient funds to the quality of life of the men and women that sacrifice everything to defend our Nation. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to salute the dean of the House for his strong support of the USO. Over 40 years ago, I was one of those soldiers, and it made a real difference in my life.

All of us want to thank the gentleman for his significant leadership here over so many years and for choosing this incredibly wonderful organization to plus up.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. We haven't received a copy of the amendment. We would like to see a copy of the amendment if that would be possible. That is the reason for the reservation.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to add an additional $1 million for research and development for Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Duchenne muscular dystrophy is the most common lethal genetic disorder affecting American children today.

□ 1800

It is a progressive neuromuscular disorder that affects approximately 1 in every 3,500 boys or 200,000 babies born each year worldwide. Over time, patients experience severe loss of muscle strength and control.

Most boys diagnosed with Duchenne lose their ability to walk by the time they become teenagers. There is no known cure for Duchenne, and life expectancies for individuals with this disease are significantly shortened. Many do not live past their 21st birthday.

Like many of my colleagues, I have met with many Duchenne patients and their families and have seen the impact this disease has and what it imparts on their daily lives.

There have been very promising advances in recent years, including development of a new drug which has achieved success in early clinical trials. I have had one child in my district confined to a wheelchair who, under this clinical trial, is able to walk by himself currently. However, much more work needs to be done to find a cure for this disease and to better understand what causes Duchenne in the first place.

This amendment will directly benefit the thousands of Duchenne patients throughout the United States, as well as their countless loved ones who care for them every day. By increasing funding for peer-reviewed research, institutions across the country will have additional resources necessary to make progress on eliminating this devastating disease.

We as a nation are on the cusp of historic progress in advancing critical research. Now is the time to recommit to robust support of our country's biomedical research for this disease.

In closing, I would like to thank the countless physicians, researchers, and scientists who work tirelessly to find a cure for Duchenne. I would also like to thank the Jett Foundation, which has long been a national leader in increasing awareness and providing support for patients and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I thank the chair and ranking member for their consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order. We are doing a little more homework on the amendment. Certainly, I am supportive of it.

I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I understand the gentleman's concern is the lack of the copy of the amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think we wanted to make sure we have the figures that go with what it is set against.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make sure it comports to the rule of the House. We are not against it. We just want to make sure it is in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. We had moved this with a later change to the defensewide operations and maintenance fund for the pay-for for this; that probably explains this balance, but it is coming from that portion. The $1 million, I think, is in excess, if my memory is correct, of the $3.5 million that is already there.

We are able to leverage this for a greater opportunity to move quickly on this. That is the rationale. That is where it came from.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I check the figures to make sure that it is properly offset, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. KEATING. I would just like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman, if that information is currently being analyzed now.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield, there is some consultation going on at the desk. At the conclusion of those consultations with the Parliamentarian, I will have a better opportunity to respond in, hopefully, a more positive fashion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the chairman for the effort he is going through and the consideration he is giving with this.

Many times, we have the opportunity to talk to families and deal with issues. In this particular instance, we have an opportunity. As I mentioned, we are right on the cusp of very significant research. Leveraging a small additional

amount now would have tremendous ramifications.

I was just completely struck by the fact that I saw a person—a young boy in his teens, confined to a wheelchair, like so many of those afflicted with this terrible disease have had to suffer through, and as a result of those clinical trials, to see that person no longer in a wheelchair and up and ambulatory and walking, those are the type of dramatic improvements we are on the cusp of right now.

That is why this amendment just seeks to get an incremental increase with that because I think it would be leveraged and have enormous significance as a result.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I continue to reserve, let me compliment the gentleman on his amendment, as we do further investigation on the offsets.

Medical research for diseases that affect our military members and their families are a priority of our committee; you can be sure of that. That is why our bill includes $3.2 million, again, this year for the Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Research Program.

The committee has provided, which I think would be of interest, more than $43 million for this research area since fiscal year 2003, and you have alluded to it, but research breakthroughs in this area will only help those suffering from this debilitating disease, but will also help research in other various muscular and motor neuron diseases.

I think the research is absolutely essential, and I think we are closer to a resolution of the issue that would allow me to withdraw my reservation. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

I would be happy to withdraw my reservation of the point of order and support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his indulgence and patience and the good work he has done in this respect, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,644,274,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $999,621,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $276,761,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,815,862,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $6,731,119,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $6,605,400,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $14,078,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $234,829,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and their staff because I have worked on this in past appropriations and had the privilege of receiving the support of both the chair and the ranking member on the question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I heard the chairman mention both Chairman Young and Chairman Murtha. Over the years, I have had the privilege of working with them on this question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I just want to use a little anecdote, particularly as it relates to Vietnam vets. Many of us remember Vietnam vets coming back and, some long years later, getting a better understanding of Agent Orange. I remember a Vietnam vet telling me about it, but as he indicated, they mentioned it or spoke about it or tried to explain it when they came back directly from Vietnam.

It was a long time before the understanding came about Agent Orange, and in years going forward, there was great medical care needed, medical costs needed, because those veterans had been suffering for a long time.

We now understand post-traumatic stress disorder; and, as I look over the landscape of the last years of war, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, about 11 to 20 out of every 100 veterans, or 11 to 20 percent, who served have post-traumatic stress disorder in any given year.

In the Gulf war, Operation Desert Storm, about 12 out of every 100 Gulf

war veterans who still live have PTSD in any given year. In the Vietnam war, about 15 out of every 100 Vietnam vets, or 15 percent, are currently diagnosed with PTSD. In a recent study in the late 1980s, the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study stated that it is estimated about 30 out of every 100.

Other factors contribute to it, and, if you listen to individuals who have PTSD, they seek to be part of a normal life and to work and survive and provide for their families.

My amendment is simple. It adds an extra $1 million to increase funding for PTSD. These funds will be used to outreach activities targeting hard-to-reach veterans, especially those who are homeless and reside in underserved urban and rural areas who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

I had the privilege a couple of years ago to provide a PTSD facility that was offsite of a veterans hospital in a small, community-based hospital. Mr. Chairman, the response from veterans was amazing because they were able to come to an offsite location for counseling in PTSD.

We know that the tragedies of war last with men and women for a very long time. I am hoping that my colleagues will support this amendment again to ease the trauma of the thoughts that these men and women have, the nightmares when they sleep, because they really want to be—as they are—contributing members of society.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me commend the gentlewoman for your strong advocacy.

Just for the record, our bill does provide $155 million, including a plus up of $1 million above the request level of $55 million, for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

Additionally, our bill includes $676 million in operation and maintenance funding within the Department of Health program to care for servicemembers affected by TBI and psychological health injuries.

We welcome the additional money; we accept your amendment, and I commend you for your efforts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reclaiming my time, I applaud the compassion that the chairman and the ranking member have had in the writing of this legislation, highlighting several very important points needed for our servicemen and -women, and I am grateful for the support of the additional resources, continuing the advocacy for them.

In closing, let me thank this Congress for the wounded warrior that I have in my office. He is someone who suffers from PTSD. He has been an excellent staff person in reaching out to the veterans throughout my community.

He is an example of the fact that, when you have treatment, you can be part of contributing to society, as they all want to be, even with some of the challenges they have.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is virtually identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted in last year's Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 2685).

My amendment increases funding for the PTSD by $1,000,000. These funds should be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas, who suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images that American servicemen and women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war see on a daily basis.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face. Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning. And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep. These are called flashbacks. A person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD. These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

My amendment recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human. They carry their experiences with them.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

My amendment will help ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $300,000,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,290,000)''.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,290,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be offering and then withdrawing this amendment because of a point of order on the timing of the budget outlays that we are not able to reconcile at this point in time.

But I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, for their leadership.

Now, this is an important amendment though. My amendment would protect from possible cancellation an innovative program that promises to provide a breakthrough capability for a very small amount of money.

Right now, if Iran or North Korea launches a ballistic missile attack on our homeland, we, unfortunately, have no enhanced way of knowing whether or not our defensive missiles actually hit the target or not.

That is why the Missile Defense Agency is executing a promising and groundbreaking space sensor system called Space-Based Kill Assessment.

The U.S. desperately needs improved sensors in space to provide tracking, discrimination, and more. A robust, multimission space sensor network will be vital to ensuring a strong missile defense program. Without this, we might otherwise waste extremely expensive ground-based interceptors, costing the taxpayer more money, and depleting our limited number of interceptors.

The Space-based Kill Assessment program cannot survive a 50 percent cut. Program cancellation may result, and it would waste taxpayer dollars already invested and would also fail to meet congressional intent to have an initial operating kill assessment capability by 2019.

This experiment, up until today, has had zero scheduling delays since it was conceived in fiscal year 2014.

Finally, this program is a great example of the cost savings and other benefits the government can leverage through commercially-hosted satellite payloads. This program, and other similar efforts, are critical to ensuring that the United States stays ahead of future ballistic missile threats.

I would hope that this amendment would have been adopted because it would take money from a lower priority fund and put it into critical ballistic missile defense against our homeland.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Allow me to commend the gentleman from Colorado for pointing up the value of what he talks about here. And let me promise to him that I am sure I will be working very closely with Mr. VISCLOSKY to see what we can do to elevate our investment and our knowledge and support for this program.

I do appreciate your willingness to withdraw the amendment and regret that the outlay issue somewhat has complicated matters on the floor this evening.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's words, and I will certainly work with him on that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $368,131,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $8,232,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $228,717,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $103,266,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components, and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, $358,496,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $84,140,000.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,336,971,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,160,482,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private

plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,805,773,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000) (increased by $100,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would direct the Army to prioritize the modernization of the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet.

The Army maintains a program to modify and standardize its Bradley Fleet to two digital configurations, the M2A3 and the M2A2 ODS–SA. These two variants are the most advanced versions of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and provide our soldiers significant improvements in survivability and force protection.

These upgrades feature advanced digitized electronics to provide troops with optimal situational awareness, network connectivity, and enhanced communication hardware within the heavy brigade combat team.

Almost all units within the Active Army components and prepositioned stocks are fielded with these digital configurations. Unfortunately, there are still National Guard units that have not yet received these upgrades and are fielded with obsolete, nonstandard, nondigital M2A2 Operation Desert Storm variants.

Maintaining these outdated vehicles within the National Guard will severely restrict our servicemembers' ability to maintain proficiency in the technical requirements necessary to operate the advanced digital Bradleys utilized in combat operations.

This will result in significant degradation of combat effectiveness of these units and poses a significant risk to units who deploy with the older Bradley variant, or train on the older variant but fall in on the newer models in theater.

Furthermore, servicemembers within these units will face significant and unnecessary challenges in maintaining their Military Occupational Specialty qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, the Army has an existing program of record for the remanufacturing of Bradley vehicles to attain updated digital configurations. It exists within the President's budget under Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Vehicles: Bradley Modifications.

This year's budget request includes $225 million for Bradley modifications. Unfortunately, none of these funds were designated for the Bradley Fighting Vehicles digital upgrades. In fact, the President's budget does not provide funding for these upgrades over the entire FYDP.

So it is unclear whether or not these Operation Desert Storm-era Bradley vehicles will ever receive the upgrades necessary to make them combat effective or adequate training platforms. It is for this reason I am offering this amendment.

My amendment would designate and fence off $100 million of the $1.8 billion under the Army's procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles accounts to prioritize and upgrade the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet. This is 0.005 percent of the total appropriation.

The $100 million is less than half of what is necessary to upgrade the remaining nondigital, nonstandard variants, but it is an important step to ensuring that the combat formations within our National Guard maintain the combat effectiveness and readiness they have attained over the last decade.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I very much regret that I rise in opposition to the amendment, knowing what a strong supporter of our national defense the gentleman from Nevada is and what a strong supporter he is of the National Guard, not only across the Nation, but in his own State. And I regret even more so since we have been talking about this for several weeks. I feel badly that I have to rise.

The amendment, as the gentleman has stated, directs the Secretary of the Army to repurpose approximately one-half of the $225 million in the budget request that was requested and included for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle Upgrade Program.

The amendment would direct the Army to revise the schedule for the Bradley Upgrade Program by accelerating the schedule for providing more modern Bradley Fighting Vehicles to the 1st Squadron of the 221st Armored Cavalry of the Nevada National Guard, which I am sure is most deserving because, as he said, they have the oldest of the oldest.

Having said that, the schedule change would disrupt, as I am advised, a carefully synchronized plan for Abrams Tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle modernization and would cause production breaks at both manufacturing lines.

The production break would also add significant startup costs to the Bradley Engineering Change Proposal 2. In other words, this amendment would throw out of balance the Army-wide armor modernization plans and drive up costs in order for one squadron of one State's Guard forces to receive more modern vehicles.

As you can tell, Mr. Chairman, from my rather convoluted response, I am prepared to work with the gentleman from Nevada to assist him, but at this point, I need to regretfully oppose his amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman's offer to work with the gentleman as we proceed but would associate myself with the chairman's concerns relative to the amendment that has been offered and, particularly, with an emphasis to the break in production, which I think is a very serious issue.

So I do want to associate myself with the chairman's concerns and objection that he has raised, but again, his willingness to work with the gentleman in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I do recommend a ''no'' vote, but I certainly make a, I hope, valid offer to work with the gentleman because I know that he is going to be working on me to make sure that this occurs, and I want to be helpful to him. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Thank you both, Mr. Chairman and ranking member, for your offer to work with me to try to rectify the situation where we have an important National Guard unit that is dealing with and working with Desert Storm-era Bradley Fighting Vehicles and, yet, expected to be ready to deploy on to the newer materiel in theater should they ever be called.

With your assurance to work with me on this effort, I appreciate that.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private

plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,007,778,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,230,677,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,871,819,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $2,998,541,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $559,141,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $1,559,977,000;

Carrier Replacement Program (AP-CY), $874,658,000;

Virginia Class Submarine, $3,346,370,000;

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,971,840,000;

CVN Refueling Overhaul, $637,588,000;

CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP), $14,951,000;

DDG–091000 Program, $433,404,000;

DDG–0951 Destroyer, $3,012,904,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,347,411,000;

LPD–0917, $550,000,000;

Afloat Forward Staging Base, $635,000,000;

LHA Replacement (AP-CY), $277,543,000;

TAO Fleet Oiler, $674,190,000;

Moored Training Ship (AP), $138,200,000;

Ship to Shore Connector, $255,630,000;

Service Craft, $30,014,000;

YP Craft Maintenance ROH/SLEP, $21,838,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $80,738,000; and

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $601,008,000.

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $389,305,000.

In all: $16,852,569,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, of which $389,305,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, to fund completion of prior year shipbuilding programs: *Provided*, That amounts made available for prior year shipbuilding programs may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available for such purposes in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2020, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $6,696,715,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $973,084,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $14,224,475,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading for F-35A Joint Strike Fighter airframes and contractor furnished equipment, no more than the amount necessary to fully fund procurement of 36 airframes and associated contractor furnished equipment may be obligated until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense has accepted Autonomic Logistics Information System equipment that meets requirements to support a declaration of Air Force initial operating capability for the Joint Strike Fighter.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $2,334,165,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $1,935,034,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and

accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $253,496,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $15,098,950,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $35,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $49,000,000)''.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment, and I will later withdraw that amendment.

The amendment I am offering today is a simple, commonsense amendment that fulfills a critical need for our Air National Guard, who stand watch while performing the 24/7 Aerospace Control Alert mission as diligently today as they have after the attacks on 9/11. This mission is carried out by several Guard units across the country, including the 180th Fighter Wing in Toledo, Ohio, whom I have the great honor to represent, and by the D.C. Air National Guard, who are less than 15 miles away from this Capitol. These servicemen and -women also serve in combat theater operations overseas when they are called upon and play a vital role in fighting foreign threats.

This amendment would provide funding for an additional ARC–210 or equivalent radio in the Air National Guard's F–16s. These radios have a capability for secure line-of-sight and beyond line-of-sight communication, providing the ability to securely communicate with ground forces and command and control. However, one radio in the aircraft does not allow for the simultaneous contact with them.

Currently, Air National Guard F–16s only have one ARC–210 radio that works on an ultrahigh frequency band, and it is this band that most command and control and air traffic control agencies use. An additional second radio will simultaneously allow Air National Guard F–16s to communicate with command and control agencies and coalition troops on the ground in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and dense threat environments.

Members of the Air National Guard, along with fulfilling their duties of protecting our borders against those who wish to do us harm, also deploy with our Active Duty military, side by side, on the front lines in overseas conflicts. In fact, the request to have these additional radios comes from the combat commanders in such theaters around the world. So not only is this needed at home, but also abroad. The Air National Guard designates the need to have this capability as ''critical.''

My offset for this amendment is the Defense Rapid Innovation program, a program intended to take off-the-shelf technology and put it in the hands of the warfighter as soon as possible. My amendment would do just that. It takes low-cost existing technology and puts it to work for our warfighters today.

As I said, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment, but I want to say I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey and his committee staff and all the members of the committee for their hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to speak on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his strong support of national defense, his incredible dedication to the National Guard, and his great service to the State of Ohio.

His amendment, while it will be withdrawn, as he said, is intended to provide radio equipment for the Air National Guard F–16s but was only recently brought to our committee's attention. Should the Air Guard choose to purchase the ARC–210 radios with NGREA funding, which the committee has provided quite a lot of money for, the committee would support their decision.

We are sensitive to the need of the Air Guard, yet the committee needs to do its due diligence. Ranking Member VISCLOSKY and I look forward to working with you and your staff on this important issue, as we have already been doing, and appreciate your indulgence and willingness to withdraw the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his willingness and especially for his dedication and support for our Air National Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment is not a reflection of concern with what is a good bill under the circumstances. The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment would appropriate $25 million to fund military responses to Russia's continuing violation of the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the INF Treaty. This is the exact same amount that the House Armed Services Committee, the HASC, authorized recently in a bipartisan and noncontroversial provision in H.R. 1735, which passed the House Armed Services Committee on a 60–2 vote.

Senior DOD officials, from the Secretary of Defense to lesser Senate-confirmed officials, have testified that the United States is considering a range of military options to respond to Russia's violation of the INF Treaty. DOD defines these as countervailing and counterforce options. What do these include?

Number one, extending the range of the Army's current Army Tactical Missile System, ATacMS; land-basing Tomahawk or otherwise modifying similar capabilities; and also other capabilities per classified DOD reporting.

The emphasis should be on modifying current systems as opposed to developing brand-new capabilities, which would take longer and cost far more.

This amendment is imperative to ensuring that another year isn't allowed to go by before Russia's President, Vladimir Putin, is made to understand that he cannot profit by his violation of the INF Treaty.

As The New York Times reported on June 5, following the submission of the most recent State Department annual report on arms control compliance: ''American officials have made no discernible headway in persuading the Russians to acknowledge the compliance problem, let alone resolve it. . . . In December, the Pentagon told Congress that it had developed a range of military options to pressure Russia to remedy the violation or neutralize any advantages it might gain if diplomatic efforts fail. Brian P. McKeon, a senior Pentagon official, told Congress that . . . if a diplomatic solution was not found, 'This violation will not go unanswered.' ''

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of all Members for the Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's concern relative to Russia and his desire to make sure that they do abide by the existing treaty.

Certainly, I would acknowledge that they have invaded the country of Ukraine. They control a quarter of that country's industrial production, and as the gentleman has indicated, are very concerned about their violation potentially of the treaty that exists.

My concern is that the gentleman's amendment is premature. He is absolutely correct that the authorizing committee in this body did pass legislation that you are trying to address with your amendment. The other body has not yet acted.

Additionally, I would point out—and again, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct—that DOD is considering a range of options. You have enumerated at least three of them, I think, very correctly.

Again, I think it is premature, given the fact that we are still, as a country, considering what options should be utilized to deal with this very serious question that the gentleman raises. Given the fact that we don't have direct authorization and we are considering options, while I agree with the intent, I would have to object to the timing of the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chair, I would just argue that, while it is true that the other body has not acted on this yet, it is also true that this body has already acted in the Defense Authorization bill. It came through committee, and certainly it had overwhelming support in committee and overwhelming support on the floor of the House.

I think that the will of this body ought to be done by all of my colleagues supporting this very important amendment and to make sure that Russia understands that they cannot go unchecked when they violate a treaty of this magnitude.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I will simply conclude by again expressing sympathy for the aim of the gentleman but pointing out that to appropriate money, we need authority. We do not yet have that, given the absence of action by the Senate and signature of the authorization into law by the President. I would ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,143,095,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the staff, first, for working with Members and getting Members in order to be able to present their amendments; and then I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their understanding of this amendment and, again, make the point that this amendment that I am offering at this time I have been able to work on with the appropriators over the years.

I am a breast cancer survivor, and as I, myself, was going through that period, I met women who were experiencing triple negative, which is a very deadly aspect of breast cancer.

My amendment increases funding for Defense Health Program's research and development by $10 million, and these funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Just the fact, to take note of the point, that more than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times, 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2001.

My amendment will add additional research dealing with this question. And the good news is that, when the military research component works on this, there is a great possibility of moving forward.

Breast cancer strikes relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male servicemembers, veterans, and their dependents are at risk as well.

'' 'Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer,' says Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University. Clapp, who works for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues, says life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.''

Just a moment about the triple-negative breast cancer, when I saw firsthand a very wonderful professional in my community go very quickly, first at the diagnosis and then the short-term survival that she experienced.

It is a term used to describe breast cancer whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

So what does that mean? TNBC accounts for between 13 and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States. It is a higher grade, onset is younger, is more aggressive, and is likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer do not live more than 5 years after being diagnosed, and it impacts various ethnicities and ethnic groups in a far different way.

□ 1845

We find that African American women are more likely to be diagnosed with large tumors, but it impacts women of all backgrounds, racial backgrounds as well.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this amendment that I have had the privilege of offering in years past. Might they also take note of the fact that the amendment would not change the overall level of budget authority, and it would lower the overall level of outlays.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I add this article into the RECORD, ''A New Drug for Triple Negative Breast Cancers Seems Promising,'' dated June 5, 2015.

Again, the research that the United States military can do under the research development test and evaluation is powerful. There are many women and men in the military and many women throughout the Nation and around the world who would benefit greatly from the additional focus on this very deadly disease, deadly form of breast cancer.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted in last year's Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 4870).

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program's research and development by $10 million. These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Women in the military have had to fight battles against Triple Negative Breast cancer and far too many of them are losing the battle.

My amendment is designed to advance the study of triple negative breast cancer which is an aggressive and deadly type of breast cancer.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed. TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States.

It is essential to support research to identify multifaceted targeted treatments for this type of breast cancer.

TNBC is an extremely deadly form of breast cancer.

Unlike traditional forms of breast cancer there are no targeted treatments for TNBC.

Additional research is necessary to find the molecular cause for TNBC in order to develop an effective treatment regime.

It is only in the last few years that professionals studying breast cancer have concluded that breast cancer is not one disease, but many different forms of cancer all originating in the breast.

Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells

Triple Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC) cells: TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States; usually of a higher grade and size; onset at a younger age; are more aggressive; and are more likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than White women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26% vs. 16% in non-African Americans women.

The survival rate for breast cancer has increased to 90% for White women but only 78% for African American Women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

There continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

Depending on its stage of diagnosis, triple negative breast cancer can be extremely aggressive and more likely to recur and metastasize than other subtypes of breast cancer.

It typically is responsive to chemotherapy, although it can be more difficult to treat because it is unresponsive to the most effective receptor targeted treatments.

There is no question that researchers are increasingly recognizing the importance of TNBC as an entity and focusing their efforts on several key areas.

On June 5, 2015, it was reported that "A New Drug For Triple Negative Breast Cancer Seems Promising—Enzalutamide."

Research on effective treatment options for triple negative breast cancer is critically need to improve the survival rates of women who are diagnosed with the disease.

We must also improve upon tests that can detect triple negative breast cancer while it is in its early stages, which could increase survival rates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

[From The Inquisitr, June 7, 2015]

A NEW DRUG FOR TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER SEEMS PROMISING—ENZALUTAMIDE

Breast cancer. The two words strike fear in nearly everyone's heart, as, by far, it is the most common cancer that women can get. In fact, one-out-of-eight women will be diagnosed at some point in their lives. Early detection remains the most important tool we have against fighting breast cancer, but it's only one tool. Not at all tests reliably show all breast cancers in their early stages, and many breast cancers are not detected until they begin to metastasize, or spread to remote locations in the body, which makes them incurable. They can be treated, but it is medically deemed impossible to cure at that point in time, with various metastatic lesions having to be handled as they appear—which means more chemo, more radiation, more lost quality of life.

What many people don't realize is that there are actually several kinds of breast cancer—not all are the same or are treated the same. Many breast cancers have hormone receptors which are considered easier to treat the other types, because when biological therapy denies the tumor of the particular hormone that feeds it, the tumor dies.

Triple-negative breast cancer, however, does not respond to hormone or biological therapies—that's because the tumor does not have those receptors. It also is a particularly aggressive cancer that usually strikes women in their childbearing years and moves quickly to the brain and bones. Lumpectomies, Mastectomies, chemotherapy, and radiation have been the medical standard, but often with dismal results—the five year prognosis for triple-negative breast cancer is not good.

However, a new drug on the market seems promising in the fight against this disease that takes far too many young women. A drug used to treat prostate cancer in men seems promising—called Enzalutamide—shows promise in a subset of women with advanced triple-negative breast cancer. For women whose tumors express the androgen receptor (approximately 40 percent) the drug shrank or stopped tumor activity.

Tiffany Traina, a medical oncologist at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in New York, who specializes in breast cancer, spoke about the trial which included 118 women, 47 percent of which had triple-negative breast cancer with androgen receptors.

"Enzalutamide is an oral therapy and extremely well tolerated. We are seeing impressive improvements in progression-free survival [PFS] and in the clinical benefit rate. AR by immunohistochemistry is not perfect in predicting who is going to respond. This is not the whole story. We found that even those with really low AR expression level have had great responses [on trial. Combining AR expression with the gene signature has allowed us to enrich for the population that appears to truly benefit from enzalutamide. This is the most exciting data we have had in triple-negative breast cancer and certainly supports moving this therapy forward in development."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment. Again, I thank the staff, the chairman, and the ranking member for their commitment to the betterment of the lives of our young men and women in the United States military.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $76,680,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $7,372,047,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $17,237,724,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V–22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $23,163,152,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,207,171,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $250,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration; engineering, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,543,000) (increased by $3,543,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, at a time when the United States is facing constantly evolving global threats from a wide range of enemies, our military urgently needs the technology to monitor and respond to these threats.

Our military does not have the time to wait decades or even years for the development and launch of surveillance or communications satellites.

Operationally Responsive Space, or ORS, allows the U.S. to quickly respond to the emerging and often unanticipated needs of the warfighter. The program rapidly develops new capabilities, giving our military the ability to launch field-ready satellites extremely quickly.

These cost-effective satellites provide transformational advantages on the battlefield. They provide surveillance, tactical communications, countercommunications, space protection, space situational awareness, and weather data from around the world to assist our military in combating our enemies.

You don't have to take my word for it. Air Force leadership has consistently praised the program as an effective national security tool. General Schwartz, the former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said: ''ORS is exactly what we need. Innovation and greater efficiency as we contend with ongoing fiscal constraints and changing space posture.''

General Welch, current Chief of Staff of the Air Force, recently said that we ''have to look at space now as a warfighting domain,'' and he went on to say that doing so requires us to ''look at different ways of building, maintaining, and improving the assets we currently have in space and the capabilities they provide in new and different ways than the very functionally developed, large program, large investment over long periods of time that have dominated the space architecture up until this point.''

ORS plays a critical role beyond immediate response to our needs on the battlefield.

The U.S. also needs to have the ability to relaunch crucial military communication and even weather satellites that are lost to countermeasures by other countries. In 2007, China used a ground-based missile to destroy a satellite orbiting more than 500 miles in space, demonstrating their capacity to target our national security satellites and space defense systems.

The U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission's 2014 report to Congress notes that ''China, in 2014, continued to pursue a broad counterspace program to challenge U.S. information superiority in a conflict and disrupt or destroy U.S. satellites if necessary . . . China likely will be able to hold at risk U.S. national security satellites in every orbital regime in the next 5 to 10 years.''

Currently, Russia is developing a sea-based missile and space defense system capable of destroying satellites. As other countries modernize their military, the threat level to our communications, navigation, and guided munitions satellites intensifies.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including some funding for ORS in this year's bills, but I do not believe that it is fully adequate to fund this vital program. Without sufficient funds, ORS cannot produce the space systems that give our military an advantage on the battlefield. It is not in our best interest to solely focus on building satellites that take decades to develop, build, and launch, and cost billions of dollars.

While I believe that ORS is integral to maintaining our advantage in space and bringing much-needed capabilities to our warfighters, I understand the committee is not at this time able to reallocate additional funds to this very important program. I hope to continue to work with the committee as the appropriations process moves forward.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment with Congressman ROONEY, my co-chair of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force.

Traumatic brain injury continues to be the signature injury among our Nation's servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 300,000 troops have been diagnosed with mild TBI since 2000. This number continues to increase as identification and detection methods become more accurate. Despite these staggering figures, there was a decrease of 20 percent from last year's funding level. Our amendment would restore the same funding level to the TBI program.

The program supports the DOD's Psychological Health and TBI Center of Excellence in its efforts to educate servicemembers and their families, enhance clinical and management approaches, and facilitate other vital services to best serve the needs of our servicemembers impacted by TBI and psychological health problems.

In recent years, the DOD has made significant strides in improving both in-theater and post-incident assessment and diagnosis, but still more needs to be done in evaluating troops' ability to return to duty. As it is, we are not living up to our responsibility in caring for servicemembers who have already been diagnosed with TBI. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to use this time to heap compliments upon my colleague from New Jersey who heads up the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force and has been providing that leadership and support, and it is certainly bipartisan.

Just for the record, our committee has been very active in supporting this type of work and research. And for the

record, our bill provides $155 million, which includes a plus up of $100 million above the request level of $55 million for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

In addition, our bill provides $676 million in operation and maintenance funding within the Defense Health Program to care for servicemembers affected by traumatic brain injuries and psychological maladies.

There has been an issue about the slow spend down of some of the money. Of course, if we are here on the floor advocating, as we should, for such an important program, we need to ensure that the bureaucracy gets the money spent. I am sure my colleague from New Jersey would agree that if we are going to put money on the table, let's make sure they spend it rapidly to address this ever-growing problem which affects so many people who come off the battlefield. I commend the gentleman and support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $170,558,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,634,568,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $474,164,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels, including procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, $31,440,009,000; of which $29,489,521,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017, and of which up to $13,972,542,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $373,287,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,577,201,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than $8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than $597,100,000 shall be made available to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command to carry out the congressionally directed medical research programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment that would set aside $1 million for studying a neglected segment of suicides within our Armed Forces. Our brave men and women in uniform risk their lives every day to keep us safe and free, yet they often don't get the care that they deserve.

While attention has been given to the subject in the past, we have recently seen a need for research that deals with high suicide rates among our female servicemembers and veterans. This week, the Los Angeles Times reported on a recently released study which found female military veterans commit suicide at nearly six times the rate of other women.

□ 1900

This new government research released in the journal of Psychiatric Services went even further, reporting that female veterans between the ages of 18 and 29 are nearly twelve times more likely to commit suicide than nonmilitary women. We need to do better by the women who risk their lives to protect our Nation. We cannot sit idly by while our female servicemembers and veterans suffer in silence.

My amendment would set aside $1 million to study the possible causes for this level of suicides among our women in uniform. Service-related causes like traumatic brain injuries and PTSD, in addition to nonservice related factors such as adverse childhood experiences, financial troubles, and other external stressors, must be investigated if we hope to seriously confront this travesty head on.

In addition, according to the VA, the suicide gap between men and women is shrinking. Men typically have higher suicide rates than women. When military service is incorporated, the gap between the two shrinks significantly.

This is a serious problem and one that we don't know enough about to confront. Until we understand why we are seeing this horrific trend, we cannot help the women who bravely serve.

When we are faced with rising generations where female veterans are twelve times more likely than nonmilitary women to commit suicide, we need to take action. My amendment will conduct a study to understand how we get here, so we can move forward and take real action to address this crisis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $720,721,000, of which $139,098,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $50,743,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $21,289,000 for activities on military installations and $29,454,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, to assist State and local governments; $2,281,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2018, of which $2,281,000

shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $579,342,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $569,339,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, $878,298,000, of which $616,811,000 shall be for counter-narcotics support; $113,589,000 shall be for the drug demand reduction program; and $147,898,000 shall be for the National Guard counter-drug program: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $316,159,000, of which $314,059,000, shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which $2,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $514,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $507,923,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $4,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled ''Explanation of Project Level Adjustments'' in the explanatory statement regarding this Act, the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: *Provided*, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' appropriation and the ''Operation and Maintenance'' appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: *Provided further*, that except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act

shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2016, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2017.

(c) As required by section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) civilian personnel at the Department of Army Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories may not be managed on the basis of the Table of Distribution and Allowances, and the management of the workforce strength shall be done in a manner consistent with the budget available with respect to such Laboratories.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term ''manufactured'' shall include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in the current fiscal year or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M–1 Carbines, M–1 Garand rifles, M–14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M–1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8018. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8019. Of the funds made available in this Act, $15,000,000 shall be available for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over $500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8022. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $39,500,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $27,400,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) $10,400,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force''; and

(3) $1,700,000 shall be available from ''Other Procurement, Air Force'' for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2016, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2017 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by $88,400,000.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8025. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8027. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2016. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 8028. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8029. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8030. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $250,000.

SEC. 8031. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) disestablish, or prepare to disestablish, a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; or

(2) close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place on probation a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with the information paper of the Department of the Army titled ''Army Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria'', dated January 27, 2014.

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2017 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal

year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093) shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8035. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not less than $12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8036. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8037. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8038. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats;

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense; or

(4) an Air Force field operating agency established to administer the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Program and Mortuary Operations for the Department of Defense and authorized Federal entities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) $10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (h) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the competition or outsourcing of commercial activities.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

(1) ''Other Procurement, Army'', 2014/2016, $40,000,000;

(2) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2014/2016, $91,571,000;

(3) ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2014/2016, $888,000;

(4) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $2,300,000;

(5) ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $1,000,000;

(6) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $12,600,000;

(7) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2014/2016, $14,000,000;

(8) ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', 2015/2017, $30,000,000;

(9) ''Other Procurement, Army'', 2015/2017, $30,000,000;

(10) ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2015/2017, $49,377,000;

(11) ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2015/2017, $15,422,000;

(12) ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', 2015/2017, $8,906,000;

(13) ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', 2015/2017, $88,996,000;

(14) ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $108,870,000;

(15) ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $75,000,000;

(16) ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2015/2017, $8,000,000;

(17) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', 2015/2016, $232,228,000; and

(18) ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', 2015/2016, $60,271,000.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force

Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of ''commercial items'', as defined by section 103 of title 41, United States Code, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8046. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, the Secretary shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: $20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and $24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program setasides may be taken from programs, projects, or activities to the extent they contribute to the extramural budget.

SEC. 8049. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8050. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101–510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8052. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8053. Using funds made available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern and at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks area, such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 4 that is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8053.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Each year, the Department of Defense ships coal from Tamaqua, Pennsylvania, about 3,000 miles away to an Air Force base in Germany, costing taxpayers millions of dollars more than if we simply treated this particular base like every other military base in the world.

Why do we do this?

Since 1972, each Defense Appropriations act has included an earmark requiring that the Pentagon purchase anthracite coal from Pennsylvania to heat this base in Kaiserslautern, Germany. This is wasteful spending, pure and simple.

My bipartisan amendment, which I am offering with my colleague TOM MCCLINTOCK, would finally remove this zombie earmark and save taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

At its peak, this earmark mandated that the government purchase more than a million tons of anthracite coal each year to power overseas bases and installations, but today, the Department of Defense purchases only about 5,000 to 9,000 tons of coal annually, and it is to meet the requirements of this specific base in Kaiserslautern. It costs taxpayers millions of dollars each time. According to the last study we did on this, which was way back in 1989, the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the Department of Commerce jointly concluded that these mandates had cost U.S. taxpayers $1.1 billion, and that was 26 years ago, so it is a lot more since then.

For decades, the Pentagon has urged Congress to remove this wasteful earmark and allow the use of cheaper fuel

to power our military base in Germany. President after President has urged the removal of this earmark—both Republicans and Democrats—every President since Jimmy Carter and including President Ronald Reagan. Today, we have an opportunity to finally achieve that goal.

I want to thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for his leadership in introducing this amendment with me.

The passage of this amendment would be proof positive, I think, to Americans back home that Republicans and Democrats can work together to cut wasteful spending. I urge my colleagues to support the Huffman-McClintock amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I don't support the war on coal that is waged by some of my friends on the left, but I do support the war on waste, and I support this amendment based upon that fiscal imperative.

Just a few weeks ago, so-called defense hawks demanded spending well in excess of budget caps because, they said, our defense spending had been stretched to the breaking point. In light of those warnings, I find it inexcusable that these scarce defense dollars would be so recklessly squandered to continue to fund a corrupt earmark from a disgraced and deceased Pennsylvania Congressman, an earmark that dates back more than 40 years.

That earmark, as my friend has just said, requires that one—and only one—American Air Force base must purchase 9,000 tons of Pennsylvania anthracite coal a year at the grossly inflated price that is estimated to be about $20 million. That is about 80 percent more expensive than commonly used coal, and that doesn't include the cost of transporting this overpriced coal across the Atlantic Ocean and halfway across the European continent—a cost that is absorbed elsewhere in the Air Force budget. The excuse is that we would otherwise be dependent on Putin, but that doesn't hold water. No other U.S. military base in all of Europe is required to buy this coal, only Kaiserslautern.

The Pentagon and successive Presidents have consistently protested this waste, but these protests have fallen on deaf ears in Congress even while we are told our defense spending has been cut to the bone.

If we don't change the spending trajectory of this government, the Congressional Budget Office warns, in the next 10 years, just paying the interest on the national debt will greatly exceed our entire Defense budget. That makes rooting out waste like this a national defense imperative.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert in coal, and I am not an expert in what these men describe as an earmark, but I do know that coal is reliable, that it is cost-effective, that it is domestically produced, and that it has been used at this Air Force base for a long time. This provision both promotes domestic resources of energy and ensures that our bases and that particular base have a reliable, continuous source of energy for their daily operations.

I don't think we ought to dismiss the notion that Germany is under attack by Russian aggression, and Russia would at any time cut off fuel supplies, as they have done to other countries in Eastern Europe. Europe, as an area, as a continent, remains heavily reliant on Russia for its energy, and Russia uses its leverage on an annual basis to quiet potential opposition to that aggression in Ukraine and other parts of the region. This is a stark reminder of how important it is to ensure that our military has a reliable domestic source of energy wherever it is in the world. This may be an unusual circumstance, but I see no reason to change it. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have well over 30 other defense installations in Germany and hundreds of others across the globe. To my knowledge—and I have made inquiries on this subject—not a single one of those installations operates with a congressionally mandated fuel source like the one we are talking about here. The Kaiserslautern facility is, truly, one of a kind.

This is a commonsense amendment that provides the Pentagon the flexibility to ensure that our military installations continue to have reliable, cheaper, and cleaner energy sources in the years ahead. The congressional mandate in question was added to the Defense Appropriations bill over 40 years ago to an accumulated cost of well over $1 billion to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about our national security. This is not a weapons system. This is not funding to support or protect our troops. This isn't doing anything for our country or our national security except wasting taxpayer dollars and making one particular coal company in eastern Pennsylvania a little bit richer.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' and support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8054. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide'', $20,000,000 shall be for support of high priority Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program requirements and activities, including the training and funding of personnel: *Provided*, That the funds are made available for transfer to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided further*, That funds transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which the funds are transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8056. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section XI (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8057. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any training, equipment, or other assistance for a unit of a foreign security force if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

(2) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to provide any training, equipment, or other assistance to a unit of a foreign security force full consideration is given to any credible information

available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by such unit.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the government of such country has taken all necessary corrective steps, or if the equipment or other assistance is necessary to assist in disaster relief operations or other humanitarian or national security emergencies.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish, and periodically update, procedures to ensure that any information in the possession of the Department of Defense about gross violations of human rights by units of foreign security forces is shared on a timely basis with the Department of State.

(e) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the application of any exception under subsection (b) or the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(1) in the case of an exception under subsection (b), providing notice of the use of the exception and stating the grounds for the exception; and

(2) in the case of a waiver under subsection (c), describing the information relating to the gross violation of human rights; the extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the waiver; the purpose and duration of the training, equipment, or other assistance; and the United States forces and the foreign security force unit involved.

SEC. 8058. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8059. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 45 days after a report, including a description of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8060. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8061. Notwithstanding section 12310(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8062. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nongovernmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of ''armor penetrator'', ''armor piercing (AP)'', ''armor piercing incendiary (API)'', or ''armor-piercing incendiary tracer (API–T)'', except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8065. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $76,611,750 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: *Provided further*, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8066. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to take any action to modify—

(1) the appropriations account structure for the National Intelligence Program budget, including through the creation of a new appropriation or new appropriation account;

(2) how the National Intelligence Program budget request is presented in the unclassified P–1, R–1, and O–1 documents supporting the Department of Defense budget request;

(3) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are apportioned to the executing agencies; or

(4) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are allotted, obligated and disbursed.

(b) Nothing in section (a) shall be construed to prohibit the merger of programs or changes to the National Intelligence Program budget at or below the Expenditure Center level, provided such change is otherwise in accordance with paragraphs (a)(1)-(3).

(c) The Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense may jointly, only for the purposes of achieving auditable financial statements and improving fiscal reporting, study and develop detailed proposals for alternative financial management processes. Such study shall include a comprehensive counterintelligence risk assessment to ensure that none of the alternative processes will adversely affect counterintelligence.

(d) Upon development of the detailed proposals defined under subsection (c), the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) provide the proposed alternatives to all affected agencies;

(2) receive certification from all affected agencies attesting that the proposed alternatives will help achieve auditability, improve fiscal reporting, and will not adversely affect counterintelligence; and

(3) not later than 30 days after receiving all necessary certifications under paragraph (2), present the proposed alternatives and certifications to the congressional defense and intelligence committees.

(e) This section shall not be construed to alter or affect the application of section 1623 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 to the amounts made available by this Act.

SEC. 8067. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $5,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8068. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'' and ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $487,595,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, $55,000,000 shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, subject to the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement, as amended; $286,526,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which $15,000,000 shall be for production activities of SRBMD missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures; $89,550,000 shall be for an upper-tier component to the

Israeli Missile Defense Architecture; and $56,519,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $389,305,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred to:

(1) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2008/2016: Carrier Replacement Program $123,760,000;

(2) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2009/2016: LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $22,860,000;

(3) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: CVN Refueling Overhauls Program $20,029,000;

(4) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: DDG–51 Destroyer $75,014,000;

(5) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: Littoral Combat Ship $82,674,000;

(6) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: Amphibious Transport Dock Program $38,733,000;

(7) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2012/2016: Joint High Speed Vessel $22,597,000; and

(8) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2013/2016: Joint High Speed Vessel $3,638,000.

SEC. 8070. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8072. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2017 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the Procurement accounts, and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts: *Provided*, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP–5 and OP–32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8073. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8074. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to favorable foreign exchange rates, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $1,152,206,000.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC–130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: *Provided*, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8076. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: *Provided*, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8077. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 8078. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ–1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8079. Up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'' may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8081. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8082. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8083. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate, restructure, or realign Army Contracting Command–New Jersey or make disproportionate personnel reductions at any Army Contracting Command–New Jersey sites without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8084. None of the funds made available by this Act for excess defense articles, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), or peacekeeping operations for the countries designated annually to be in violation of the standards of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c-1) may be used to support any military training or operation that includes child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008, unless such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8085. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $20,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available

for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

SEC. 8086. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that—

(1) creates a new start effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of $10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations, unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying the Act unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

SEC. 8087. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8088. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 8089. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation Inherent Resolve, Operation Freedom's Sentinel, and any named successor operations, on a monthly basis and any other operation designated and identified by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 127a of title 10, United States Code, on a semi-annual basis in the Cost of War Execution Report as prescribed in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 ''Contingency Operations'', Annex 1, dated September 2005.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8090. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', and ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8091. Funds appropriated by this Act may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfers to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8092. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8093. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of $1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a ''covered subcontractor'' is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of $1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract term selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8094. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to $121,000,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–84: *Provided*, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417: *Provided further*, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8095. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more senior executive employees than are specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8096. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8097. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of sections 1661, 1662, or 1663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SEC. 8098. The Secretary of Defense shall report quarterly the numbers of civilian personnel end strength by appropriation account for each and every appropriation account used to finance Federal civilian personnel salaries to the congressional defense committees within 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8099. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $1,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act for the National Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2016.

SEC. 8100. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release,

or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARDY). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8100.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered deals with the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. I would suggest to my colleagues that the continued operation of the facility at Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material.

I do regret that the bill and other relevant appropriations acts continue this or any attempts to close Guantanamo by prohibiting viable alternatives. Also, as we are debating an appropriation bill, and this committee has to pay for things, I think it is appropriate to discuss the cost of the detention facility at Guantanamo. We are now spending approximately $2.7 million annually per inmate, which is about 35 times the cost per inmate in a supermaximum Federal prison in the United States.

The United States Government has transferred approximately 620 detainees from Guantanamo since May of 2002, with 532 transfers occurring during President Bush's administration and slightly in excess of 88 transfers occurring during the current administration.

Nearly 500 defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism have been—and I would emphasize this to my colleagues—successfully convicted in the United States since 2001. It includes one former GTMO detainee who was tried in New York City, the Times Square bomber; Richard Reid, the shoe bomber; and others. All of them are incarcerated in our Federal prisons throughout the United States, and there have been no security incidents. Further, there are six Defense Department facilities where Guantanamo Bay detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent of their end capacity.

I would ask my colleagues to adopt this amendment so we could move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. These important provisions that are already included in the law have been included in the past several appropriations bills for several years running, and there is a reason that they are there. This wording represents a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason. This is debated back and forth in agreement on both sides of the aisle.

Striking these provisions would have unknown consequences for a number of U.S. communities, and it is impossible for any of us to know how many detainees might be brought there, where they might be held, and the impacts on communities and facilities that are holding them. It is also impossible to know what the cost might be, so we are asking for this unknown to be pursued without knowing the risks or knowing the costs.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and potentially disastrous. We know former FBI Director Mueller had stated: To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.

The last thing we need today in the face of ISIS is to convert more folks to extremism. The idea of bringing detainees for trials in the United States quickly collapsed as local jurisdictions voiced their strong opposition. We heard that across the United States.

As everyone here is aware, several detainees that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals as appropriate. Any proposal that results in these detainees being sent to the United States for any reason is simply the wrong policy. We have tread this ground time and time and time again.

I therefore oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, let me thank the gentleman for his comments, and may I add emphasis to what he said.

The thought that people that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and been involved in the killing of Americans in the Middle East is repugnant and makes all of us angry. That is literally what has happened. We read about it in open sources, and we can speculate because I think sometimes these things are not reported, that a lot of these people that have been released have gone back and actually headed up efforts to ambush our soldiers and kill our soldiers and seek vengeance. In reality, I am glad these people continue to be locked away.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would simply say that the gentleman from Virginia noted that there is supposition and unknown in the future, and that is certainly correct. What is known is that we are a nation of laws, and our military protects this country so that we can continue to be governed by those laws. I, for one, happen to think that the indefinite detention of any human being without a trial is violative of those laws, and that that is a foundational principle of our Nation, and we ought to conduct ourselves accordingly. I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8101. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8101.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would strike the section of the bill restricting the use of funds for building and modifying facilities in the United States to house prisoners presently at Guantanamo Bay.

The argument for why we should strike this section is straightforward. The detainees at Guantanamo Bay must be brought to justice. Those who are guilty of terrorism need to be tried and punished in a swift and judicious manner. Any detainee who is innocent should, with equal speed and sincerity, be released.

Two cases exemplify this argument and underline the importance of this amendment. The first is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind behind the attack on the United States on 9/11. Since 2006, Mr. Mohammed has been detained at Guantanamo, where he has yet to be tried, convicted, or appropriately punished for his heinous actions. Justice for the victims, for the families who lost loved ones at the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and in Pennsylvania must be carried out. So far, this has not happened.

At the same time, while they haven't managed to try and convict anyone at Guantanamo, more than 400 terrorists, including the 9/11 conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui, have been tried, convicted, and sentenced in the Federal courts in the United States without incident and in a manner befitting the American justice system. No convicted terrorist has ever escaped from a U.S. prison, and no prison has ever been compromised or been subject to an attack because of the dangerous persons being held within.

The second case I want to mention is of Mr. Shaker Aamer, which came to my attention in a recent New York Times editorial or op-ed piece authored by a bipartisan group of British members of Parliament. In November 2001, Mr. Aamer, a British permanent resident, was doing charity work in Afghanistan when he was picked up by the Northern Alliance, sold to Americans for a bounty, and taken to Bagram prison before being moved to Guantanamo in February 2002. He was cleared for release by President Bush in 2007 and cleared again by President Obama in 2010. Six different U.S. agencies agreed, including the CIA, the FBI, the Departments of State and Defense, while Prime Minister David Cameron and the House of Commons unanimously have called for Mr. Aamer's immediate release and transfer to Britain.

□ 1945

So far, this has not happened. Mr. Aamer has never been charged with anything and has twice been cleared for transfer. Every American agency that has looked at this says that he has not been a terrorist and did not fight against the United States. There is no reason for him to remain in this custodial purgatory; yet he remains a detainee at the Guantanamo Bay facility.

As long as this provision remains in the bill, people like Mr. Aamer, guilty of nothing—not terrorists, not fighters against the United States—will be unjustly imprisoned, and people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed who are guilty—probably, we think—of terrorism will not be tried.

For too long, the terrible people in Guantanamo have avoided facing the consequences of answering to a U.S. court for their horrendous actions, while innocent detainees are denied recourse for continuing their detention.

The United States must not keep people in prison indefinitely for no reason, with no trial. The opponents of this amendment must not share my faith in America's courts to deliver justice. For hundreds of years, our legal system has kept Americans safe by imprisoning dangerous individuals while protecting those who are innocent of any charges.

Time and time again, Federal courts have successfully proven their ability to convict criminals and terrorists without violating the rights of due process. This amendment represents a return to our founding principles, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law.

Without this amendment, we will continue to hold terrorists and innocents alike, indefinitely and without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for.

We must close this facility, try these people, release the innocent, and restore our national honor.

I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in opposition to this amendment.

We see that today, Guantanamo is equipped to hold these detainees. The military tribunals there, if allowed to do so, are able to try these detainees. Again, they were captured under the rules of engagement as enemy combatants. Let's make sure that we are putting them in that situation to be tried as such.

Another element, too, is localities have spoken vocally to say, No, we do not want these detainees here, for a variety reasons. One is they are worried about security there. I know the argument is, Well, the facilities here in the United States can hold them. That is not the single issue. The issue is the communities' concern about what the outcomes of the movement of these detainees will be here today.

We see today radicalization across the United States from outside the United States by forces like ISIS. Think about the opportunity as those detainees are moved here and the notoriety that they will attain and how the press will cover it and that being used in addition to radicalize folks on the side of extremism. That is another issue that I believe needs to be addressed.

Again, GTMO is working. It is detaining these individuals, enemy combatants that have been picked up on the battlefield. It has been, I believe, the determination of this body through extensive debate that we shouldn't build facilities here specifically for that purpose and that GTMO is well suited to do the job.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. The continued repetition of untruths does not make them true.

Not all these people were captured on the battlefield. Mr. Aamer, whom I referenced, for example, was picked up doing charity work in Afghanistan. He was picked up by a faction of the Northern Alliance, which then sold him for a bounty to the United States. He was not a fighter. He was not on the battlefield. He was a victim of a kidnapping by a foreign faction.

Everyone who has looked at this—President Bush, President Obama, the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, the British Parliament—agrees on the facts with him; yet we hear that everybody was a fighter. No, they weren't. Some were; probably most were.

We are told that military tribunals will try these people. Well, Mr. Aamer has been in Guantanamo for 9 years. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed has been in Guantanamo for 15 years. They can't get their act together. Every time they try to hold military tribunals, there is another legal objection. Federal courts have tried, convicted, and imprisoned 400 terrorists.

We have to do justice. Keeping people in jail indefinitely because we repeat that they were caught on the battlefield, when some were not, hoping for a military tribunal that doesn't occur, is not American. It is un-American.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8102. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at United States Naval Station Guantanamo

Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity except in accordance with section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8102.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the three amendments that have the same purpose. This one would strike the section of the bill that makes it more difficult to transfer Guantanamo detainees to other countries.

I find it surrealistic. We have now debated two amendments tonight, and all we hear in opposition are repeated statements that everyone at Guantanamo is a terrorist—not true—and that everyone in Guantanamo is picked up on the foreign battlefield, fighting—not true. It is demonstrably not true.

These are not debatable propositions. Some of the people in Guantanamo are terrorists. Some of the people in Guantanamo are picked up on the battlefield. Some were not.

I gave you the example of Mr. Aamer, who was picked up by a foreign faction in the Northern Alliance and sold for a bounty because the United States offered a bounty for people who someone claimed was a terrorist. Everyone looked into it and said he wasn't a terrorist, he wasn't a combatant; yet he stays in Guantanamo.

It costs us $3 million per prisoner, per year. There are communities in the United States which can handle these trials. I can think of no honest reason why we would not want the terrorists to be tried.

The terrorists cannot be tried by military tribunal; let them try it, but the fact is they haven't been able to. They have been trying the military tribunals for 10 years now, and they haven't succeeded in convicting one person. They have had three plea bargains, no convictions, and no trials in the last 8 or 9 years.

The Federal courts are functioning. Why not save money, try the people we think are guilty, get a guilty verdict, put them in maximum security prisons, and not hold people indefinitely without charge and without trial? That is simply un-American.

Finally, we are engaged in an ideological war. Someone referenced radicalizing people. What radicalizes people more, what gives more evidence of the American bad faith and of anti-Islamic sentiments of terrible behavior than Guantanamo? It is a symbol worldwide. It is a radicalizing influence. Our own generals have said that nothing has recruited more enemy soldiers than Guantanamo.

Let's close it, take care of the people who are there one way or the other, and do justice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. I thank the chairman for yielding.

The gentleman from New York raised a good question. He said:

I can think of no honest reason why these terrorists have not been prosecuted in a military tribunal.

I can give him the answer to that. I don't know if my friend from New York has actually been to Guantanamo Bay, but in 2010, I went there. As the administration came into office, if the gentleman met with the prosecutor at that time, he had assembled a team that had worked for over 2 years trying and prosecuting the terrorists of the World Trade Center attack.

That prosecutor had gone through a stack of hearings this tall that he had prevailed on. His life had been threatened. His team's life had been threatened. He told all of us, Democrats and Republicans who went down there, that he would have guilty pleas on all those terrorists within 6 months.

To answer the gentleman as to why that didn't happen, it is because, when the administration came into office, they canceled that prosecution, took him off the case, disbanded that whole prosecution; and to this day, they have not allowed that prosecution to go forward.

If you want to ask the real, honest question of why we haven't prosecuted them in the military tribunals—the gentleman from Virginia said the facilities are there, the will was there, the hearings were there. The reason is because this administration has refused to prosecute them.

I hope we will defeat these amendments, keep those terrorists there, or let this administration prosecute them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, what is really surrealistic around here, to use the gentleman's word, is that we spend more time on these Guantanamo detainees than we do on Americans locked up in Iranian prisons and jails—that is unconscionable—or with Americans detained in North Korea.

Let's focus on liberty for some of the people in those countries that we are trying to work with on the nuclear deal, such as the Iranians holding Americans prisoners.

You have the right to focus on these detainees. Ninety-nine percent of them are guilty as hell, but we seem to be doing little in the public way to release Americans held in prisons in various parts of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we all obviously want to free Americans unjustly held by North Korea or Iran or anybody else. I suspect the reason that we don't spend a lot of time on the floor is because we all agree. There is nothing to debate. We obviously want them freed.

I hope our government behind the scenes is doing whatever we can to do it; we should do whatever we can publicly, but that has nothing to do with Guantanamo.

The fact of the matter is it isn't that the administration decided not to prosecute people by military tribunals. That is not the case. It is that every time the Bush administration or the Obama administration tried to prosecute—and they have continued to try—another legal obstacle comes up. They have never worked it out.

Appeal after appeal has shut the process down. I should say judicial decision after judicial decision as a result of appeal after appeal has shut the process down because they haven't managed to find a military tribunal procedure that gives enough constitutional rights to pass judicial muster, but is short of a Federal article III court. That is why 400 terrorists have been convicted in article III Federal courts—and no terrorists—let them be tried properly, and let the innocent be freed.

We can't simply stand here and say they are all guilty. How do we know that? How do we know that every single one of them is guilty? We know that some are not. By what right do we hold those who are guilty of nothing forever? It is a blot on American justice; it is a blot on our country's representation, and we should stop it.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 8104. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for any agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

SEC. 8105. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this

or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense, or any other official or officer of the Department of Defense, to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport or any subsidiary of Rosoboronexport.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that it is in the vital national security interest of the United States to do so, and certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) the armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) agents of the Russian Federation have ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to a waiver issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and not later than 90 days after the date on which such a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense, the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted with respect to such waiver.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purchase or manufacture of a flag of the United States unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8107. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government for the direct personal benefit of the President of Afghanistan.

SEC. 8108. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Department of Defense, amounts may be made available, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to local military commanders appointed by the Secretary, or by an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, to provide at their discretion ex gratia payments in amounts consistent with subsection (d) of this section for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces in a foreign country.

(b) An ex gratia payment under this section may be provided only if—

(1) the prospective foreign civilian recipient is determined by the local military commander to be friendly to the United States;

(2) a claim for damages would not be compensable under chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Foreign Claims Act''); and

(3) the property damage, personal injury, or death was not caused by action by an enemy.

(c) NATURE OF PAYMENTS.—Any payments provided under a program under subsection (a) shall not be considered an admission or acknowledgement of any legal obligation to compensate for any damage, personal injury, or death.

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines a program under subsection (a) to be appropriate in a particular setting, the amounts of payments, if any, to be provided to civilians determined to have suffered harm incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces under the program should be determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary and based on an assessment, which should include such factors as cultural appropriateness and prevailing economic conditions.

(e) LEGAL ADVICE.—Local military commanders shall receive legal advice before making ex gratia payments under this subsection. The legal advisor, under regulations of the Department of Defense, shall advise on whether an ex gratia payment is proper under this section and applicable Department of Defense regulations.

(f) WRITTEN RECORD.—A written record of any ex gratia payment offered or denied shall be kept by the local commander and on a timely basis submitted to the appropriate office in the Department of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(g) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis the efficacy of the ex gratia payment program including the number of types of cases considered, amounts offered, the response from ex gratia payment recipients, and any recommended modifications to the program.

(h) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to provide any new authority to the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8109. None of the funds available in this Act to the Department of Defense, other than appropriations made for necessary or routine refurbishments, upgrades or maintenance activities, shall be used to reduce or to prepare to reduce the number of deployed and non-deployed strategic delivery vehicles and launchers below the levels set forth in the report submitted to Congress in accordance with section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8110. The Secretary of Defense shall post grant awards on a public Web site in a searchable format.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, Portugal, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on an analysis of operational requirements, that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund the performance of a flight demonstration team at a location outside of the United States: *Provided*, That this prohibition applies only if a performance of a flight demonstration team at a location within the United States was canceled during the current fiscal year due to insufficient funding.

SEC. 8113. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8114. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for basic allowance for housing for military personnel, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, $400,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8115. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty.

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or divest AH–64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the active Army in fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall ensure the continuing readiness of the AH–64 Apache aircraft and ensure the training of the crews of such aircraft during fiscal year 2016, including the allocation of funds for operation and maintenance and personnel connected with such aircraft: *Provided further*, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 115, line 2, strike ''in fiscal year 2016'' and insert ''prior to June 30, 2016''.

Page 115, beginning line 7, strike the proviso.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, since its establishment, the National Guard has answered the call to defend our Nation and respond in times of crises. They have fought bravely with the Active Component, while continuing to achieve their mission here at home.

At the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, nearly 50 percent of the Army's total force was a mix of Reservists and members of the National Guard. The Pennsylvania National Guard alone contributed more than 42,000 individual deployments.

Unfortunately, the Army's Aviation Restructuring Initiative, or ARI, will have devastating impacts on all that the National Guard has achieved. ARI will result in the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component, leaving the National Guard less combat-ready.

It will also deprive our Nation of an operational reserve for these aircraft, which is essential to the retention of talented aircrews. ARI represents a fundamental shift in the nature and role of the National Guard.

Last year, Congress wisely created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to offer a deliberate approach to addressing force structure issues such as ARI. Yet, as it stands now, many of these transfers will be long done before the Commission has

examined the proposal and reported its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, once these transfers begin, it will be all but impossible to reverse them. We need to allow the Commission time to do its work before the Army takes any harmful and irreversible actions.

In the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, the House adopted an amendment to delay some Apache transfers until June 30, 2016. This amendment extends that responsible limitation to all National Guard Apaches, while also taking important steps to ensure continued readiness of the Apache fleet.

Together, these provisions strike a proper balance between safeguarding our national security and preventing any premature Apache transfers. Only this can truly ensure that the irreparable harm is not done to the National Guard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of colleagues who want to speak, so I will be brief.

But I would point out that this amendment, if adopted, will undo last year's compromise legislation that supported the Army's critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative. Part of that compromise was to establish a commission to study the force structure of the United States Army. I believe we should await that report.

The Army has indicated that if they are restricted under the gentleman's amendment, they would have to inactivate—and I would repeat this—they would have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in States such as New York, Kansas, and Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going on into the remanufacture plant in 2016.

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my good friend, who is also an Apache pilot.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for the amendment.

Without this amendment, as he said, we will see the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component while, just last year, this Congress created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to deliberate this change in force, this restructuring issue.

You say, why should we care? I mean, isn't this a squabble between one big brother and a little brother? And it kind of is.

But we should care because the taxpayers have invested billions and billions of dollars over years to create the infrastructure within the Guard.

But more importantly, this imposes on and weakens our national security because the Guard and the Reserve component is the repository for experience in Apache pilots.

When you get tired of flying the Apache on deployment over and over again on Active Duty but want to continue to serve your country, what do you do? You join the Reserve component. You come to the Guard.

And those pilots have the most experience because they have flown on Active Duty and they have flown in the Guard for years and years and years. So when they deploy, that is who you want to fly with. That is who units want to fly with because they have the experience.

The operational depth is in the Guard.

It is not that Governors need the Apache; it is that the United States needs the Apache. And should we transfer the Apache because the Army wants to pick on its little brother and can? And that is exactly what is happening here.

I have heard the arguments. I have listened to all the arguments. I have spent 34 years in uniform. None of them make any sense, and they can't justify any of them. They talk big around this place in all kinds of acronyms that most people don't understand, but none of it is justified.

I don't understand why we would do this, why we wouldn't wait just till February to get the report from a Commission that we sponsored, that we authorized in this body. Why wouldn't we wait till then?

Why would we transfer the aircraft, and when the Commission comes back and says don't transfer the aircraft, oh, well, sorry, we already did that. Won't we look foolish.

But more importantly, isn't this important for national security to have the experience there when called upon to go fight—and as the gentleman said, make up 50 percent of the force in the fight.

Let's not do this for all the wrong reasons.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to prohibit funding for any transfer of Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

In committee, Chairman WILSON and I worked very closely to authorize a congressional review no less than 60 days following the Commission's report release.

And on the House floor, as an amendment to the NDAA, Mr. PALAZZO and I thoroughly examined and determined a fixed transfer date of Apaches no later than June 30.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is being used as a backdoor scheme and a delay tactic. This ploy places devastating impacts and potential deactivation of the Army's Combat Aviation Brigades in States like New York, Kansas, Hawaii, Arizona, and overall Black Hawk modernization in California.

As the Representative of Fort Drum, home of the 10th Mountain Division, any delay would cause this high operational tempo unit to be left without an Aviation Brigade.

Let me be abundantly clear. Any Apache delay will have grave consequences on our Army's readiness, deployment schedule, and our soldiers' dwell time. A delay would severely limit the Army's ability to meet expected operational requirements and place an even greater burden on our Nation's brave servicemembers.

So, Mr. Chairman, where I think some may be confused I want to clarify. In exchange for Apaches, the National Guard is set to receive fully modernized Black Hawks, which are essential to lift-and-rescue operations and remain critical to a State's emergency response. Derailing, delaying, or limiting Apache transfers would, therefore, halt this Black Hawk modernization.

This is merely a ploy to prevent our soldiers from receiving the equipment they need to protect American lives overseas, and it is unconscionable. I am appalled that this is even being discussed and will continue to fight for an ontime transfer of the Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I only have one more speaker left, and it is my understanding that, as a member of the committee, I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman concludes his remarks.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would just urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this important amendment to prevent the premature transfer of Apaches out of the National Guard until the Commission has had the opportunity to do its work.

This Congress created the National Commission for the very purpose of studying the impact of transfers such as Apaches out of the Guard after spending billions of dollars, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has said.

This was an investment on the part of the taxpayers to build an operational reserve. We should not take this step until the Commission has completed its work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my colleague from

the Appropriations Committee, to close the debate.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. I will enter into the RECORD a letter from General Odierno that I received, as well as others. It references the FY15 NDAA, which expressly allows for the transfer of Apaches with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter.

And it says: ''If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches, or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going in the remanufacture plant in 2016.''

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2015.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

We are writing to inform you that pending legislation may cause great damage to the readiness of the United States Army, create enormous disruption to the lives of thousands of military family members, harm our industrial base, and require us to send Soldiers into combat who may not be fully trained. Specifically, provisions in both the House and Senate versions of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), and the House version of the Defense Appropriations Act will, if enacted, undo last year's compromise legislation that supported the Army's critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative (ARI). The proposals drastically alter the statutorily permitted movement of AH–64 Apache helicopters between the Army National Guard (ARNG) and the Regular Army in 2016—a transfer authorized in the FY15 NDAA. Accordingly, as discussed below, to protect our Soldiers and their Families, we request that you continue to support our comprehensive ARI plan.

The FY15 NDAA provisions were based on the following factors, none of which has changed:

The National Guard Bureau's (NGB) alternative to ARI proposed the transfer of 72 AH–64 Apaches to the Regular Army;

The decision to transfer the remaining AH–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the Regular Army would be resolved based on recommendations by the National Commission on the Future of the Army; and

The GAO and the Office of the Secretary of Defense CAPE would conduct independent reviews of both ARI and the NGB alternative, both of which have since confirmed that the ARI plan is less costly and provides greater warfighting capacity than the NGB alternative.

With these principles in mind, the FY15 NDAA allowed the Army, with the certification of the Secretary of Defense, to transfer 48 AH–64 Apaches between October 2015 and March 2016, with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter. Nevertheless, recognizing Congressional concern, the Army specifically committed to transferring no more than 24 additional Apaches in FY16 for a total of 72, which precisely matched the number in the National Guard's alternative proposal. Our FY16 plan provided Congress with time to act upon the results the Commission's report (to be delivered in February 2016); allowed for the normal induction of aircraft into the AH–64 remanufacture line in Arizona; and preserved the Army's ability to deploy trained and equipped Soldiers and units into combat. We strictly adhered to FY15 NDAA and made critical programmatic and operational decisions based upon it.

The key points of the Army plan for FY16, which is based on the FY15 NDAA, are below:

Transferring 24 AH–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 25th Infantry Division (ID) in Hawaii;

Transferring 24 AH–1–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 1st ID in Kansas;

Transferring 24 AH–64 Apaches from the ARNG to the 10th Mountain Division in New York after 31 March 2016; and

Inducting 24 ARNG and 32 Regular Army AH–64 Apaches for remanufacture in Arizona.

Should Congress now dismantle this carefully crafted plan, it would not only be disruptive, but also dangerous for our Soldiers. As you know, several proposed legislative changes either prohibit our ability to transfer any or part of the 72 aircraft or require us to count airframes, which were inducted into the remanufacture process in 2014, against the permitted transfers in FY16. The potential impacts of these provisions are stark.

If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches (24 in October 2015, 24 in February 2016, and 24 in July 2016), or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going into the remanufacture plant in 2016:

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 Soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit;

Up to three Combat Aviation Brigades (CAB) of 2,500 Soldiers each, will become combat ineffective, because they will be missing their reconnaissance units, which is half of their attack capability, thus depriving the entire brigade this crucial capability;

Nearly 30% of the entire Regular Army combat aviation force could be rendered ineffective, leaving only eight fully ready CABs in 2016—compared to the 13 Regular Army CABs that existed prior to the inactivation of two in FY15; it should be noted that the ARNG has not reduced a single aircraft or unit in this same time frame;

We will not be able to meet PACOM requirements for a ''no-notice'' Korea warfight;

We will have to send Soldiers into combat in Iraq and Afghanistan without the proper training in Joint Combined Arms maneuver from the 25th ID, 1st ID, and 10th Mountain Division; additionally, the remaining Apache Battalions would have to extend the amount of time they are deployed (note, they are already operating at a 1:1.5 deploy to dwell ratio); and

We may have to stop inductions into the AH–64E remanufacture line, because we could not, under certain provisions, process 24 Apaches from the ARNG. Additionally, the risk of losing 32 Regular Army AH–64's for a year, which are planned for induction, without the backfill transfer of the 72 Apaches from the ARNG could be too high. This stoppage could jeopardize a workforce of 4,100 employees in 22 states, including 2,200 in Arizona, 360 in Alabama, 350 in Florida, 285 in California, and lesser numbers in WA, TX, MO, IL, MS, OH, WV, PA, NY, VT, NH, CT, NC, SC, and GA.

We face an unprecedented and unpredictable global environment that continues to morph in dangerous and unforeseen ways. Now more than ever, we need a force that provides the capabilities necessary to execute the missions that we know are coming, as well as the versatility, agility and depth to handle contingencies we cannot predict. An absolutely critical component of our force is our aviation formations, and we must be able to effectively restructure them to meet current and future demands. Accordingly, we need your support to ensure that the framework created by the FY15 NDAA remains in place. We owe this to our Soldiers, their Families, our industry partners and, most importantly, the American people. Simply put, delaying or derailing ARI jeopardizes your Army, and our Nation's security.

We appreciate your time and thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. ODIERNO,
General, United States Army Chief of Staff.

JOHN M. MCHUGH,
Secretary of the Army.

Mrs. ROBY. Look, friends and colleagues, we have heard from several Members about the devastating impacts that any delay in ARI would have on our Army.

But let's take time to revisit why we are here in the first place. We are here because this Congress put the Army in the position to have to make these difficult decisions in the first place. We are here because of a thing called sequestration. And if there has ever been a time for a stronger argument to revisit this so that we can properly fund all of our military across all branches so that they are not put in this box where the Army has to make these tough decisions, now is the time.

We have got to properly fund the United States military. So here we have a letter from a highly respected Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army to Congress saying, If you do this, if you delay these helicopter transfers, you will create a domino affect that will result in the United States of America sending our soldiers to Afghanistan and Iraq who are neither fully trained or in fully equipped.

We have to do better. We have to do better. And this is the case. Again, I oppose this amendment, and I call on my colleagues to revisit fully funding our military and repealing the sequester.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8117. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for activities authorized under section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1621) to initiate support for, or expand support to, foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals unless the congressional defense committees are notified in

accordance with the direction contained in the classified annex accompanying this Act, not less than 15 days before initiating such support: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used under such section 1208 for any activity that is not in support of an ongoing military operation being conducted by United States Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibitions in this section if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances and, by not later than 72 hours after making such waiver, notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

SEC. 8118. (a) Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to assess whether the justification and approval requirements under section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2405) have, inconsistent with the intent of Congress—

(1) negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department of Defense greater than $20,000,000;

(2) discouraged agencies from awarding contracts greater than $20,000,000 to covered entities; and

(3) been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

(b) The Comptroller General shall analyze and report to the congressional defense committees on the sufficiency of the Department's report in addressing the requirements; review the extent to which section 811 has negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department, discouraged agencies from awarding contracts, or been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

SEC. 8120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any A–10 aircraft, or to disestablish any units of the active or reserve component associated with such aircraft.

SEC. 8121. Of the funds provided for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' in this Act, not less than $2,800,000 shall be used to support the Department's activities related to the implementation of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (Public Law 113–101; 31 U.S.C. 6101 note) and to support the implementation of a uniform procurement instrument identifier as described in subpart 4.16 of Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, to include changes in business processes, workforce, or information technology.

SEC. 8122. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be transferred to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8122.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has already been supported by 375 Members of this House; yet this amendment has, 90 percent of the House. It is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has such bipartisan support; yet this amendment has.

This is an amendment not put in by just me, but by my good friend Mr. COURTNEY, by Mr. WITTMAN, by Mr. LANGEVIN, by Mr. ROGERS, by Ms. DELAURO—three HASC subcommittee chairmen, two HASC ranking members, and a Defense appropriator. It is an amendment that is supported by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

It is rare to find such different groups in support, the Navy League, the United Auto Workers, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, AFL–CIO; yet this amendment has that support.

The reason these planets are all aligning in this rare configuration is because it is also rare—in fact, once every other generation—that we have to build something like the *Ohio* class submarine; yet it falls upon this generation.

In 4 years, we will begin the procurement. In 6 years, we will start construction of 12 ships—they call boats—that will carry 70 percent of the nuclear deterrence of this country—$92 billion.

The national sea-based deterrence fund we formed last year helps us prepare for that in advance, instead of waiting until the night before to come up with $92 billion. It transfers $1.4 billion into a fund and allows the Department of Defense to find other moneys, a rare thing for the government to actually prepare in advance, instead of waiting until the last minute to prepare. It will help to purchase in bulk and save perhaps millions, maybe even billions of dollars.

Now, I know there are voices that say in this world, with all the threats we see and all the demands we have for national defense, we cannot find creative solutions, and we have to do everything the way we have always done it.

We disagree because, if we are not creative, if we don't find other solutions, CRS says we could lose—32 other ships, including as many as 8 *Virginia* class subs, 8 destroyers, and 16 combatant ships.

Those same voices will say, We can't set up a fund like that; yet they have already set up four different funds very similar to that.

We ask for your support for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, our committee strongly supports the *Ohio* class submarine. We have done it for years.

Both the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and I not only serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and provide its leadership, but we have also supported this program on Energy and Water, which is the other part of the package.

With respect, the gentleman from Virginia's amendment proposes to strike a provision of the bill, prohibits the transfer of funds to the national sea-based deterrence fund, a reserve established but not funded last year in the NDAA.

We recognize this submarine will be expensive; however, the national sea-based deterrence fund will not make the submarine any less expensive, and it will not increase resources available to the Department of Defense.

This Congress has an important responsibility to provide resources to all of our military services and the intelligence community. Under the structure of this special fund, the Secretary of Defense has the authority to divert dollars into this new fund from the Army, Marines, Air Force, Special Forces, missile defense, ISR, and other types of essential programs. This is the wrong approach. It removes, furthermore, congressional oversight from the Secretary of Defense.

Secondly, if the President determines the *Ohio* class replacement is a must-fund platform, then the Navy should buy it, just as it has every other submarine in its inventory that our committee has supported. Establishing a special fund to pay for the submarine is an attempt to have other military services pay for what is a Navy responsibility.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, could I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt for a second the sincerity of the chairman and the ranking member and their support for the *Ohio* replacement program.

This chart, which the Navy produced, showing the 30-year shipbuilding plan, if we fully fund the *Ohio* class program,

as well as a 300-ship Navy, demonstrates exactly the problem that confronts us today.

It shows, again, a red line across, which shows the modern era of shipbuilding at about $15 billion a year; and, with the yellow portion of the chart, it shows how, for 13 years, Congress, starting in the 2020s, is going to be asked to raise unprecedented amounts of money for the shipbuilding account.

The fact of the matter is this is an asset that is not just the Navy's; it is the country's. Under New START, 70 percent of the nuclear triad will be borne by the Navy through its submarine program, far greater than in the past.

The Air Force and their long-range bombers and the Army, with their ground-based systems, are not going to be bearing the same burden as a result of the *Ohio* class' planned burden under New START.

We have an opportunity to do something sensible, which is based in clear precedent, as the gentleman from Virginia indicated.

The sealift fund was funded out of the shipbuilding account. The missile-based system was funded on a separate account because these are national assets that provided assistance and national security across the board for the Pentagon.

Support this amendment if you support a strong shipbuilding account and protect the shipbuilding industrial base of this country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment to restore the national sea-based deterrence fund. This amendment is critical to maintaining our Nation's nuclear deterrence and ensure a robust Navy shipbuilding budget.

It makes sense now to set aside funding for the Ohio class submarine replacement program. This makes sure that, down the road, we are not forced to choose between building a replacement ballistic missile submarine or a destroyer or an aircraft carrier.

The Navy already faces challenges in building enough warships to meet the global threats our Nation faces. Funding the national sea-based deterrence fund is the best solution to maintaining national strategic deterrence without hollowing out the Navy's shipbuilding budget.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the ranking member of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee for the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the national sea-based deterrence fund is critical to the future of our national security. It provides space outside the shipbuilding fund for the most survivable piece of our national deterrence, a bill that last came due in the 1980s in the Reagan defense buildup.

Mr. Chairman, these boats are absolutely essential. This is not just a Navy issue, as Secretary of Defense Connor has said. This is a national priority. The deterrence fund allows us to treat it accordingly and avoid pressuring the Navy out of badly needed investments in other ships and capabilities.

Unless Congress acts, these boats will consume half of the projected shipbuilding funding for a decade, causing crippling shortages that would echo in our fleet for decades after.

We and many of our colleagues have worked on a bipartisan basis to rise to this challenge, and the result is this sea-based deterrence fund.

Earlier this year, this body spoke loudly and clearly in overwhelming support of the fund and its purposes.

I urge my colleagues to reaffirm that position with this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, this is where reality comes into play. We talked about this earlier. Having a fund that is set up does not evade the responsibility of providing the long-term funding.

All of these things in the Department of Defense are priorities, and our friends on the Appropriations Committee have the difficult job of trying to balance these priorities and have the big picture available to them.

I think they have done exactly the right thing. I think this needs to be subsumed within the overall budget. There is no magic money. Having something that subverts the hard work that we ask the Appropriations Committee to do, I think, is the wrong thing to do.

It is not easy to stand up and make this argument, but I appreciate what they have done. They did it last year, and it was appropriate. They have done it this year, and it is appropriate. We have to be able to deal with this in a comprehensive way and not use sleight of hand.

I appreciate what the chair and ranking member have done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in opposition to the amendment in the strongest possible terms. I certainly respect the position of my colleagues on the other side of this argument, but I do remind my colleagues that the CBO estimates that this program is going to cost somewhere between $102 and $107 billion.

You are absolutely correct. This is a very expensive program, and we ought to be very, very careful. Given the tremendous financial resources that we will be required to modernize or replace the U.S. nuclear delivery systems and weapons over the next two decades, it is imperative that Congress begin to make tough decisions now and not set up segregated funds.

Unfortunately, this fund is a means to avoid those tough decisions. Firstly, the fund in no way solves the problem of where are we going to get the money. It is not going to make the next generation of ballistic missile submarines any cheaper. It simply shifts the burden for paying for their construction from the Department of the Navy to the entire Department of Defense.

I categorically disagree with the amendment's sponsor relative to this replacement program and the suggestion that it should exist outside the existing Navy shipbuilding account.

The sponsors are correct that the funding for that shipbuilding account has been relatively flat in recent years. However, if the Ohio class replacement and the 300-ship Navy are priorities of this Nation and consistent with our national defense strategy, then we ought to pay for both in a transparent manner by increasing the resources in the shipbuilding account and not resort to setting up independent funds.

Further, the sponsors indicate that this is a national priority, and I would not argue that point. These systems play a very important role in our nuclear deterrence, so do our long-range bombers and the weapons that they carry.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, long-range bombers also provide protection for this country as well as the weapons they carry. I think they qualify as national asset distinctions. Should we then set up funds for these programs?

Let's think about other priorities within the Department. Should we set up a fund for the Army's 82nd Airborne? Should we set up a fund for the Air Force combat rescue officers? They are very deserving. Should we set up a fund for the special Marine Air-Ground Task Force? They are very deserving.

Another concern that I have is it really expands and transfers authority to the Secretary of Defense. The last time I looked, we have a constitutional responsibility to make decisions ourselves.

The fact is we already have a segregated fund that has drawn a lot of attention to this bill that is called the overseas contingency operations fund. Should we start picking between services now as to which one should receive special treatment? Should we then pick programs within particular services? I think not.

Again, I strongly oppose the amendment and am pleased to join with the chairman in opposition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

Mr. FORBES. Can I request how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers have made my point for me. Mr. BLUMENAUER made the same arguments 4 weeks ago. It was defeated by 375 votes.

The last gentleman that spoke said it is $102 billion. The question is whether we wait until the night before to come up with $102 billion or whether we start now and make sure we have it. This is a national priority. I hope we will pass this amendment and build these ships.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8123. None of the funds provided in this Act for the T-AO(X) program shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of the following components unless those components are manufactured in the United States: Auxiliary equipment (including pumps) for shipboard services; propulsion equipment (including engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8124. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for military personnel pay, including active duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, $700,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8125. The amounts appropriated in title II of this Act are hereby reduced by $359,000,000 to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds, as follows:

(1) From ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $138,000,000;

(2) From ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $221,000,000.

SEC. 8126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to lower than anticipated fuel prices, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $814,000,000.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the end strength levels for the Army National Guard of the United States below the levels specified for the Army National Guard of the United States in subtitle B of title IV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291): *Provided*, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 8128. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

TITLE IX

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $5,664,570,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $1,643,136,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $555,998,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $2,376,095,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $24,462,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $12,693,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $3,393,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $18,710,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $166,015,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $2,828,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $18,910,604,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $80,000,000)''.

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $80,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) uses the global war on terrorism funds for the Army operations and maintenance to provide $80 million in the same account for hard body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program.

Now, every warfighter deployed or scheduled to be deployed deserves to be provided with the most advanced and the lightest hard body armor. The amendment will ensure that the deployed soldiers are protected with the modern body armor they need. Presently, this bill provides no funds for the Army hard body armor.

This amendment will also help to ensure that the industrial base producing the specialized boron carbide powder, fabricating ceramic plates, and producing finished hard body armor can stay in business and sustain production of the lifesaving soldier protection equipment.

The body armor industry is in crisis, and that puts our troops at risk.

Last year, the House and Senate appropriated $80 million to the Army for industrial preparedness body armor.

All four congressional defense committees explicitly directed the Army to ensure that the industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor.

Despite this clear and explicit direction, the Army has completely ignored Congress. The Army's failure to sustain the body armor industrial base has put a vital industry at risk and is causing layoffs among very specialized employees, which puts the entire industry at risk.

There is no doubt that our troops deserve modern, lightweight body armor that requires a strong, reliable, and fully capable industrial base.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my good friend, my colleague on this issue.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her leadership on this issue and partnership in supporting this important and critical mission of our military to make sure that the United States warfighter in combat has the most advanced, lightweight body armor available to protect that soldier in the field against the enemy, and we must act now to make sure that the U.S. Army does what is the intent of the Congress.

As the gentlewoman pointed out, despite the fact that Congress has been clear on this matter, despite the fact that report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measures recognize the importance of lightweight body armor protecting soldiers in combat, we encouraged the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base was able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor by implementing the body armor modernization through a replenishment program.

Despite all of that, despite the articulation of the clear will of this body, the Army has not used and deployed the funds appropriated properly, and the Department of Defense was at odds because the Army did not deploy the resources appropriated until, or expressed the intent of not deploying those resources until the end of the fiscal year.

What this amendment will do is make sure that congressional intent is honored, make sure that the armor industrial base is properly maintained, and most importantly and most critically, when our men and women are called into combat to defend liberty and freedom, that we give them the tools that they need to keep them safe and carry out their mission with victory and honor.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, this $80 million is to provide body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program. I ask for Members' support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but, in fact, I support the amendment put forward by a member of our committee.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her amendment, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky for his strong advocacy.

Supporting our industrial base is a strong priority of mine and our committee's. We think this amendment is a good idea. It sends another message to the bureaucracy that we mean what we say.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $6,747,313,000: of which up to $160,002,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'' account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2215 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $1,871,834,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $10,799,220,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $7,559,131,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,260,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used to support the Government of Jordan, in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense may determine, to maintain the ability of the Jordanian armed forces to maintain security along the border between Jordan and Syria, upon 15 days prior written notification to the congressional defense committees outlining the amounts reimbursed and the nature of the expenses to be reimbursed: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That the authority in the preceding proviso may only be used for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, up to $30,000,000 shall be for Operation Observant Compass: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 124, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $430,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts aid to Pakistan in half. Pakistan is the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call our allies.

Before Osama bin Laden met his maker in 2011 in one of the greatest U.S. military raids ever conducted, bin Laden was living in plain sight in a bustling military town. To think that the most senior levels of the Pakistani Government did not know that he was there requires, as Secretary Clinton said, ''the willing suspension of disbelief.''

This February, the former head of Pakistan's version of the CIA, called the ISI, said that Pakistan most likely sheltered Osama bin Laden. And just last month, three U.S. intelligence sources told NBC News that Pakistan knew where Osama bin Laden was hiding all the time. Not only did Pakistan not help us get Osama bin Laden, Pakistan threw the doctor who did help us under the bus and put him in jail for 33 years for cooperating with America.

Pakistan did not help us because Pakistan was working with Osama bin Laden. Newly released documents retrieved from bin Laden's compound show that Pakistan's intelligence service was in contact with bin Laden and was working with him to convince U.S. leaders to negotiate with al Qaeda.

There are some who say we need Pakistan to help us fight the war in Afghanistan, but Pakistan is on the wrong side. Pakistan is helping the terrorists, not us. Pakistan's intelligence service gives safe haven, resources, and training to terrorist groups, like the Haqqani network that has killed dozens of Americans.

On September 22, 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee: ''With ISI support, Haqqani operatives planned and conducted the truck bomb attack, as well as the assault on our Embassy.''

The truck bombing he mentions wounded more than 70 U.S. and NATO troops. Admiral Mullen went on to say: ''The Haqqani network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency.''

Throughout 2011, Pakistan tried to cheat the United States by filling out bogus reimbursement claims for allegedly going after terrorists when they weren't even doing that. That is the same account this money funds.

There are others who say we need Pakistan's southern supply route to help our troops in Afghanistan. But for 7 months in 2012, Pakistan closed off the supply route, and we did just fine. What we really need access to is Pakistan's tribal areas. Terrorists that kill our troops in Afghanistan run back and forth across the Pakistan border and hide in these tribal areas, but Pakistan won't let our troops chase them there. And so the terrorists kill Americans, and they get away with it.

Pakistan did do some military operations in the tribal areas last year, but they tipped off the Haqqani network before they got there that they were coming. Pakistan tipping off terrorists is nothing new. Last fall, Leon Panetta, Secretary of Defense at the time of the bin Laden raid, says of the Pakistanis, ''We just can't trust them.'' I agree. We can't trust Pakistan.

My amendment does not cut money to protect Pakistan's nuclear weapons. The amendment does recognize the U.S.-Pakistan relationship for what it is. We don't need to pay Pakistan to be our enemy; they will do it for free. Pakistan has already received over $30 billion of our money since 2002. After 13 years of giving Pakistan more and more money, it is time to do something different. My amendment simply cuts the money we give Pakistan in half.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I certainly understand the gentleman's passion, and at times, I share some of the same concerns he stated in his remarks.

Just to put a little perspective on it, the coalition support fund allows the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support, including access, specialized training to personnel, procurement and provision of supplies and equipment provided by that nation in connection with the U.S. military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom.

Receipts for reimbursements are submitted by cooperating nations and are fully vetted by the Pentagon and follow strict criteria to meet the standard for reimbursement, and all payments are made in arrears and follow a notification to Congress, so there is a notification to Congress.

Regarding Pakistan, the coalition support fund remains a critical tool to enable Pakistan to effectively deal with future challenges emerging from the U.S. drawdown. At times, I wonder whether we are withdrawing.

It is also a cost-effective tool, some would say, for the U.S. to remain engaged in the region. I know all too well that our relationship with Pakistan is an uncomfortable one; I feel it, but these funds are sent to reimburse Pakistan for actions to protect our interests.

These reimbursements are made to maintain some 186 Pakistani forces along 1,600 miles of border between Pakistan and Afghanistan to deter cross-border conflict, movement, and counterterrorism-counterinsurgency operations throughout the FATA, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas.

The focus of this core level is against TTP, an al Qaeda-allied organization that conducts regional terrorist and insurgent attacks. Nearly 28,000 militants were killed, injured, or arrested due to these operations. Pakistan itself—and this doesn't get much press—has suffered a lot of casualties themselves, about 5,000, while attempting to secure this treacherous border.

Continued support of the deployment of the Pakistan Armed Forces in FATA and other areas in the future is needed for the long-term stability of the area.

I must oppose the amendment, although I understand the passion with which the gentleman has made his argument because I think it is in our long-term interest to have this relationship.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and would acknowledge the gentleman from Texas' legitimate concern.

I would associate myself with the chairman's remark, but make one important addition, and that is the chairman has been adamant that we be very, very careful about our relationship with Pakistan, and the bill recognizes difficulties we face.

I would draw the Member's attention to section 9015 that prohibits funds to Pakistan if the government is engaged in activities that present a concern to the government of the United States.

I appreciate that the chairman insisted on that language. That is included in the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee.

Pakistan cannot be trusted. They lie about the reimbursements. They have not met the criteria that the ranking member has talked about the last 4 years, and they got the money anyway. They are playing us, Mr. Chairman, and we pay them; and they use that money to hurt us, to hurt Americans.

This amendment says: we are cutting the money in half because of your prior conduct that shows you can't be trusted.

That is all this amendment does.

I would hope Members of Congress would send a message to Pakistan: we are not going to pay you to hate us and pay you to kill us; we are going to cut the money off.

And that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $124,559,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $34,187,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to

section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $3,455,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $209,606,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $160,845,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $225,350,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund'', $2,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support, or facilitate counterterrorism and crisis response activities pursuant to section 1534 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall transfer the funds provided herein to other appropriations provided for in this Act to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and subject to the same authorities and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That the funds available under this heading are available for transfer only to the extent that the Secretary of Defense submits a prior approval reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall comply with the appropriate vetting standards and procedures established elsewhere in this Act for any recipient of training, equipment, or other assistance: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $3,762,257,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may obligate and expend funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title for additional costs associated with existing projects previously funded with amounts provided under the heading ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That such costs shall be limited to contract changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuation, rate adjustments, and other necessary contract actions to complete existing projects, and associated supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not use more than $50,000,000 under the authority provided in this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify in advance such contract changes and adjustments in annual reports to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan or transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $10,000,000 shall be for recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces, and the recruitment and training of female security personnel: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 130, beginning line 2, strike ''Provided'' and all that follows through line 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island that works to assure the appropriate use of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan.

This amendment is in keeping with the clear position of the House, as we have voted numerous times in bipartisan fashion to limit funds for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund, a program which has been poorly run and is lacking in oversight.

This amendment would specifically strike the language which allows $50 million in funds for the Afghanistan security forces fund to be redirected toward the Afghanistan infrastructure fund account.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has provided $1.3 billion to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund since it was created in 2011. However, funds have been slow to be spent; and, as of March 31, 2015, more than 55 percent of AIF funds remain to be expended.

Additionally, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, has repeatedly found that DOD has experienced challenges in executing large infrastructure projects and that many projects underway are behind schedule and face serious cost overruns.

SIGAR's audits have also found that we have inadequate sustainment plans and that projects lack an identifiable counterinsurgency benefit. SIGAR has also expressed reservations about the Afghans' ability to even operate and maintain these energy projects upon completion.

Now, it is my understanding that DOD requested this repurposing of funds because the budget authority on previously authorized funds is about to expire. I know we all look to our commanders in the field for guidance on what they need to finish the job in Afghanistan, but with over half of existing funds remaining to be expended, I ask: Mr. Chairman, why should we take away from other programs and give to this one?

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's deep concern over the tax dollars that have been, if you would, wasted—is probably the most polite term I can think of—in some of the infrastructure investment in Afghanistan and would not in any way argue that point.

The gentleman mentions the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. He and his office have been in mine, the chairman's, the committee, and there is no question that the gentleman makes a very, very important point about making sure that those funds we are spending, despite the best of intentions, be spent carefully.

I would note to my colleagues that we do have within somewhat recent time, the last year or so since August, a new government in place in Afghanistan. The administration has made a decision to maintain troop levels at their current position given that change of government and, if you would, after all of the loss of life, the suffering, and loss of treasury for the last 14 years, to give that nation one last good chance.

I rise in opposition, essentially, to do that for Afghanistan and to give them that last good chance for these few remaining significant projects.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the sentiments of Mr. VISCLOSKY about some of the concerns and some of the reports that have been issued by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. It should be worrisome. A hell of a lot of money has been wasted.

I do think there are some projects that need to be completed. One that comes to mind is the Kandahar bridging solution, the plan to bring electric power to Kandahar. It ends in 3 months. We need to continue that investment. This was a top counterinsurgency priority. Most road projects are completed. The second is the Kajaki Dam has less than a year's work remaining and will supply renewable electric power to the grid.

These are elements of stability that sometimes get lost in reports of empty buildings where there are no occupants and no electricity. I think we need to continue to give a helping hand to the Afghan people because, if they don't have an economy, then they are not going to have any national security. They need a stable economy, and some of these projects near completion need to be continued.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest, again, we have a new government. I certainly think their concern for ethics, as well as care in investment, is worth taking that last good chance to give them a last good chance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words, the sentiments, the compassion of both my colleagues; but this is an issue that we have addressed for quite some time. It is not new.

I am as concerned about our administration of the funds, our Department of Defense encouragement of Afghans to use the funds, and to make sure that contractual arrangements are in place so completion will take place. We have not seen that.

I think it is time that reality strikes home. While I understand the need to encourage a new government, sometimes, the best way is tough love and a clear indication that comes through finances as well.

I, again, encourage my colleagues to adopt my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

□ 2100

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'', $715,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3558), to provide assistance, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies, and services, stipends, infrastructure repair, renovation, and sustainment to military and other security forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces or other local security forces, with a national security mission, to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that prior to providing assistance to elements of any forces such elements are appropriately vetted, including at a minimum, assessing such elements for associations with terrorist groups or groups associated with the Government of Iran; and receiving commitments from such elements to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, including the Government of Iraq, and other entities, to carry out assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entities, may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated or expended until not fewer than 15 days after (1) the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees, describing the plan for the provision of such training and assistance and the forces designated to receive such assistance, and (2) the President submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees on how assistance provided under this heading supports a larger regional strategy: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, not more than 60 percent may be obligated or expended until not less than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that an amount equal to not less than 40 percent of the amount provided under this heading has been contributed by other countries and entities for the purposes for which funds are provided under this heading, of which at least 50 percent shall have been contributed or provided by the Government of Iraq: *Provided further*, That the limitation in the preceding proviso shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines, in writing, that the national security objectives of the United States will be compromised by the application of the limitation to such assistance, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days in advance of the exemption taking effect, including a justification for the Secretary's determination and a description of the assistance to be exempted from the application of such limitation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive a provision of law relating to the acquisition of items and support services or sections 40 and 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780 and 2785) if the Secretary determines such provisions of law would prohibit, restrict, delay or otherwise limit the provision of such assistance and a notice of and justification for such waiver is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' under this heading means the congressional defense committees, the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $715,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by taking a moment to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY. As one who served a long time ago when everything came up under an open rule, we don't see as much of that. I can't commend both of the gentlemen

and their committees enough. I wish everybody in America could see how hard they have worked in their committees and here on the House floor. The country should know that there are no two more highly regarded people who are serving in this Chamber than our chairman and our ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that will save us a lot of money and, quite frankly, end a sad chapter in American history. My amendment eliminates funding for the Iraq Train and Equip Program and applies that money to reducing the deficit. The administration, as we all know, is now urging strategic patience with Iraq. The truth is we have had a failed strategy there from the very beginning. The fact is that this is a century-old conflict. The fact is that we have no friends in this conflict. The history of it is clear.

I happened to be up in Tora Bora back in the seventies, and I learned that we were funding and training and equipping the Mujahedeen to fight against the Russians under the notion that the enemy of our enemy is our friend. We were wrong. They morphed into al Qaeda, and they were the people who bombed the World Trade Center. Then we supported Saddam Hussein in the war against Iran. We knew he had used chemical weapons, because we had the sales receipts. We had supplied them. After that, we deposed him. Then we put the Shiites in power, and the Shiites proceeded to tell all of the Christians and the Jews and the Catholics, ''Get out of town, or we will kill you.'' They shut down all of the synagogues and the Catholic churches. Then we decided we would have a Sunni awakening. That was supplying arms and weapons to the Sunnis because the Shiites were persecuting them. They ultimately morphed into what we now have as ISIL. Now here we are. We find ourselves fighting the Shiites in Yemen, and we are supporting the Shiites in Iraq. We are not sure if we are for them or against them in Syria.

The simple truth is that we have been on every side of this conflict. We really have no friends in this conflict. Inevitably, our goodwill, our good intentions have resulted in the arms and the weapons, as Judge POE just said, ending up in the hands of our enemies, and they use them against us.

The fact is we have spent $3 trillion on this conflict. Think about that—$3 trillion. For $1 trillion of that, we could have graduated debt free every kid in America from college and vocational school. Just think about it. We could have rebuilt our transportation and infrastructure system in this country. For another $1 trillion, we could have given the Americans a tax break.

Mr. Chairman, instead of 13 years of war, the administration now admits that we have no strategy. The Secretary of Defense admits that the Iraqi Army has no will to fight ISIL. When they took over Ramadi, all they did was growl at them, and they ran like rabbits. They left their Humvees, and they left their tanks, and they left all of their weapons, and we resupplied ISIL, once again, to use those weapons against us. The weapons we have supplied and the people we have trained have ended up in enemy hands time and time again and have been used against us.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, you know the old definition of insanity is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior over and over and expecting some different result. To paraphrase the old Serenity Prayer, let me say, Mr. President and colleagues: Let us change what we have the power, the wisdom, and the courage to do before we bankrupt this country.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I share quite a lot of the gentleman's sentiments.

I have said on a number of occasions, when you put the Defense bill forward, sometimes you have to support things that the Commander in Chief and the President want that you are highly dubious about. I have been very conflicted about this Train and Equip. At times, I think the enemy is doing a better job of training and equipping their own than we are, and, at times, it has been pretty deplorable. I want the gentleman to know I do support this effort. Let me just put some meat on the bones to, maybe, even make his point but, in reality, tell a little truth about the program.

The Iraq Train and Equip Program provides about $715 million in both funding and authority to assist military and other forces associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces, with a national security mission to counter ISIL. We do know in the overall mix—and the gentleman from Minnesota knows it—there are some good guys over there. Of course, a lot of the good guys have been taken over by the Quds Force and the Iranians to the south, but, in reality, we do have some good allies in the north with the Kurds, so I haven't given up on all parts of Iraq.

I think we need to continue to support the program. Evidently, our President does as well. We are sending 400 more advisers over to, shall we say, set up a new base camp in Ramadi in Anbar province to sort of respond to a huge crisis there when that city was taken over. I would hate to abandon the people of Iraq without giving it one more try.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's motivation in offering this. In a sense, the three of us are agreed given the skepticism that has been expressed here today.

I would also add that I do believe this institution needs to have a resolution that defines with some specificity what our projection of force should be as to the disposition of our military personnel and assets. Certainly, I am grievously disappointed for those countries in that region in their lack of clarity and purpose. Also, in using, if you would, a religious theme, I was taught that we should have hope in the future, and my concern is, if we cease this training program for those who want a change in government, for those who want to do the right thing in Syria, they will lose what shred of hope still exists.

Principally, for that reason, I join with the chairman in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I do appreciate the gentleman's motivation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In reclaiming my time, I have a few other comments.

Mr. Chairman, I said I do work on behalf of the President of the United States and our Commander in Chief, and I have to say I have concerns about our continued investment in Pakistan. We debated that. We have had talk about the Afghan infrastructure fund, which has been troubled with projects, and this is an ongoing area which has not been trouble free. Yet it is interesting that nobody from the White House, since the budget was introduced, has reached out to me relative to defending these programs.

I think the people of these countries deserve protection and support, but it is interesting that we carry the water on these issues and on many other issues on this committee. Do we get any reinforcements? Actually, our entire bill has been put together for all of our military services without any assistance from those military services to get us across the finish line. I think it is remarkable. The standoffishness—the ambivalence—about working with us, I think, is a total disgrace.

I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and he certainly knows more about my sentiments publicly that I have expressed in the past.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the ''Syria Train and Equip Fund'', $600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, stipends, construction of training and associated facilities, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes: defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition; protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria; and promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments and other entities to carry out activities authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entities may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may provide assistance to third countries for purposes of the provision of assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That the term ''appropriately vetted'' shall be construed to mean, at a minimum, assessments of possible recipients for associations with terrorist groups including the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusrah, Ahrar al Sham, other al-Qaeda related groups, Hezbollah, or Shia militias supporting the Governments of Syria or Iran; and for commitment to the rule of law and a peaceful and democratic Syria: *Provided further*, That none of the funds used pursuant to this authority shall be used for the procurement or transfer of man-portable air-defense systems: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances, in accordance with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment before the floor for consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $600,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start tonight by saying that my mother is gravely ill in Florida this evening, and I can't be with her, but I want her to know that I am with her right now, and I am always with her.

We all want to end U.S. involvement in conflicts where there is no long-term strategy, no vision of success in the end, and the disproportional sacrifice of our brave military forces, Mr. Chairman. U.S. involvement against ISIS in Syria fits this characterization. The administration even admits that there is no comprehensive strategy in place. Therefore, by amendment, we are proposing to defund U.S. support for the Syrian rebels and move the funds to the spending reduction account.

Last September, Congress allocated $500 million to train and arm Syrian rebels. This program, however, is fraught with uncertainties and doubts, and the launch of the program has been less than impressive. Of the 15,000 Syrian rebels we planned to train and equip over a 3-year period, so far, only about 400 have been vetted and deemed ready. Meanwhile, other Syrian rebels have either disappeared from the battlefield or have defected to extremist factions, and ISIS has expanded its ground forces, its operations, and its territories. Other jihadist factions in Syria are also gaining strength, and the Assad regime continues its atrocities.

The civil war in Syria has now resulted in 220,000 Syrian deaths and in 11.5 million people—over half the population—displaced within Syria. The U.S. continues to provide, by far, the bulk of the military might, most of it air power. It is hard to imagine defeating ISIS without substantial ground forces to combat it at this point. The Defense Appropriations bill includes $600 million to train and arm Syrian rebels as part of this needed boots-on-the-ground.

□ 2115

But whatever the number of Syrian rebels we ultimately introduce into the battlefield, they alone, I believe, are unlikely to turn the tide. Nor are these rebels expected to end the Assad government, even though that, too, is one of our stated goals.

History has shown that when we arm untested and difficult-to-vet rebel forces, the weapons we provide too often wind up being aimed at our U.S. troops. I am told that the last time our country funded a foreign war through vicarious fighters was the Taliban fighting against the Russians in the 1970s.

Please join us in saying ''no'' to additional funding for these untested Syrian rebels unless and until Congress receives clear answers to the following questions: Where is the accounting for the first $500 million? I don't have it. Why isn't the second $600 million, if appropriate, funded by other folks in the coalition? What is the objective? What does success look like in the Syrian civil war? Does victory require the end of the Assad government? What is the comprehensive strategy for defeating ISIS in Iraq and beyond?

In our view, without the answers to these questions, it makes no sense to proceed. It is our job to review and assess. I ask that defunding of the Syrian train and equip fund be accomplished by this amendment to H.R. 2685.

I acknowledge my deep admiration for the chairman and ranking member and what they have accomplished in this bill and acknowledge so many good things in the bill, but it is hard for me to accept this war that is going nowhere.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to join my colleague. I have enormous respect for the chairman and the ranking member's good and noble intentions, but, again, the fact is we have no friends in these conflicts. The weapons that we send inevitably are being used against us. I was here during the Vietnam war conflict, and the arguments that we hear today for continuing this involvement is to somehow make something good out of what hasn't been quite so good, and we finally ended that conflict by cutting off the funds for it. That is how we are going to end our wars of choice in the Middle East, wars of choice that are bankrupting this country and costly in blood and treasury.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure, on behalf of everybody on the floor, we extend to Mr. CLAWSON our sympathy and hope that his mother will recover. I am sure if she has the ability to be watching the television tonight, she is already very proud of his courageous remarks on the floor.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Heartfelt. Thanks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the sentiment of the amendment, this is a complicated issue—that is an understatement—with multifaceted policy ramifications that really can't be fully debated in 5 or 10 minutes. The situation in Syria remains highly complicated and complex and poses imminent threats to the United States and allied interests, particularly Israel, Jordan, and Iraq.

Recognizing congressional concerns regarding potential U.S. military involvement in Syria, our bill appropriates funds in the GWOT account, the title IX that I talked about several hours ago to train and equip Syrians. It also further prohibits the introduction

of U.S. military forces into hostilities in Syria except in accordance with the War Powers Act.

However, this amendment, in my judgment, goes too far, for it attempts to tie the U.S. Government's hands in navigating the complicated situation we—or, more importantly, our allies Israel and Jordan—face related to threats emanating from ISIL in Iraq and Syria every day. We have to be realistic. There are many countries, including our allies, as well as other groups already involved in Syria.

This amendment would do nothing to stop the arming of the Syrian opposition. What this amendment would do is remove the possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstances, even if such engagement would be in the best interests of the United States or allies. Even at this rate, the U.S. is paying just a portion of the costs.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member, for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to express my best wishes for the gentleman's mother. It is hard to oppose a gentleman who went to Purdue University. I know he is a very smart individual. I have my other colleague here from Minnesota.

I have spoken to our colleagues on the previous amendment. I think people understand my position. I simply would add my voice to the chairman and emphasize, this is a very tough problem, and we ought to maintain as large a degree of flexibility as we can.

I appreciate the chairman's remarks and associate myself with them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, but I certainly understand the sentiments behind it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $759,073,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $572,735,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $647,630,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $431,640,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,648,312,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $722,274,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $105,459,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $12,186,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $234,741,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $1,297,726,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $773,638,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Space Procurement, Air Force'', $452,676,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $1,673,358,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $7,045,550,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $217,701,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT ACCOUNT

For procurement of covered items for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this paragraph, the term ''covered items'' means items that— (1) are not major weapon systems, aircraft, or other items central to the mission of an organization; and (2) are useful for both missions performed under title 10, United States Code, and missions performed under title 32, United States Code, when applicable, including radios, generators, computers, trucks, and other dual-use items: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $1,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $217,647,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $1,366,242,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $199,264,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $88,850,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $272,704,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $275,300,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $443,271,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the ''Office of the Inspector General'', $10,262,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress

SEC. 9002. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9003. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $3,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 9004. Supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance or the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9005. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle; and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9006. Not to exceed $10,000,000 of the amounts appropriated in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small-scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed $2,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of $500,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9007. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9009. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other

Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 9010. None of the funds provided for the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' (ASFF) may be obligated prior to the approval of a financial and activity plan by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of $50,000,000 annually and any non-standard equipment requirements in excess of $100,000,000 using ASFF: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that the AROC has convened and approved a process for ensuring compliance with the requirements in the preceding proviso and accompanying report language for the ASFF.

SEC. 9011. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $500,000.

SEC. 9012. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', up to $140,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction, and site closeout activities prior to returning sites to the Government of Iraq: *Provided*, That to the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include non-operational training activities in support of Iraqi Minister of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training activities that they determine are needed after the end of fiscal year 2016, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2016*: Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 9013. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, to the Government of Jordan for purposes of supporting and enhancing efforts of the armed forces of Jordan and to sustain security along the border of Jordan with Syria and Iraq: *Provided*, That up to $600,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund may be used for activities authorized by this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments to carry out activities as authorized by this section and shall be credited to the appropriate appropriations accounts, except that any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall not be available for obligation until a reprogramming action is submitted to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the President and the Secretary of Defense shall comply with the reporting requirements in section 149(b)(1), (b)(2), (c), and (d) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113–164): *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances, in accordance with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 9014. For ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine'', $200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing assistance, including training, equipment, lethal weapons of a defensive nature, logistics support, supplies and services, and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, for the purposes of securing the sovereign territory of Ukraine against foreign aggressors, protecting and defending the Ukrainian people from attacks posed by Russian-backed separatists, and promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to Ukraine: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not less than 15 days prior to obligating funds provided under this heading, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Ukraine and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the military or National Security Forces of Ukraine or returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees*: Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 9015. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' for payments under section 1233 of Public Law 110–181 for reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan may be made available unless the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Government of Pakistan is—

(1) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries;

(2) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan;

(3) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs;

(4) preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise;

(5) implementing policies to protect judicial independence and due process of law;

(6) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(7) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national security interest to do so: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, exercises such waiver authority, the Secretaries shall report to the congressional defense committees on both the justification for the waiver and on the requirements of this section that the Government of Pakistan was not able to meet: *Provided further*,

That such report may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike subsection (b) of section 9015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 2130

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is very simple. It makes it so the Secretary of Defense cannot waive the conditions that are in the bill on giving money to Pakistan.

Since 2010, Congress has put conditions on our aid to Pakistan because Pakistan, frankly, can't be trusted. In 2011, Pakistan tipped off terrorists who had IED factories that the U.S. Government knew where they were. Pakistan tipped off the Haqqani network before the Pakistan military went to the tribal areas last year.

We didn't tell Pakistan before we launched the raid that killed Osama bin Laden because, according to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, ''We just can't trust them.''

This bill puts seven conditions on our aid to Pakistan. They are good conditions. Earlier this evening, about an hour ago, the ranking member mentioned these conditions for aid to Pakistan. They are commonsense things like, if Pakistan wants our money, it shouldn't support terrorist activity against the United States—imagine that—or the Pakistan Government should dismantle the IED factories run by terrorists in Pakistan. These IED factories have killed many of our troops.

Here is the problem. Each year, we put conditions on our aid. The bill also gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to give the money to Pakistan even if Pakistan doesn't meet those conditions, and this year is no exception. Once again, in this bill, we give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the conditions Congress puts in the bill.

Four of the last 5 years, Pakistan has failed to meet the conditions Congress has imposed on this type of legislation, and then the Secretary of Defense went ahead and gave the waiver, thus giving the money to Pakistan anyway.

The administration has never not given Pakistan money because it failed to meet our conditions—conditions set by Congress—normal, commonsense conditions like: you don't get this money unless you meet these conditions.

This amendment does one simple thing. It says: you meet the conditions, or you get no money from the United States; you don't give money to terrorists, or you get no money from the United States.

It does not allow the Secretary of Defense to waive Congress' conditions and give the money anyway.

That is what this legislation does. I would ask that the House support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. This amendment would strike, as he said, the waiver that is used by the Secretary of Defense and also the Secretary of State. I think it would affect our national security.

We need the cooperation of the Pakistanis. If we don't have any, we lose insight into the actions of those who would do our country harm.

I oppose this amendment as potentially damaging to our national security, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chair for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Again, I am not unsympathetic to the position the gentleman has raised, but I do not think we are in a very difficult relationship, that we restrain our flexibility to meet the moment.

For that reason, I join the chairman in his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank both the ranking member and the chairman for their comments and their work on this legislation.

My amendment says, to quote the chairman earlier, ''We mean what we say.'' We say as a Congress that, if we are going to give American money to Pakistan to help us, they can't do certain things with that money. They can't support terrorism. They can't allow IEDs to be built that are used to kill Americans. These conditions are commonsense, good ideas.

In the past, we have done this before. If we mean what we say, then we should require these conditions before we give Pakistan American money; but the law has allowed that Secretary of Defense to waive Congress' conditions and give them our money anyway.

Pakistan has proven they didn't meet the conditions in 4 years of the last 5. They got the money anyway because the Secretary waived the rule of law or waived our conditions.

This bill does something very simple. It says: Congress says there are certain rules to get American money; you follow the rules, or you don't get the money. Nobody can waive the condition and give you a pass and give you American money anyway.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for the work that he has done on this.

I understand that I had an amendment earlier today. There had been ongoing discussions about that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the end that the amendment stands disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9016. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act, $500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to the operations and maintenance, military personnel, and procurement accounts, to improve the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days prior to exercising the transfer authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the proposed uses of these funds: *Provided further*, That the funds provided in this section may not be transferred to any program, project, or activity specifically limited or denied by this Act: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9017. In addition to amounts appropriated in title II or otherwise made available in this Act, $2,500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and

made available for transfer to the operation and maintenance accounts of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force (including National Guard and Reserve) for purposes of improving military readiness: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 9018. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed or military forces into hostilities in Syria, into situations in Syria where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Syrian territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of that law (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10001. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the United States has been engaged in military operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) for more than 8 months;

(2) President Obama submitted an authorization for the use of military force against ISIL in February 2015; and

(3) under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to ''declare war''.

(b) Therefore, Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 10002. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 131, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—300

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—131

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brownley (CA)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Honda
Hoyer
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takai
Takano
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Keating

□ 2205

Ms. CHU, Messrs. MOONEY of West Virginia, SHERMAN, LEWIS, LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GRAYSON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. RICHMOND, SIMPSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2207

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment by Mr. VISCLOSKY of Indiana.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. FORBES of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment by Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. POE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 237, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—195

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

□ 2211

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 179, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—252

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brat
Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly

Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graham
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer (MN)
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Rice (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2216

Mr. MCCARTHY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 257, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—174

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Quigley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 259, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—173

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—259

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 251, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES—181

Adams
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—251

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 321, noes 111, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—321

Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—111

Abraham
Aderholt
Amash
Bass
Becerra
Bilirakis
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brown (FL)
Buck
Burgess
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Donovan
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Fleischmann
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Israel
Jeffries

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
Lance
Lee
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Lowey
MacArthur
McDermott
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Nadler
Nunes
Palazzo
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Trott
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2230

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. PAYNE and BUCSHON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 315, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—117

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Brat
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hardy
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Perry
Pingree
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tonko
Trott
Upton
Walden
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—315

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2233

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 199, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—233

Abraham
Adams
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kennedy
Kind
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—199

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gibbs
Gohmert
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Poliquin
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2237

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 375, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—56

Amash
Blum
Blumenauer
Burgess
Capuano
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Gohmert
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kennedy
Kuster
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Massie
McDermott
McGovern
Moulton
Mulvaney
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Rohrabacher
Sanford
Schrader
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Watson Coleman
Welch

NOES—375

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—2

Gowdy
Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2239

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 323, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—107

Amash
Blum
Blumenauer
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
DeFazio
Dent
DesJarlais
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Heck (NV)
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt (VA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kennedy
Labrador
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Massie
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Miller (FL)
Moulton
Mulvaney
Neal
Neugebauer
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rothfus
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—323

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Bost
Gowdy
Hultgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2242

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 318, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—114

Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hahn
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Labrador
LaMalfa
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pearce
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rouzer
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—318

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—1

Gowdy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2245

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest or retire, or to prepare to divest or retire, KC–10 aircraft.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have an amendment regarding the KC–10 air-to-air refueling tanker.

Air superiority is critical if we are going to protect our men and women on the ground and our interests, and that requires that we have fighters in the air. It is of vital importance. It is why the Air Mobility Command is so important. It may not be as exciting as fighters and close air support, but it is every bit as essential. The KC–10 air-to-air refueler is the larger, newer of the tankers, and the KC–135 is the smaller, older version.

This is the problem. The KC–46 is a new tanker that the Air Force is introducing. It has had development problems, and it is not ready for prime time. General Welch of the Air Force confirmed that the new tanker was not intended to replace the KC–10 but that it is at risk of being replaced due to budget cuts, and he has confirmed that it would cost more in the midterm to replace the KC–10.

Just to put the difference in capabilities in perspective, the KC–10 can carry 350,000 pounds of fuel. The other tanker—the older KC–135—and the new KC–46 can only carry 200,000. It is 200,000 versus 350,000. The KC–10 carries double the payload, and it carries more passengers. The long and the short is that this tanker is essential for our ability to project force, and in this world of increased global threats, we cannot afford to deteriorate our capabilities.

The answer, I believe, is to prohibit the early retirement of the KC–10 tanker. We did that in the National Defense Authorization Act. There is no provision in the budget to replace the KC–10. I am simply looking to close the loop tonight and prohibit in the Defense Appropriations bill any funding for the early retirement of the KC–10.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacARTHUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey, my colleague, for his advocacy on behalf of the KC–10.

Mr. Chairman, none of the good work we have done in the Middle East could have been done without the remarkable history of the men and women who work on those KC–10s and these tankers, allowing so many flights to go without any problems, any issues. That is a remarkable plane. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I congratulate him for introducing it.

Mr. NORCROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacARTHUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues from New Jersey, I stand in support of this amendment, and I appreciate the fact that Congressman MACARTHUR has kept in the forefront how important this is, not just for New Jersey but for our Nation as a whole.

We are strategically located in that one area that makes it extremely efficient to refuel. More importantly, we have two ways of getting the fuel to those planes, which is so strategically important. It is over land and it is underground. That has been why McGuire-Fort Dix has been the place for this command to be joined together for years and years. I think this is not only strategically smart for our country, but this is an efficient way of spending the taxpayers' money to make sure that we get the best bang for the buck.

Mr. MacARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman

from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, 10 months ago, we entered into the war against ISIS. During the course of that war, we have put our pilots and other servicemembers at considerable risk, and we have suffered casualties. We have expended hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars, and, as yet, there is no end in sight to this conflict.

In the beginning of the conflict and our participation in it, the administration took the position that it didn't need an authorization from Congress although it desired one. The administration relied on the authorities that were passed in 2001 and 2002. The authority in 2001, passed in the hours after 9/11, authorized the use of force against those responsible for 9/11. That is al Qaeda. He also relied on the authorization passed in 2002, which authorized the use of force against Iraq. In fact, neither of those authorities is on point. The use of force that we are employing now against ISIL is being used against an organization that didn't exist on 9/11 and, in fact, is often at war with the organization that was responsible for 9/11. That is al Qaeda.

Nonetheless, the administration has asserted that it can rely on these authorities, and it asked Congress to pass a new authorization because it felt that was the preferential course. At the time and before the midterm elections, the leadership in the House of Representatives took the position that a lame duck Congress should not be voting on a new war and that a vote must wait until after the elections. So the Congress abdicated its constitutional responsibility to have a debate and a war declaration, and, instead, we awaited the elections.

The elections came and the elections went, and those of us who raised the cry that it was time for Congress to do its job were met with a new response: we couldn't vote on an authorization now because the administration had not sent us one, even though there is nothing in the Constitution that provides that Congress shall declare war only when asked by the Executive or only when asked politely by the Executive. Nonetheless, we sat, once again, derelict until the administration sent us a draft authorization.

□ 2300

Then there was a new explanation for inaction. We couldn't act on this new authorization because we didn't like the terms of it. This was irrespective of the fact that the Congress has all the power it needs to change that draft or operate under a completely new draft authorization, and still we did nothing.

Then the explanation was given we couldn't act on a war authorization because we had to have a vote on the negotiations with Iran, even though those negotiations were not yet complete. So we had a vote on the negotiations with Iran, in fact, a vote to later have a vote.

Now we are here once again with a series of shifting rationales for why we don't have a debate on this war ongoing now for 10 months. This must come to an end. The amendment that I have offered this evening would provide that no funds shall be expended for the war against ISIS after a certain date in March of next year unless Congress authorizes a war against ISIS. If this is worth fighting—and I believe it is; I believe this ought to be authorized—it is worth having Congress do its job. If we are going to ask our servicemembers to risk their lives, we ought to have the courage ourselves to make a vote on this war.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, currently, U.S. forces are conducting multiple airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Without this authority, these campaigns would stop immediately.

Should this Authorization for Use of Military Force be replaced? Perhaps it should. On May 19, Speaker BOEHNER urged President Obama to start from scratch on a measure to legally authorize the Islamic State conflict, declaring, ''We don't have a strategy.'' I agree with the Speaker, we have no strategy with regard to ISIL.

Recently, President Obama stated he still does not have a complete strategy for defeating the Islamic State. A sad commentary—shifting rationale, shifting strategy, no strategy. At a time when sectarian tensions are at their highest levels since the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom in December of 2001, the terrorists have once again succeeded in capturing control of major cities in Iraq, killing innocent citizens, causing thousands of families to flee.

What kind of message are we sending with this amendment to both the Iraqi people, to our soldiers and marines who have valiantly served and sacrificed, and even now the President suggesting sending another 400 advisers to advise and to train and equip Iraqis to recapture Ramadi?

This amendment is not about substance; it is about symbolism. Unfortunately, its effect would be much more than symbolism. Acceptance of this amendment would rob our Nation of one of the key authorities our Commander-in-Chief relies on to keep us safe. I strongly urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my colleague.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if I could make a comment. As the chairman indicated, this is a very complicated situation. Because lives are at stake, it is all the more reason, I think, to support the gentleman's amendment to force this body, if you would, to very carefully define what our purpose is, what our policy is, and how we should go about its implementation. I do support the gentleman's amendment and thank him for yielding time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman and would like to respond to my colleague's points.

First of all, the effect of this is not to end funding immediately. The effect of this would end funding in 9 months if we fail to take up and pass an authorization. Certainly, 10 months into the war and 9 months from now ought to be ample time for the Congress to do its constitutional duty.

Second, my colleague makes the point that he doesn't agree with the President's strategy. We may take issue with the President's strategy, and we all have our opinions about how this war ought to be waged, but one thing is clear: it is not going to impact the strategy if Congress does its job or not. That impacts our institution; that doesn't impact the Presidency. It is our institutional interest in having a voice in the war-making authority that is at stake here.

Finally, the gentleman asked: What kind of a message are we sending with an amendment like this? I would say the message we are sending is that we value our Constitution; we respect the requirements of our Constitution. Our Constitution says that Congress—not the Executive, but Congress—shall have the power to declare war.

My colleague says this is merely a symbolic act. I suppose that is true if you think that the constitutional clause that gives the Congress the power to declare war is only symbolic, but I think it is far more than symbolic and key to the balance of power.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by

the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would reiterate Congress' objection to a proposed policy change by the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, OFCCP, that would treat healthcare providers as Federal contractors.

In December of 2010, OFCCP quietly issued directive 293, asserting that contractual arrangements under Medicare, TRICARE, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will trigger OFCCP jurisdiction. This is absurd. This directive would reclassify a majority of hospitals in the United States as Federal contractors, subjecting hospitals in your district and mine to OFCCP's often crushing regulatory burden.

With respect to TRICARE, the agency aggressively asserted its jurisdiction in a 2009 administrative case, OFCCP v. Florida Hospital of Orlando. OFCCP argued the hospital was a Federal subcontractor by virtue of its participation as a provider of a TRICARE network of providers. The agency took this troubling position despite the fact that the Department of Defense, which regulates TRICARE, previously concluded, Mr. Chairman: ''It would be impossible to achieve the TRICARE mission of providing affordable health care for our Nation's Active Duty and retired military members and their families if onerous Federal contracting rules were applied to the more than 500,000 TRICARE providers in the United States.''

Unfortunately, the administrative law judge in the case did not heed DOD's warning and failed to see this policy change for what it is—an expansion of government power over the healthcare sector. As such, Congress acted to oppose this outreach, and in 2012 the National Defense Authorization Act clarified that a TRICARE network healthcare provider is not—is not—a Federal contractor or subcontractor.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply concerned by this attempt by OFCCP to expand its jurisdiction through executive fiat. In response, I introduced the Protecting Health Care Providers from Increased Administrative Burdens Act in the 113th Congress, which clarified that healthcare providers are not Federal contractors subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's OFCCP.

Our actions on the committee in bringing attention to this issue have been successful in prompting OFCCP to place a moratorium on the policy. However, as OFCCP has previously defied Congress and the Department of Defense, I believe this amendment is necessary. Therefore, I ask the House support my amendment that would prohibit funds to be used under this act for implementing this overreaching policy and affirmatively show the House will not support such actions by the Department of Labor and OFCCP.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan for a colloquy.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

As you know, TRICARE provides coverage to over 9.5 million people worldwide, including Active Duty, activated Guard and Reserve members, retiree survivors, and their families. To ensure coverage, they must choose between independently practicing TRICARE certified medical health counselors and/or supervised mental health counselors.

I entered my amendment and withdrew it, but it is important that we get this on the RECORD.

The independent providers must have a master's degree from a mental health counseling program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, which we call CACREP. They must also pass the National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Exam by January 1, 2017.

But this rule unfortunately has unintended consequences that require counselors to complete their education at an institution that only has been accredited by CACREP. This freezes out some of our most respected institutions, including Harvard, Columbia, and, in my home State of Michigan, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

I am extremely concerned about and would ask for the committee's support in addressing this issue. With more time, we can get this right, ensure our military members have as much access to care as possible.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for bringing this issue to the committee's attention. I look forward to working with her on it to address the unintended consequences of the existing DOD rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the Small Business Administration interim final rule titled ''Small Business Size Standards; Adoption of 2012 North American Industry Classification System'' (published August 20, 2012, in the Federal Register) with respect to the procurement of footwear.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer this amendment that will ensure a fair and open bidding process to supply our men and women on the front lines with one of the most indispensable pieces of equipment that they use every day—their boots.

My amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Defense Logistics Agency to implement the 2012 Small Business Administration's rule in regard to footwear preventing the Defense Logistics Agency from bidding the contract as a small business set-aside.

When SBA released this rule, there was significant concern that they did not go through the normal rulemaking and public comment process, and more specifically did not perform due diligence on how the changes would actually affect the footwear industry and military supply base, which the SBA has acknowledged.

This rule dramatically changed the competitive landscape amongst companies supplying very compliant footwear to the U.S. military. There are very few of these manufacturers here in the United States, and even fewer that manufacture Berry Compliant footwear. This amendment would ensure that all businesses capable of supplying high-quality footwear to our warfighters are able to compete for that contract.

□ 2315

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that last year, we had been able to get language inserted in that would call for a study. I just wanted to have a quick quote from that on the impact of jobs. This is from the report that was issued:

> Although the overall impact on the industrial base is low, the abrupt and drastic change in the small business size standards is likely to have an impact. The DOD footwear industry is highly capable, but also very dependent on DOD orders. It's important to consider both the short-term and long-term health of the industrial base.
>
> The industry is also a critical element to the Nation's national security because of the enduring need to meet wartime footwear requirements.

The emphasis here is mine. Given the industry's sensitive and critical position, such abrupt and drastic policy changes that impact the competitive landscape should be executed with greater moderation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the concern here today, and that is why I would urge my colleagues to support this vital amendment.

I do appreciate the opportunity for dialogue that I have been having with my colleague from Illinois and also with the Small Business Committee on that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, as you may know, the reason I stand in opposition is the Small Business Administration sets these standards. As of 2012, this standard was set in place.

Though I am more than willing to work with the gentleman in the future on what might come forward actually through the Small Business Committee, the concern I have is that those that do qualify under small business inadvertently, through his language, would be removed from that.

The concern I have also is that is located in my district, with a company that has already received a contract under that.

It is a process that we have in place. We know that there may be flaws in the process, and in the Small Business Committee, we are going to be working on those. I believe that the gentleman has sincere hopes to try to straighten this problem out for his district. I understand that.

I believe that this is not the way to do this. I stand in opposition. I hope that others will join me in voting ''no'' on this, but I do give the commitment that, if a ''no'' vote does occur, I will be working with him.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I simply would add my voice to his in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

It is certainly my belief and understanding that the Defense Logistics Agency is executing an acquisition program that maximizes to every extent possible long-term contracts and multiple award strategies that limit variability to limit each vendor's economic risk.

The gentleman mentions small manufacturers. Some of the largest companies in the country are involved at the Department of Defense, which is fine. They do wonderful work for our country. We ought to make sure that we protect the prerogatives of small businesses to make sure that they are on equal footing for these contracts so that you have that limit on economic risk for all vendors, big and small.

I appreciate the gentleman's objection, and I would join him in it.

Mr. BOST. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I do appreciate my colleague from Illinois and other members from the Small Business Committee who are committed to working at this.

The concern, again, would be one of our capacity and our industrial base and being able to supply that most vital of needs for our men and women in uniform, which is their footwear. When we talk about large, we talk about small at the same time because 400 is the number of west Michigan jobs that are in the balance here; but we wouldn't be able to reach the full capacity if we needed to surge again in a very unstable world, as we have been dealing with a number of crises around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2015.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is really very simple. It is cosponsored by Representatives GRIJALVA and ELLISON. It prohibits any funding in this bill pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force after December 31, 2015.

This timeline gives the President and the Congress sufficient time—that is 8 months after this is signed into law—to determine what if any authorization would be needed to replace the 2001 AUMF.

This amendment is not only timely, but it really is necessary. On September 14, 2001, I could not vote for the 2001 AUMF. That was an authorization that I knew would provide a blank check to wage war any time, for any length, anywhere.

In the last 14 years, it has become increasingly clear that this authorization has essentially provided the President—this is any President—President Bush, now President Obama—the authority to wage war against anyone, anywhere, at any time, against any country, with no authorization from Congress.

In fact, the Congressional Research Service has found that the 2001 AUMF has been used more than 30 times to justify military action and other activities, including warrantless surveillance and wiretapping, indefinite detention practices at GTMO, targeted killing operations using lethal drones, and the open-ended expansion of military operations abroad, which have nothing to do with the original congressional intent.

In addition to the activities I mentioned, the AUMF has reportedly been invoked to deploy troops in Afghanistan, Yemen, Djibouti, Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia. The 2001 AUMF is now being cited as the authority for the now 10-month-long war against ISIL—and, yes, we are in a war.

We know that ISIL must be degraded and dismantled, but Congress must do our job. We should debate and vote on the use of force. That is our constitutional responsibility.

I know that, while many of us may not share a common position on how to deal with the 2001 authorization, many of us do agree that the overly broad authority is a major and concerning deterioration of congressional oversight and warmaking authority.

I think many of us can agree that a robust debate and vote is necessary, long overdue, and must take place, whatever we believe about how we should vote. The American people deserve to have their Representatives speak for them on these grave matters which the Constitution requires.

Let me be clear. With the 2001 authorization still on the books in its current form, any administration can continue to rely on this blank check to wage endless war. That is why my amendment to prohibit funding for the 2001 AUMF after December 31, 2015, is so important.

There was very little debate. I remember that very moment that we had this debate on this resolution 12 years ago. I think the debate maybe was about 1 hour—pro and con, 30 minutes. I probably was the only one who voted and said ''no'' in terms of the debate, but it wasn't a very long debate, and I am sure, if we had had more time to debate this, more Members would have realized that this was a blank check.

Let's repeal this. I have introduced this legislation once again to get this off the books. Congress cannot continue to abdicate its constitutional responsibility while the United States now is embroiled in yet another open-ended war in the Middle East.

We can begin to address this today by passing this amendment, providing Congress and the President with plenty of time to decide what measures should replace this authorization before the end of the year.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), our ranking member, and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I join in support of her amendment.

As she indicated, more than 14 years have passed. The United States withdrew their large troop presence and marked the end of combat operations in Iraq since then. Security operations for Afghanistan were transferred to the Afghan National Security Forces in June of 2013. The basic mission of U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan has been to train those forces, including the Afghan Army.

I think the gentlewoman made a very good point. She and I may not agree on what that resolution and authority should look like in the end, all the more reason for all of us collectively, both parties, to have a fulsome debate on that issue.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

In order to prosecute the global war on terrorism, one of our primary current missions, the President, our Commander in Chief, relies on this Authorization for the Use of Military Force, which he is trying and attempting to repeal.

This AUMF, better known as the 9/11 AUMF, is necessary for the Department of Defense and U.S. military forces to address conducting campaigns against al Qaeda and al Qaeda-related affiliated forces worldwide by using this authority. It has been used by both this President and his predecessor since 2001.

Granted, this amendment was written to sunset on the last day of this calendar year, but without a follow-on authority in place, killing the 9/11 AUMF would tie our Nation's hands and our Commander in Chief's hands with regard to combating worldwide terrorism in 7 short months.

This amendment cripples our ability to conduct counterterrorism operations with partner nations and our allies against al Qaeda and their affiliates.

Once again, the gentlewoman attempts to put in place a major policy change that does not belong in an appropriations bill, this Defense bill.

The terrorist threat today is no less real and, in many ways, far more dangerous than it was when Congress overwhelmingly gave the President that authority in 2001 to protect us against those who want to do us harm.

These terrorist organizations pose a real threat to United States persons and interests. It is my judgment this amendment erroneously assumes that al Qaeda and its affiliates ended their terrorist acts once major military operations ceased in Afghanistan. Obviously, they haven't.

Recent disastrous events in Yemen and, most recently, frightening developments in Iraq and Syria have shown its affiliates and new terrorist groups are on the rise.

This amendment would effectively eliminate the President's ability to address that threat or other emerging threats from al Qaeda and like-minded groups in north Africa, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere and leave our Nation and our allies more vulnerable to attacks.

Therefore, I strongly urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

□ 2330

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1295, TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 1295, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House, one, concur in the Senate amendment to the title and, two, concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1; that the Senate amendments and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2331

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any EC–130H aircraft.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for including funds to support our fleet of EC–130H Compass Call aircraft in this bill. The underlying legislation restores $27.3 million to support 15 EC–130H aircraft next year.

My amendment today does not cost a dime. The chairman has already provided full funding for our entire EC–130H fleet, and my amendment simply ensures that the chairman's intentions are carried out, and that the Air Force does not use backdoor means to try to retire these important aircraft.

The Compass Call is the only dedicated U.S. Air Force electronic warfare

aircraft. I can tell you in this unclassified setting that it can perform electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, and offensive counter-information operations.

It was successfully employed during Desert Storm, Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and provided electronic warfare support in operations in Kosovo, in Haiti, Panama, Serbia, and Afghanistan. It was the most heavily-tasked special mission C–130 in operations in Afghanistan.

Despite plans to divest 50 percent of the fleet, the Air Force has not identified a follow-on capability, and no other platform currently performs this mission. In fact, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff Lieutenant General James Holmes confirmed there are things that only the EC–130H does and does best.

Right now, the Compass Call is currently deployed both in Afghanistan and in the fight against ISIS. Divesting it without a replacement for the unique capabilities it offers would be irresponsible, especially given its high rate of deployment.

I restate that my amendment would not cost a dime, simply ensures the chairman's decision to fund the fleet is carried out. This is a critical capability, and we cannot afford to dispose it without a replacement.

I want to thank the chair, and urge support of my amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCSALLY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are pleased to accept your amendment. May I also say, we are proud of your service to our Nation. Thank you for the time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings on the vote on amendment No. 2 be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the vote on the amendment is vacated, and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funding pursuant to the 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force. And once again I am proud to offer this amendment with my colleagues, Representative ELLISON and GRIJALVA.

Now, why is this amendment necessary?

Three years ago, mind you, President Obama declared that the Iraq war was over. Since then, the President has stated a number of times that the 2002 AUMF is no longer necessary, and that Congress should work to repeal it. Yet, Congress has allowed this war authorization to remain on the books indefinitely.

Now, we all are familiar with the report, and we know what is taking place in Iraq, Syria, and across the Middle East as it relates to ISIL. We all agree that they must be degraded and dismantled.

But just as with the 2001 resolution, the 2002 AUMF is completely inappropriate to deal with this threat.

This is a new war, Mr. Chairman, not an old war. This is a new war, which the people of this country have a right to have their Members of Congress debate and vote on.

Even the President included a repeal of the 2002 AUMF in the proposed authorization he sent to Congress in February. Yet, we can't even get that authorization brought up for a debate and a vote.

So, simply put, the 2002 authorization is no longer necessary. We need to come back to the drawing board and decide, based on what this body wants to do, should we vote for a new authorization or not.

If we want to commit the United States to another war in Iraq, then Congress must have that debate and decide whether or not to authorize another war.

I am pleased that my sense of Congress resolution—it was an amendment actually—affirming this was passed on a bipartisan basis in committee and is included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is common sense, and we cannot continue to leave authorizations for the use of military force on the books indefinitely. It is time for us to reassert our constitutional prerogative to declare war or not, to debate and vote on any military action in Iraq.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will just reiterate my comments in the gentlewoman's last amendment and that is, after the passage of 13 years, things have changed. And one of the changes we ought to make in this Chamber is to have, again, that fulsome debate as to what the parameters of our military involvement overseas is going forward from this point in time, not the beginning of the previous decade. I appreciate the gentlewoman offering the amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say with regard to this amendment, Congress has a constitutional responsibility. It is our prerogative to declare war or not. It is our prerogative to debate and vote on any military action anywhere in the world. More than a prerogative, it is our constitutional responsibility.

We represent the American people. The American people deserve to have a voice in such grave matters. That is why the Constitution required that. And for us not to do our job and to continue to rely on old authorizations from 13 and 14 years ago really is an abdication of our responsibility.

People did not elect us to Congress to duck and dodge the hard questions and the hard issues. Some of us agree that we need to go to war. Some of us don't agree. But that is not the issue, and that is not what this amendment, nor my prior amendment, was about.

It was about doing our job here, laying out the pros and cons, making some heavy-duty decisions—and that is what they are, but that is why we are here—and then instructing our Commander in Chief what Congress believes should be the appropriate course of action.

Many would vote for it; many would vote against it, but, again, not to have this debate and vote when we are now 10 months into another war is downright wrong. It is almost lawless. It is something that it is hard to imagine getting away with this long.

So I hope that we get a good bipartisan vote on this. It is about time that we do debate this again. If the Speaker did not like the President's authorization that he brought forward, then let's get another authorization. Let's write one ourselves. I have one. I know other Members have one. Let's bring forth an authorization and debate what we want to do moving forward. That is the wise thing to do. That is the smart thing to

do. That is the right thing to do. We have troops in harm's way. They need to know what their Members of Congress believe, what the Constitution requires in terms of doing our job. They deserve us to do better.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few minutes ago, currently U.S. forces are conducting multiple airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Without this authority, those campaigns would stop. And certainly, much has happened since the authority was first given. As a matter of fact, things are getting far worse than they have been in the past.

Acceptance of this amendment would rob our country of one of the key authorities our Commander in Chief needs and relies on to keep us safe and to address these types of crises, which seem to occur all over the Middle East. Therefore, I strongly reject and oppose the amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 2483(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman from New Jersey and just thank him for the wonderful job he has done protecting our troops and our people around world and making sure that the world remains a safer place than it would be otherwise without the United States there.

□ 2345

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Defense from increasing the prices paid by our troops and their families, our veterans and their families at military commissaries, especially overseas.

The commissary benefit is one of a number of benefits that our servicemembers receive upon joining the military, and it is one that our servicemembers and their families rely upon to maintain their access to wholesome, affordable, and healthy food.

The Defense Commissary Agency, or DeCA, has embarked upon a poorly researched plan to raise prices on commissary consumers as part of a move towards what they call a ''commercial'' business model.

This amendment requires the Department of Defense to continue using the existing model of produce sourcing for commissaries in Asia and the Pacific unless and until the Secretary of Defense can certify that a new sourcing model will not raise prices on the shelves. This maintains the promised benefits that our warriors and their families expected to receive when they raised their right hand and became a United States sailor, airman, soldier, or marine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in contravention of section 801 of Public Law 94–241 or section 2663 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, many of us in this Chamber share a concern that the Federal Government has so much power and so many resources that it can overwhelm and even intimidate smaller State and local governments.

The amendment I am offering responds to that concern. It requires, before any funds are expended in the Northern Mariana Islands for expanded activities by the military, that the Secretary of Defense reach agreement with the government of the Northern Mariana Islands on the nature and scope of those activities.

My amendment levels the playing field between the very powerful Federal Government and a very small territorial government.

A little history: in 1975, the people of the Northern Marianas elected to become a part of the United States, and 78 percent of the people voted for the negotiated agreement that defined our political union. Part of that agreement includes the lease of two-thirds of our island of Tinian to the U.S. military for 100 years and the lease of the entire island of Farallon de Medinilla. The cost to the United States—$175,000 a year. That is a Manhattan Island deal.

The people of the Northern Marianas committed those lands for the purpose of national defense willingly because we understood that with citizenship comes responsibility, and the United States recognized in the agreement negotiated with us that we have very little land and that any future acquisition, therefore, would be ''only the minimum area necessary.''

Today, however, the U.S. military is proposing the takeover of another entire island. It is called Pagan. One more out of only 14 islands in the Northern Marianas, when we have already given up all of Farallon de Medinilla and two-thirds of Tinian—25 percent of our total land area of only 183 square miles. The military is proposing to use these lands for live-fire ranges, training courses, and maneuver areas.

I should explain that these are public lands and that decisions about the use of public lands in the Northern Marianas rests in the hands of the Governor and our legislators.

To lease lands to the military or not, what the terms and conditions of any lease may be, those decisions are an exercise in local self-government, and I will respect those local decisions. But as the official in Congress representing the people of the Northern Marianas, I want to be sure that the Federal Government also respects the decisions of the government of the Northern Marianas.

Again, that is what my amendment would do. My amendment simply assures that none of the funds we appropriate today will be used for the activities the military is proposing for public lands in the Northern Marianas without first obtaining the consent and the agreement of the Northern Marianas government and actually obtaining an agreement for the use of that land.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue. Obviously, he is a wonderful representative of the Mariana Islands.

However, given the way this amendment is written, it is unclear to me the impact that this may have on our military's future ability to train. So, regretfully, I must oppose this amendment, but I look forward to working with the gentleman to address his concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABLAN. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN very much.

Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way. You have a piece of property, and it belongs to you in title. I come over; and without asking you if I could use your land, I come in with a yardstick. I bring surveyors. I bring architects and engineers to your land, and I start drawing up my plans.

Would any person alive allow that to happen in the United States of America? They won't. Two-thirds of Tinian they already have. They are asking for an entirely new island, Mr. Chairman, and they would own 25 percent of the Northern Marianas.

They are going to fire howitzers in our community. They have claimed that on this one island there are no inhabitants. I happen to live two doors from these people. And that they are from Pagan. They live in Pagan. They are residents of Pagan. Many of them are in Saipan for work, just like many of us, 541 Members of Congress who come to Washington to work and go home every break—except for one, the Delegate from the District of Columbia. This is her home. All of us come to D.C. to work. Some of us, even those who don't have homes in our districts, claim that we go back to our districts because that is our home.

Present Federal law says that the United States Government, the military must first seek permission and obtain access to the property. They don't have that access. And in the meantime, until they obtain that access or an agreement for the use of that land, then they should cease and desist from any plans that they are making for the use of an island that they don't own.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the compassion and his conviction and would join in wanting to work with you, as the chairman has indicated, to see if there is some resolution to your concern.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't own the land. I am just bringing out facts here and bringing out the sentiments of my constituents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, since August 8, 2014, in Iraq——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The committee is prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under section 9014 for ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10003. None of the funds made available by this Act may be expended by the Department of the Navy to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any search and rescue units from the Marine Corps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would preserve a very important component of the Marine Corps: its search and rescue units.

According to the most recent Marine aviation plan, the Corps had these units slated for a divestiture by the end of the calendar year. I was glad to see that, after some public backlash on that plan, the Corps decided to temporarily postpone those divestiture plans. But just as easily as the Marines postpone their decision, they could also recommence.

I still believe such actions would be a bad decision, and I am not alone. That is why I am offering this bipartisan amendment with my colleagues, Representatives JONES, SINEMA, and BUTTERFIELD.

After many years, there were only two remaining search and rescue units left: one at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, Arizona, and one at MCAS Cherry Point, North Carolina.

Marine Corps Air Station Yuma search and rescue unit performed 72 rescue missions to aid surrounding communities from 2010 to 2014. Last October, the Yuma unit facilitated the rescue of 28 Boy Scouts and four chaperones who were lost during a canoe trip.

MCAS Cherry Point's search and rescue unit, known as VMR–1, performs roughly 50 missions annually to help retrieve lost paddlers and hikers. Just this past March, VMR–1 rescued a man who was reported missing during a kayaking trip near Cedar Island, North Carolina. This was not only a nighttime mission, but there was a heavy fog as well, so much so that the first rescue helicopter, known affectionately as Pedro, had to abort its first landing at a hospital in Morehead and ultimately travel 75 miles to Greenville, where the man was finally admitted for treatment.

But none of us have yet heard a viable alternative to sustain the mission of these search and rescue units. Law enforcement and first responders do not have these capabilities, and, apparently, no contractor does either. This proposed divestiture would literally cost lives.

I ask: What would have happened to these Boy Scouts if these marines didn't come to help? I ask my colleagues to support this amendment which was meant to save lives.

I thank the chair and ranking member.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, respectfully, I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Arizona's amendment.

The Marine Corps has an aviation plan calling for the orderly transfer of this capability to other entities. The East Coast mission will be assumed by the Coast Guard, while the West Coast mission will be competitively contracted out, as I understand it, in fiscal year 2017.

While we respect the gentleman's concerns, this amendment takes a rifle shot approach against the Department of Defense's force structure plan, and we believe that this is not good policy. Therefore, I urge opposition to the amendment and would appreciate the gentleman making the case for his position.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I join with the chairman in expressing my opposition.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, but we have had a series of amendments like this brought to the debate limiting transfers, limiting consideration of any movement or decisions or changes at the Department of Defense. At some point, we are going to have to allow the Department of Defense to run itself as well and not to second-guess that maybe sometime they actually will make improvements because of a decision they make, and for that reason, I do support my chairman in his opposition.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the idea that the East Coast may be absorbed may be one thing; but accordingly, from what I have heard down in Yuma, there is no viable option or contractor that has been and will be found for Yuma.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on May 28, 2014, narcotics agents, assisted by members of the Habersham County, Georgia, Special Response Team, executed a no-knock search warrant on a home on a quiet street. Officers terrified the sleeping family but did not find any drugs when they entered the home.

During the raid, a 2-year-old child, baby Bou Bou, was badly burned when the officers tossed a flash-bang grenade into his playpen which was located in a darkened room. The officers justified their actions by saying that their intelligence indicated that there would be no children present.

Mr. Chairman, as an editorial in The Washington Post noted: ''A flash-bang grenade is an explosive device that emits a deafening boom and a blinding flash of light. It is designed to temporarily stun the occupants of a building so that the armed men who deployed it can clear the building. It is an instrument of war.''

My amendment is simple. It would prohibit the transfer of flash-bang grenades from the Department of Defense to local law enforcement. The Department of Defense's 1033 program has helped to sometimes distort the relationship between the police and the communities they serve by allocating over $5 billion in surplus military equipment to local police, including flash-bang grenades. Nothing in current law prevents the military from giving police, including school and university police departments, flash-bang grenades. Allowing this loophole to exist puts our communities at risk of increasing militarization.

Mr. Chairman, while we have real tensions across the country, our police and their communities are not at war. Funneling free military equipment to the police, however, helps to further deepen the divide in our communities. The same Washington Post article I mentioned earlier cited over a dozen incidents in recent years where police injured themselves or others while using flash-bang grenades.

This amendment is not about regulating what types of equipment law enforcement agencies should or should not have. Instead, it is about whether this Congress should purchase flash-bang grenades for fighting wars abroad and then allow these flash-bang grenades to be transferred by the Department of Defense back to local law enforcement agencies for use here at home.

Local governments, in consultation with law enforcement agencies that they oversee, should decide what types of equipment the law enforcement agencies can acquire. Law enforcement agencies should not unilaterally make that decision independent of civilian authority. The local government can purchase whatever equipment they deem necessary for use by the agencies under their control through the local budgeting process, and they can also seek financial assistance through Federal grants.

This amendment doesn't touch grant money or State or local governments' freedom to purchase the equipment they need. The local budget process and Federal grant programs involve making choices based on need and funding. The 1033 program is an unregulated pipeline of free equipment directly from the Pentagon to the law enforcement agency. When the equipment is free and is plentiful and civilian authority is not involved, the calculus is very simple: why not accept free gifts of military equipment. However, if acquiring this equipment militarizes our police departments beyond comprehension, what kind of community policing are we actually performing? Or are we just simply occupying?

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very common sense. We should consider whether or not we want our country to move in this direction of militarization, and we certainly need our civilian authorities to be involved in that process. So the consequences are too dangerous to keep proliferating this weaponry on our streets, and I would ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and rise in support of it. There is no question that every law enforcement officer in our country is in possession of a very dangerous job.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) to finish his remarks.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman yielding, and I do recognize the very tough and dangerous job that

local enforcement officers have, every last one of them, and what an important job they do. I certainly have been active over my career in Congress working with the Department of Defense to transfer necessary equipment to law enforcement agencies.

But I would agree with the assertion of the gentleman that we do have to make a distinction with some of these types of materials between civil law enforcement and military action.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The Department of Defense excess property program does provide valuable surplus equipment to State and local law enforcement agencies for its use in counternarcotics and counterterrorism operations and to enhance officer safety.

It has, on occasion, provided aircraft, including helicopters and small planes, four-wheel-drive vehicles, pickup trucks, ambulances, and mobile command vehicles. It has provided vests and helmets to protect officers, all sorts of important protection equipment, including binoculars, radios, clothing, and information technology.

In a time of declining budgets, at the Federal level but also at the State and local level, this program is a good example of a Federal-local partnership that ensures that we get the most out of each tax dollar spent.

This amendment would restrict the Department's ability to put equipment they no longer need to use protecting our citizens within our local communities. We think it is a good program. It obviously ought to be monitored, and things ought to be only put in proper hands.

□ 0010

On occasion, horrible incidents do occur, but all in all, this program has been a valuable thing to many communities across America.

I do rise in opposition to the amendment and urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016.

Last year, it was brought to my attention by numerous sources in my district that in 2009, the Department of Army fully phased out the CWU–27/P Army aviation flight uniform and moved to the Army aircrew combat uniform, also known as the A2CU.

Those constituents of mine—many of whom are Active Duty, retired, or are friends and family of military personnel—have expressed a desire for the Army to go back to the CWU–27/P model uniform. There are multiple reasons to switch back to the CWU model uniform. The most important reasons to switch back to the CWU model are safety and efficiency.

To sweeten the deal when making the pitch to me, my constituents explained that moving back to the CWU model would also save the Department millions of dollars a year in procurement costs. All these factors led me to offer this same commonsense amendment last Congress, and it passed this body by a voice vote.

The CWU model has a proven track record of safety and practicality. The CWU model is still authorized for Army special operation aviators, all of the aviators in the other service branches of the U.S. military, and most air forces and navies around the world.

Yes, these points are a testament to the safety and efficiency of the CWU model, and the safety aspects are of paramount importance to our Army aviators because the chances of a fire in an aviation crash are very high.

The CWU model flight suits have an antistatic fiber woven into them to prevent sparks which, for obvious reasons, are not that desirable when operating an aircraft with thousands of pounds of highly volatile jet fuel on board. The one-piece design of the CWU model is also extremely important as it does not, in the event of fire, leave any opportunities for exposed skin.

Speaking to the cost savings, the A2CU model costs an average of 56 percent more than the CWU model, and the A2CU was proven to wear out faster than the CWU. Further, every time the Army decides to change the camouflage pattern of the duty uniform, they have to spend millions more purchasing the new flight uniform.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment does not score as it is written, but, being that the intent is to move back to the CWU model, the effects of the policy should actually net some cost savings. Conservative estimates show that the Army could save around $5 million a year in procurement costs if it were to move back to the CWU model.

Further, it should not cost anything to reintroduce the CWU model back into the supply system, as the rest of the service branches still use them. In other words, there is no need to reboot the supply chain.

The cost savings are tantalizing for someone like me, who was sent to this town to rein in spending, but more importantly, I listen to these Army aviators and flight operators. They tell me it is safer. Being that they are the ones doing the training and flying, I am going to have to take them at their word.

Given the safety and practicality applications and given that the United States is not exactly running a budget surplus right now, saving a few millions here and a few millions there in the name of safety and practicality is something we should all strive to achieve.

I urge my colleagues to once again support this commonsense amendment which cuts costs and improves safety.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me commend the gentleman from Arizona on his interest in the safety of our Army aviation personnel.

This amendment would prohibit the Army from spending additional funds to purchase the Army aircrew combat uniform. As an alternative, the Army could resume using a previous flight suit, the CWU–27/P that has not been authorized since 2009, except for special operators.

I understand this amendment is based on discussions with flight crews during visits with airfields and tactical training sites. The old model is a one-piece design. It is said to cost less and be more durable than the current model Army aircrew combat uniform.

The committee is interested in providing our soldiers with the best equipment possible; however, conclusions based on what appear—and I want to say this respectfully—on somewhat anecdotal information and brief discussions rarely lead to wise spending decisions.

I reluctantly urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I am pleased to yield to Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would want to associate myself with the chairman's remarks and again reiterate my previous comments that at some point, we ought to trust some judgments being made down at the Department of Defense and not just say no to everything. We ought to be making some decisions.

I appreciate the chairman's explanation of the situation and join him in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the two individuals that

the one-piece has been preferred by the aviators for the safety aspects because of the woven cloth. I think sometimes we have to have the administration start looking to the people that are actually in harm's way in this regard.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I begin by thanking Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. VISCLOSKY in conducting the amendments around these important considerations.

This amendment that I propose this evening limits arms, training, and other assistance to the neo-Nazi Ukrainian militia, the Azov Battalion.

Foreign Policy magazine has characterized the 1,000-man Azov Battalion as ''openly neo-Nazi'' and ''fascist.'' Numerous other news organizations, including The New York Times, The Guardian, and the Associated Press have corroborated the dominance of White supremacist and anti-Semitic views within the group; yet Ukraine's Interior Minister recently announced the Azov Battalion will be among the units to receive training and arms from Western allies, including the United States.

Azov's founder, Andriy Biletsky, organized the neo-Nazi group the Social-National Assembly in 2008. Azov men use neo-Nazi symbolism on their banner.

□ 0020

These groups run counter to American values, and once the fighting ends, they pose a significant threat to the Ukrainian Government and to the Ukrainian people. As we have seen many times, most notably within the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan, these groups will not lay down their arms once the conflict is over. They will turn their arms against their own people in order to enforce their hateful views.

I urge the support of my amendment and to make it U.S. law that we will not equip this dangerous neo-Nazi militia.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I think I speak for the committee in suggesting that we accept the gentleman's amendment and appreciate the fact that he wants to exercise care, as we do on the committee, to make sure whoever is trained is someone who is, if you would, a person of good intent, as opposed to someone who is not. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and for his offering the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, sheriff's departments and local police departments are local peace officers. They enforce the law and maintain peace and order. Ideally, they are members of the communities in which they serve.

The Department of Defense's 1033 program has helped to sometimes distort the relationship between police and their communities by providing over $5 billion in surplus military equipment to local police, including armored vehicles and military grade weapons. Police who patrol the streets and neighborhoods in armored MRAPs, while armed to the hilt, can easily lose sight of their role, which is to protect and serve, and, instead, take on the mindset of a paramilitary occupation force. The routine showing of military authority on our streets creates mistrust that only further deepens the divide between law enforcement and the people they are sworn to protect and serve.

My amendment is simple. It would prohibit the transfer of mine resistant ambush protected vehicles, or MRAPs—for free—straight from the Department of Defense to local law enforcement agencies.

This amendment is not about regulating what types of equipment law enforcement agencies and police should not have. Instead, it is about whether this Congress should purchase MRAPs for fighting wars abroad and then allow the Department of Defense to give that equipment away to civilian law enforcement here at home, for free, to use on the streets of America.

Local governments, in consultation with the law enforcement agencies they oversee, should decide what types of equipment their law enforcement agencies can acquire. Law enforcement agencies should not unilaterally make that decision independent of civilian authority. The local governments can purchase whatever equipment they deem necessary for use by the agencies under their control through their local budgeting process, and they can seek financial assistance to purchase necessary equipment from Federal grant programs.

This amendment doesn't touch grant money or the State's or local government's freedom to purchase the equipment it needs. The local budget process and application for Federal grant programs involve making choices based on need and funding, while the 1033 program is an unregulated pipeline of free equipment directly from the Pentagon to the law enforcement agency.

When the equipment is free and in plentiful supply and civilian authority is not involved, the calculus is very simple: Why not accept free equipment? Why not obtain equipment based on desire rather than need? However, if acquiring the equipment required the use of local funds or involved applying for grant money, the decision would be more deliberative and inclusive of civilian authority. Other factors would be considered, including whether there is a need for such equipment, how the equipment would be used, and whether the community consents to being policed with such equipment.

This amendment simply shuts off the pipeline of military equipment from the battlefield to our main streets. This amendment forces us to consider whether MRAPs, designed and purchased for battle in the Iraqi desert, are suitable for our local police. It forces us to consider whether an ordinary American citizen would truly feel

comfortable in approaching an officer for help if the officer were behind the wheel of a 15-ton armored vehicle that had just been returned from combat in Afghanistan.

This amendment would end the transfer of these armored vehicles to school systems and to universities across the country. Are our children so unruly that order can only be maintained with the use of an MRAP?

Unless this amendment passes, a vote for the underlying bill will ultimately fund the purchase of MRAPs, which will, one day, be transferred back home for use against our constituents. The consequences are too dangerous to continue this indiscriminate flow of weaponry to the streets of this Nation. I urge support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Rather than repeat myself, I think the Department of Defense excess property program does provide some very valuable equipment to local law enforcement. Of course, it is invaluable if it is used properly and with care. As a consequence, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out a furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) that—

(1) includes in the notice of the furlough made pursuant to section 752.404(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, ''sequestration'' as the reason for the furlough; and

(2) is of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is paid from amounts in a Working Capital Fund Account pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. COLE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am offering a bipartisan amendment which prohibits the furlough of civilian employees while funds remain in the defense working capital fund. The services provided by working capital fund employees are already fully funded apart from the appropriations process. In fact, imposing furloughs actually costs the taxpayers more through delayed production, overhead increases, and the need for overtime or the transfer of workload to more expensive sources of work. The amendment will prevent that from happening again as it did in 2013.

□ 0030

If working capital fund employees are furloughed, as they were in the last government shutdown, there will be no direct savings. Indeed, it will actually cost the taxpayers more money.

The furloughs delay production, increase the overhead, and in some cases transfer workload to more expensive sources of work. Indeed, senior military officials have expressed publicly that working capital fund employees, such as depot and shipyard workers, should be considered for exemption from furloughs because the furloughs actually hurt readiness and increase costs associated with production delays.

It is important to note that under this provision, DOD still has the authority to furlough working capital fund employees for disciplinary purposes. Further, working capital fund employees could be furloughed if funded workload dried up due to budget cuts or downsizing. Therefore, ending the threat of furloughs for these employees will save money, improve military readiness, and prevent needless delays and cost overruns from work that has already been funded.

I urge the support of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend and a member of our subcommittee, puts me in a very difficult position.

I complained in my opening remarks that some of our colleagues in the Congress, as I said earlier in the day, delight every time a civilian employee is furloughed. So I certainly appreciate the gist of the gentleman's amendment. We have a much larger problem that we and the administration need to address, and I know he feels the same way.

My concern with the particular amendment is we have other departments as well, whether it be the Department of Labor, Internal Revenue Service, EPA, Housing and Urban Development, and the list goes on, and ought not to select one agency over the other. I don't think it is the proper way to go.

We ought to collectively understand that the government actually does many good things to help the people of this country. We ought to value the work of each of our Federal employees, and we ought to block the furlough of any of them in any agency, not a particular one.

So I certainly do not disagree with the intent of the gentleman. I realize we are talking about the Department of Defense, but do believe that we ought to be looking at the broader question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to quickly respond to my friend. I share many of his sentiments. I certainly don't like to see anybody furloughed. I was not in favor of previous government shutdowns. I thought they were quite counterproductive.

This is, however, a unique case. The funds are already in existence. There is no savings. We are literally taking people out of work when we have funds set aside outside the appropriations process for them to continue their work. So in this case they really deserve to be excepted if we happen to make a mistake and stumble into a process like this again.

Again, I don't disagree with my friend's sentiments about the larger workforce. I have never found these things to be particularly productive. Indeed, as I recall, in every case we have always gone back and made everybody whole, so really the ultimate loser has usually been the taxpayer because we paid for work, created uncertainty that our Federal employees didn't deserve, but ultimately compensated them.

In this case, the funds are available. We should just keep people at work. They are doing an important job for the national security. So again, I would urge the passage of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principal—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission

of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading, please.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, the chairman of the committee has shown a great deal of courtesy and kindness and consideration, so I am going to try to keep this as short as possible.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are prepared to accept your amendment because it is so incredibly reasonable.

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Government Travel Charge Card expenses by military or civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for gaming, or for entertainment that includes topless or nude entertainers or participants, as prohibited by Department of Defense FMR, Volume 9, Chapter 3 and Department of Defense Instruction 1015.10 (enclosure 3, 14a and 14b).

Mr. GOSAR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer one final amendment to the DOD Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2016.

Let me express again my sincerest thanks to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their dedication.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we will be pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

Sec.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g3(c)(1)(A).

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the reading, please.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed the House by voice vote. The amendment seeks to prohibit the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST. I urge continued support for this amendment by both sides of the aisle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, we don't know its full impact. It could have some unintended consequences. This amendment could hamper legitimate communications between the intelligence community and NIST regarding security standards. This amendment is very broadly drafted. It could prevent NIST from consulting with other intelligence community agencies about that agency's internal computer system.

I know it was reported that the 2006 NIST cryptographic standard had a NASA back door. I want to make it clear that NIST says they did not deliberately weaken cryptographic standards at the behest of other government agencies. They assure us they will not do so in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, given that assurance.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and would associate myself again with his remarks and objection to the bill. We go to great pains on the subcommittee to protect the privacy of the American people, and I would agree with the assertions the chairman has made. I appreciate him yielding to me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can try to allay some of the concerns that have been expressed.

My amendment seeks to address a serious problem. A year-and-a-half ago it was revealed that the National Security Agency deliberately subverted American cryptographic standards. Cryptographic standards for the national security community and the commercial software industry are developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST. These standards are intended to protect Americans from foreign intelligence agencies, from cyber criminals, from industrial espionage, and from privacy violations by those who wish us harm.

□ 0040

They are embedded in software products which are used and sold widely—in fact, almost universally—in this country and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, media reports have confirmed that the National Security Agency successfully and deliberately weakened encryption standards promulgated by NIST to further NSA surveillance goals at the cost of privacy of ordinary U.S. citizens. This is extremely dangerous. It leaves users of those standards vulnerable to anybody who is familiar with those weaknesses, friend or foe.

As World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee put it:

It is naive to imagine that, if you deliberately introduce a weakness into a system, you will be the only one to use it.

My amendment would seek to address this issue and resolve it once and for all by prohibiting the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST.

To be clear about it, the intelligence community can continue to provide advice. What the intelligence community

cannot do is deliberately set out to weaken cryptographic standards because whatever it does in that regard will certainly be understood and exploited by our enemies, as we saw just last week when we witnessed the decryption of information regarding classified information and U.S. employees.

It is only common sense that we should not want taxpayers' dollars that are appropriated to one agency to be used to deliberately and actively subvert the work of another agency.

Therefore, I respectfully request support for this amendment on both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk replacing amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Sections (3)(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(g), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of Executive Order 13963.

(4) Subsections (c)(4), (c)(9), (c)(10), (c)(12), or (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(6) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(7) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment forbids scarce defense dollars from being allocated to fund three executive orders and several other provisions of law that require our military to squander billions of dollars in so-called green energy. The House adopted this amendment by a voice vote last year.

I would again remind the House that, just a few weeks ago, the so-called defense hawks warned that our defense budget has been strangled by sequestration, that every dollar wasted long ago had been wrung out of the Pentagon budget, and that our national security was directly imperiled as a result.

That argument carried the day, even though it will add billions of dollars to the national debt; yet, although we were told we didn't have enough money to adequately pay and supply troops in the field, it seems that we do have plenty of defense money to indulge the ''green energy'' mandates that are imposed on our Armed Forces.

What truly troubles me is that this was all aired during debate on the DOD Appropriations bill last year. The limiting amendments were adopted by voice vote; yet we see the same waste being allowed in this year's bill.

Let me refresh memories about the green energy mandates. The GAO reports that these mandates have cost the Navy as much as $150 per gallon for jet fuel. In 2012, the Navy was forced to purchase 450,000 gallons of biofuel for its so-called green fleet at the cost of $26.60 per gallon, when conventional petroleum cost just $2.50 per gallon.

These mandates forced the Air Force to pay $59 per gallon for 11,000 gallons of biofuel in 2012. That is 10 times more than regular jet fuel costs.

It is not just biofuels. Last year, the Pentagon was required to purchase over 1,000 Chevy Volts at a subsidized price of $40,000 each. As Senator Coburn's office pointed out: ''Each one of these $40,000 Chevy Volts represents the choice not to provide an entire infantry platoon with all new rifles or 50,000 rounds of ammunition that cannot be used for realistic training.''

These green energy mandates have required the Army and Navy to install solar arrays at various facilities. At Naval Station Norfolk, for example, the Navy spent $21 million to install a 10-acre solar array which will supply a grand total of 2 percent of the base electricity.

According to the inspector general's office, this project will save enough money to pay for itself in just 447 years. It is too bad solar panels only last about 25 years.

We don't know exactly how much these mandates waste because, as the GAO reports: ''There is currently no comprehensive inventory of which Federal agencies are implementing renewable energy-related initiatives and the types of initiatives they are implementing.''

Outside estimates are as much as $7 billion for the Department of Defense last year, a figure that is expected to grow in the future.

We are told this program is necessary for flexibility. Really? Shouldn't ''flexibility'' free us to get cheaper and more plentiful fuels, not more expensive and more exotic ones?

We are told the military should do its part for the environment as if it is possible to fight an environmentally sensitive war. That, I fear, is the real reason for this wasteful spending, to sacrifice our military budget on the altar of climate change.

This is part of an ideological crusade imposed on our military that will pointlessly consume billions of defense dollars mainly to keep money flowing to politically well-connected ''green energy'' companies that can't get anyone else to buy their products.

There is a reason that Admiral Mullen warned us that, in his professional military judgment, the greatest threat to our national security is our national debt. We just increased that debt because of assurances that we had stretched the defense budget to the breaking point.

As long as this program continues to consume billions of our defense dollars, that claim cannot be taken seriously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would start my remarks by saying the gentleman from California has me at a disadvantage because we just received a copy of the final amendment that was offered in the House. Lines 7 and 8 are new to the amendment and refer to Executive Order No. 13963, which is in addition to other items that I am opposed to.

I am told that those sections in that executive order refer to planning for sustainability, but I cannot confirm that to the Members of the House.

I do rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. He talks about exotic items—exotic items. The Department of Defense would be blocked from purchasing recycled paper. Let's not buy recycled paper at the Department of Defense. Now, there is a great idea.

The Department would be blocked from generating renewable energy that might include using tents with photovoltaic materials that generate solar power onsite for our troops in God-forsaken places on this planet with no other access to energy sources.

The Department would be blocked from considering sites for new Federal facilities that are pedestrian friendly and accessible to, God forbid, public transit. Perhaps we should move the Pentagon because it is near a Metro stop.

The Department would be blocked from cooperating with the Department of Energy's efforts to maximize the use of alternative fuels for our Federal fleet.

The Department of Defense is the largest purchaser of energy in the United States of America. As a former member of the Congress, I have a profound respect for Senator Dick Lugar from Indiana, as he characterized energy. It is not an energy problem so much as it is a national security issue, given where and how much energy we import.

The Department would also be blocked from advancing sustainable acquisition by trying to procure either less toxic or more water-efficient alternatives. My sense is that, in some portions of the State of California and

other areas, they are desperate for a couple of extra drops of water, but that might just be too exotic.

□ 0050

These are programs and initiatives that make sense, both for the environment and for fiscal responsibility. Moreover, the Department has been a leader in spurring new technologies, and I thought that is what drives the economy in America.

This amendment is terribly ill-advised, and I would strongly urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right. The military is the largest purchaser of energy in our economy. That is exactly the point.

They should not be forced to purchase energy at vastly inflated prices to soothe the ideological itch of the environmental left.

No one in his right mind would pull into a gas station to pay $26.60 per gallon for fuel when the gas station next door is selling it for $2.50. That is exactly what these executive orders are requiring our military to do. It is squandering billions of our dollars and making a mockery of any claim that we are stretching our defense dollars to the utmost.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUINTA) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–146) on the resolution (H. Res. 305) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0053

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act'' and such disposition is listed as ''willful'' or ''repeated''.

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from State?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, no hard-working American should ever have to worry that her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or takes money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. This practice is known as wage theft.

Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are allowed to apply for Federal contracts. This amendment will ensure that funds may not be used to enter into a contract with a government contractor that willfully, and this is important, Mr. Chairman, willfully or repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Other iterations of this amendment have simply identified any violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This one identifies only those contracts wherein the violator has been found to have been willfully or repeatedly in violation.

Now, I hope that both Republicans and Democrats can agree that willful and repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act are unacceptable; that we can find other contractors who do not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act willfully and repeatedly. And this amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support.

It also ensures that honest, good contractors who do not willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act can have contracts.

Why shouldn't the Federal Government work with contractors who have some modicum of respect for their employees and who do not willfully and repeatedly violate the Fair Labor Standards Act?

This amendment relies upon the violations reported to the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.

Again, when a contractor applies for a Federal contract, there is documentation they have to fill out, including the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, and that system looks back to look at the prior 5 years worth of criminal, civil, or administrative agency actions which have a final disposition.

None of these things are pending. None of these things are under appeal. They have been decided.

And this amendment says that wherein violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act have been decided and determined conclusively, and only in the category of those that have been willful and/or repeated, then those particular contractors are contractors whom the U.S. Government shouldn't be doing business with, at least for 5 years, until they clean their act up.

Now, I hope that no one in this body would want to stand on the side of the willful and repeated violators of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is impossible to me that any Member would want to do that, particularly when we are trying to promote and do business with honest, decent contractors, or at least average and mediocre contractors.

This one has gone to the, again, willful and repeated violators. Very difficult to stand next to them, and I hope

no Member of this body would do such a thing.

The amendment would ensure that a single inadvertent violation would not disqualify a contractor. And that is important. I have had some people say, well, what if somebody just messes up one time?

Well, no, that particular individual wouldn't be hit by this amendment. But the willful and repeated ones would.

So I think taxpayer money should be spent wisely. I think that as the largest purchaser of goods and services, the Federal Government must find a way to make sure funds are going to companies that treat their workers fairly and give American families a chance to succeed.

This is a serious problem, Mr. Chairman. The Economic Policy Institute found that ''In total, the average low-wage workers lose a stunning $2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing as much as 15 percent of their earned income.''

A report by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee of the U.S. Senate revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

This is a problem. This is a situation that must be remedied.

□ 0100

Similarly, the National Employment Law Project study found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime, and 11 percent have been forced to work ''off the clock.''

Upholding the rule of law is a bipartisan issue. I think that we may disagree on many things; taxes, spending, we disagree on that. There have even been people in this body who disagree that any violator of the Fair Labor Standards Act should get a contract, but I certainly hope that those people who are repeated—let me repeat—repeated and willful violators should be excluded at least for 5 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we all agree that bad actors who deny workers basic protections, including wage and overtime pay, shouldn't be rewarded with government contracts funded by taxpayer dollars, but this amendment is unnecessary.

There is a suspension and debarment process already in place under the current law. If an employer has a history of bad behavior, including ''willful'' and ''repeated'' violations of FLSA, the Fair Labor Standards Act, Federal agencies know about it and have the authority to deny that employer Federal contracts.

A report by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office found that litigation stemming from such claims continues to be a significant problem.

These aren't all bad actors. Often, they are employers trying to do the right thing, but are simply tripped up by an overly complex regulatory system.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, this amendment was voted down in the Transportation-HUD, Commerce-Justice-State, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Subcommittees; and likewise, it should also be on this floor.

I urge a ''no'' vote and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to provide for defense counsel for any individual described in section 8101(c).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from being used to provide defense counsel to foreign terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay.

Simply put, Mr. Chairman, our tax dollars should not be going to defend foreign terrorists. Hard-working taxpayers should not foot the legal bill of noncitizen terrorists who plotted to kill innocent Americans.

I recently visited Guantanamo Bay and learned firsthand of the outrageous amount of time these detainees spend with their taxpayer-funded counsel. I have asked the Department of Defense to provide me with the exact amount they have spent in legal defense services for detainees, but I have received no response. Mr. Chairman, I am sure millions of dollars have been spent defending these foreign terrorists.

Legal resources provided by the Department of Defense should be prioritized for American servicemembers. The pool of judge advocates that represents detainees at Guantanamo is a stand-alone unit. They are only assigned to act as defense attorneys for suspected terrorists. Meanwhile, there is another pool of military lawyers to represent all other American servicemembers.

Why should the DOD resources be assigned to defend foreign terrorists when they could, instead, be used to defend our own men and women in uniform? I am confident most Americans would agree that this money could be better spent within the Department of Defense, perhaps by making sure that our servicemembers are provided their legal counsel ahead of noncitizen terrorists.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

We have a Constitution in this country. It contains language talking about the right to be assisted by counsel, and there are many other provisions relative to the protection of individual human beings from the State.

We are a very large country with approximately 2 million people in the military. I think one of the great foundational issues in the United States is to protect any human being from that incredible amount of power so that you avoid abuse.

We have seen enough instances of abuse because of allegations of terrorists, many of whom are very real, mean, despicable people; but to now say that no one should have protection to make sure that that incredible power of the state is used justly and wisely is absolutely wrong.

We have had any number of Members, our colleagues here yesterday and today on this bill, offering amendments because they believe the Department of Energy made a mistake on uniforms for airmen, the Department of Defense made mistakes as far as whether or not we should move helicopters from one base to another, we have made mistakes as far as how we should have life-saving rescue missions for various aspects of the Department of Defense positioned throughout our great country.

What if, God forbid, all these allegations that the Department of State may make mistakes from time to time would actually have an impact on a human being, whoever they are, and that in the last instance, we don't give them one iota of protection that we give to murderers and rapists and burglar and arsonists in this country?

I think it is absolutely wrong for the gentleman to offer this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it simple.

This amendment is quite clear. If you don't want American tax dollars being spent to protect foreign terrorists who plotted to attack and kill innocent Americans, then vote ''yes.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that, if we are talking about the protection of taxpayers dollars, we should be talking about the protection of a human life and to make sure that that life, no matter whose life it is, is protected from the arbitrary use of power.

I again strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment that I think is just contrary to the foundational principles of the United States of America. We don't torture people. We protect people's lives in the United States, and now, to withdraw any protection for them is absolutely wrong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

□ 0110

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the authority of the President pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of the President and the responsibilities of the Defense Department continue in this new climate to grow. This has been a long journey in the Defense Appropriations process and amendments on the floor, and I would like to at this hour thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for their patience and their participation in the list of amendments that we have had the opportunity to present.

I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee. Therefore, I see a lot of the new approaches.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I believe the committee would be delighted to accept your amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am delighted, and I will finish up.

I thank the chairman and ranking member. The amendment deals with countering violent extremism. I look forward to working on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the security of our country and the world.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward:

SEC._____. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to contravene the authority of the President under article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment 177 is to affirm the President's authority under the Constitution.

Countering violent extremism and preventing the recruitment of American youth into violent extremism and preventing them from becoming foreign fighters for dangerous groups such as ISIL and other radical groups around the globe is a national imperative.

Earlier this year, I introduced the "No Fly For Foreign Fighters Act," legislation that will help keep foreign fighters and terrorists out of our country.

In introducing this legislation, I was particularly concerned about terrorist groups recruiting our youth.

In fact, I was part of a special roundtable along with DHS Secretary Johnson, in Houston, Texas on "Youth Engagement and Countering Violent Extremism".

During the discussion, Secretary Johnson and I addressed the importance of community engagement in preventing the recruitment of young Americans into terrorist groups.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help to prevent the recruitment of American youth as foreign fighters, a phenomenon that is unfortunately already taking root.

In March 2009, two-hundred schoolchildren in Britain (some as young as thirteen) had been identified and reported by community members—including parents, imams, and teachers—as being at risk of extremism or of being "groomed by radicalisers."

At least six boys between the ages of 13 and 16 were captured by U.S. Forces in Afghanistan in the initial fighting there.

In Iraq, U.S. forces detained more than 100 juveniles in the first year following the invasion, and more than 600 to date.

In the last few years a number of Somali-American young men have traveled to Somalia, possibly to train and fight with al-Shabaab.

At least one of these young men was killed during a suicide bombing attack in northern Somalia in October 2008, which is the first known instance of a U.S. citizen participating in a suicide attack.

Moreover, over 140 United States persons have traveled to Syria or Iraq to fight alongside ISIL, the Nusra Front, and other terrorist organizations.

Although there are no known instances of a U.S. person attempting to return from the region after participating in conflict, we must be vigilant against this prospect.

The Jackson Lee Amendment 177, seeks to protect youth and combat the actions of terrorist groups like Boko Haram and others who are using social media to bring them to their side.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is important because data shows that individuals recruited as foreign fighters from nations in Africa, Europe, and the Middle East have crossed borders and wreaked havoc and committed terroristic acts including kidnapping of youth similar to what Boko Haram has done.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to protecting our youth, preventing and combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism and violent extremism.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will do just that.

Jackson Lee Amendment 177 prevents terrorism by ascertaining that American youth are not seduced into becoming terrorists.

The Jackson Lee Amendment promotes the United States military's unparalleled expertise and technological capability to combat and defeat terrorists who hate our country and prey upon our children, innocent persons, women and the elderly across the globe.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai Peninsula are all global and national security threats that must be stopped.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will support the Department of Defense's efforts to prevent the recruitment of American youth into terrorism and the recovery of the still missing Chibok girls from Nigeria.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New Hampshire and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill to prevent any funds from being used to conduct a new round of military base closures through a process known as Base Realignment and Closure, also known as BRAC.

While President Obama continues to discuss the possibility of another round of BRAC as a way to reduce defense spending, we know all too well the negative impacts closing military bases have on our communities, States, national security, and military preparedness.

For more than 200 years, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has provided thousands of Granite Staters with jobs and contributed millions in revenue and military equipment for the United States Navy.

Today, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has roughly 100 naval officers and enlisted personnel assigned to the facility. In addition, the shipyard employs roughly 4,700 civilian employees and offers an active apprentice and engineer recruitment program in the communities surrounding the facility. This base is more than just helpful to our local economy and our military readiness. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is absolutely essential to New Hampshire. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is one of only four shipyards remaining in the country. Each of these facilities has a mission to overhaul, repair, and modernize our Nation's submarine fleet. These services are vital toward maintaining fleet readiness.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment to show our unwavering support for our men and women in arms.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, while I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, I wouldn't express it, if you would, that I will oppose his amendment, but I do want to express some very serious concerns.

The concern I have is that we do need to begin to think about future budgets for the Department of Defense; and as I have mentioned repeatedly tonight, we are going to have to start making some hard decisions, and changes will have to be made and cuts will have to be made. I am very concerned about Congress' continued failure to confront the challenges that we face at the Department of Defense and simply saying no, no, no, and that we shouldn't even consider any possible changes.

The Department of Defense has continuously proposed significant initiatives to provide for future flexibility to meet our national security strategy, and Congress has said no, no, no. I simply do not think we should foreclose any options to consider in order to possibly, God forbid, save money in the outyears.

A BRAC round is a reasonable approach that provides Congress a chance to say yes or no, and I would make the observation again that we have got to stop saying no to everything that the Department of Defense considers. In this case, I am not even aware there is a proposal for a BRAC, but let's say no anyway. I think we have to stop doing it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concerns. While I certainly hope that there is no BRAC round, there are concerns expressed by Members relative to the President's comments in this area as a method of reducing defense spending.

We have gone through sequestration. I have seen firsthand the concerns expressed by the civilian employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. They are the best and the brightest in the business, and I feel very strongly that this is important to New Hampshire and important to the defense of our Nation.

I certainly share the concern and welcome the opportunity to look at the Department of Defense to try to find efficiencies and effectiveness to make sure that our men and women are properly prepared, but I feel that a BRAC realignment would be inappropriate at this time. I hope that Members would support this amendment.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the rest of the committee for their hard work on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC.____. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by an officer or employee of the United States to query a collection of foreign intelligence information acquired under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) using a United States person identifier.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to queries for foreign intelligence information authorized under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805; 1842; 1881b; 1881c; 1881d), or title 18, United States Code, regardless of under what Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authority it was collected.

(c) Except as provided for in subsection (d), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 101(m) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(m))) alter its product or service to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1801(f))) of any user of such product or service for such agencies.

(d) Subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

Mr. MASSIE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the American people don't want to be spied on by their own government. Our Founding Fathers included the Fourth Amendment for a reason: to require probable cause and a warrant before the government and government agents can snoop on anyone.

During the 113th Congress, the House of Representatives passed the bipartisan amendment I am offering today by a 293–123 vote. This year, our bipartisan group is reuniting once again to shut down unconstitutional surveillance that does not meet the expectations of our constituents or the standards required by our Constitution.

Our amendment shuts one form of backdoor surveillance by prohibiting warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens.

The Director of National Intelligence has confirmed that the government searches vast amounts of data, including the content of emails and telephone calls without individual suspicion or probable cause.

□ 0120

At this time, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the Director of National Intelligence, which confirms this warrantless spying.

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, March 28, 2014.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: During the January 29, 2014, Worldwide Threat hearing, you cited declassified court documents from 2011 indicating that NSA sought and obtained the authority to query information collected under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence and Surveillance Act (FISA), using U.S. person identifiers, and asked whether any such queries had been conducted for the communications of specific Americans.

As reflected in the August 2013 Semiannual Assessment of Compliance with Procedures and Guidelines issued Pursuant to Section 702, which we declassified and released on August 21, 2013, there have been queries, using U.S. person identifiers, of communicatons lawfully acquired to obtain foreign intelligence by targeting non U.S. persons reasonably believed to be located outside the U.S. pursuant to Section 702 of FISA. These queries were performed pursuant to minimization procedures approved by the FISA Court as consistent with the statute and the Fourth Amendment. As you know, when Congress reauthorized Section 702, the proposal to restrict such queries was specifically raised and ultimately not adopted.

For further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Deirdre M. Walsh in the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. CLAPPER.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the Director of the FBI has also confirmed that he uses the information to build criminal cases against U.S. persons, but the Director of National Intelligence and the FBI are not above the Fourth Amendment, and this practice should end.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding in

support of the Massie-Lofgren amendment.

As mentioned, the declassified FISA court decision has indicated that substantially more warrantless communications are collected through 702 than 215.

We had a bill up to recently, the USA FREEDOM Act, that alleged that we were stopping bulk collection, but we didn't. During the markup of that bill in the Judiciary Committee, we offered this amendment; and everyone on the committee, including the chairman of the committee, said they were for this provision, but it wasn't the right time. Well, this is the right time.

That is why we have this broad support. It is the Massie-Lofgren-Sensenbrenner-Conyers-Poe-Gabbard-Jordan-O'Rourke. It is broad; it is bipartisan. It is supported by groups like the American Civil Liberties Union, as well as the Campaign for Liberty, Demand Progress, as well as FreedomWorks. This has broad bipartisan support.

The American people deserve this. When we have an interest in querying the 702 database for American citizens, get a warrant. That is what the Fourth Amendment requires.

Finally, this closes the opportunity to require backdoors on technology. As has been mentioned earlier by technologists and scientists, to do that just opens a door wide open for the bad guys and the hackers to break in.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague stated, my amendment also prohibits NSA and the CIA from placing backdoors into commercial products.

This is important because, in December of 2013, it was reported that a U.S. security company had received $10 million from the NSA to use a flawed encryption method. Our government should strengthen technology that protects our privacy, not take advantage of it.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restricts the use of section 702 of FISA, which is not currently up for reauthorization.

The law does not sunset until December of 2017. Any reform to this authority should be fully vetted by the authorizing committees and not inappropriately attached to our spending bill.

This amendment would impose greater restrictions on the intelligence community's ability to protect national security and create an impediment to our government's ability to locate threat information already in our government's possession. Such an impediment would potentially put American lives at risk of another terrorist attack.

Colleagues, the House recently passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, with overwhelmingly bipartisan support. It was signed into law last week. This amendment seeks to relitigate an issue fully litigated in the drafting of that legislation. A similar amendment was offered and rejected by the House Judiciary Committee during its markup of that bill.

The USA FREEDOM Act does include two reforms related to section 702 collection. These were reforms properly considered during the authorization process, not slapped on an appropriations bill without consideration and deliberation.

The first limits the government's use of information about U.S. persons that is obtained under section 702 that the FISA court later determines to be unlawful. The second provision requires the Director of National Intelligence to report annually the number of U.S. person queries under section 702.

Under current law, a U.S. person can only be the target of an intelligence gathering under FISA pursuant to an individualized court order based upon probable cause. The intelligence community is allowed to query communications it legally collects from foreigners for information about a U.S. person, so long as the query itself has foreign intelligence value.

This is no different from traditional criminal law. If the government has a legal wiretap on a drug dealer's cell phone and records a conversation where a second drug dealer talks about committing a murder, police can use that phone call as evidence against a second drug dealer in a murder trial. What matters is that the initial wiretap—or, here, the initial targeting of the foreign terrorist—was legal.

Colleagues, this is an issue critical to our national security, and it is complicated. Any changes to section 702 should be fully evaluated and voted on using the authorization committee process, which is the appropriate channel for considered review and debate on this critical issue.

Unfortunately, this amendment has not benefited from the work of the authorization process and would potentially put American lives at greater risk for another terrorist attack. That is not a risk many of us or certainly I am willing to take.

For this reason and many others, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. At this time, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The unclassified FISA court reported that the 702 search had, in fact, scooped up vast amounts of wholly domestic information. How does this work?

The upstream communications are tapped into by the NSA. In the digital world, your digital information, your domestic information is stored throughout the world. It is scooped up, and it is used.

The FBI has indicated it is used and the DNI has indicated it is used for wholly domestic purposes without a warrant routinely thousands, tens of thousands of times. It is in violation of the Fourth Amendment, and it must stop.

I would just say, on the Judiciary Committee, every member of the committee who declined to support this amendment said they were for the amendment and said we should offer it to the DOD appropriations bill.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, now, it has been said here tonight that this is not the time or the place to address these problems with 702, but, look, we have a constitutional crisis, and this was the excuse we were given in the Judiciary Committee when my colleague tried to get the amendment allowed there.

It was the same excuse I was given in the Rules Committee when we had an opportunity to address this, and I would maintain that 2017, 2 years from now, is too long to go in this constitutional crisis situation where we recognize something that illegal and/or unconstitutional is occurring; yet we don't do anything about it. This is the time to do something about it; this is the place to do something about it.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to deactivate the 440th airlift wing, or to move the personnel or aircraft of the 440th airlift wing, or to otherwise degrade the capabilities of the 440th airlift wing.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

□ 0130

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue my fight against the Air Force's misguided decision to shutter the 440th Airlift Wing.

As I have stated time and time again, the removal of the 440th Airlift Wing at Pope Army Airfield injects avoidable and unreasonable risks to our military readiness. Given the instability and uncertainty in the Middle East and around the world, I find it baffling that the Air Force has chosen to close such an efficient airlift wing that provides critical training to special operations forces and units such as the 82nd Airborne's Global Response Force.

I have failed to see the true cost savings and any benefits associated with this shortsighted proposal, and I will continue working with my colleagues to pursue every option possible in order to prevent the closure of the wing. Furthermore, I find it troubling that the Air Force has made a concerted effort to hollow out this wing before allowing congressional efforts to come to fruition.

Mr. Chairman, I simply lack the confidence that there will be no negative impacts to the training of Fort Bragg paratroopers and special operations forces. I will, therefore, continue to work with my North Carolina colleagues to prevent its closure.

I believe that this is a necessary effort to preserve the 440th Airlift Wing because of the vital and unique training mission that it has at Fort Bragg with our paratroopers. Our paratroopers have to be packed and ready at any given moment for their Global Response Force. I have paratroopers who simply live day-to-day, ready to leave at a moment's notice—within hours—around the world.

I believe that this is, again, a shortsighted, myopic decision on the Air Force's part, and I believe we need to be protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law, and it constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill. Therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant Federal official of which actions would degrade given capabilities.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2685, which would prevent any funds in this bill from being provided to Pakistan.

Over the last 15 years, the United States has provided Pakistan with over $25 billion, the vast majority of which has gone to its military and security services. With this money, which we are giving them at a time when we are borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars, Pakistan is using it to subsidize terrorists, some of whom are targeting Americans.

Just as bad, our largess enables Pakistan to repress its own citizens. Our military aid is being used to murder and brutalize the Baloch and Sindhi peoples, who are citizens of Pakistan. The Baloch people are being slaughtered as part of a campaign by Pakistan, in partnership with China, to steal the natural resources of the Baloch people. With our money, the Pakistanis are, in fact, murdering and repressing their own people, and they are aggressing upon their neighbors in Afghanistan and in India.

They also have, as we have heard, a much hyped cooperation against terrorism. I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a charade. This is the same Pakistan establishment that gave shelter to Osama bin Laden for years—Osama bin Laden, the mass murderer of Americans on 9/11. The establishment of Pakistan gave him shelter and gave him a place to hide all of those years, making a fool out of us as we provided them money.

In case there is any doubt that they knew about Osama bin Laden's hiding next-door, they rubbed our noses in their arrogance and hostility when they arrested Dr. Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who helped us find Osama bin Laden and bring him to justice. As we talk tonight, Dr. Afridi still painfully languishes in a Pakistani dungeon. While Dr. Afridi is imprisoned, Pakistan should not get 1 cent of aid from our country. This is an insult to us, and it is an insult to the victims of 9/11 that we are even considering giving money to the country which hid Osama bin Laden from us, much less giving them borrowed money, perhaps, from China.

Now we see we borrow money from China and give it to Pakistan, which then gives it to China. In exchange, of course, China is getting the natural resources of Pakistan, of the Baloch people, and they are, in fact, getting a pork facility in Qatar.

Our aid to Pakistan does not make us safer or the world more peaceful. The Pakistanis and other enemies of ours see it as a weakness on our part. This payoff we hope, of course, will bring more peace and will pay the Pakistanis off. No. It emboldens the Pakistani establishment in their criminal violence against their own people and in their destabilizing violence against Afghanistan and India. Let us note: if we want to have a peaceful situation in Afghanistan someday, we cannot keep subsidizing the ISI and the military in Pakistan, which is primarily responsible for that mayhem that is going on in Afghanistan.

□ 0140

The people of Afghanistan know that, and our own specialists know that. We are just hoping if we pay people off, things will settle down. It hasn't accomplished that mission. We have emboldened our enemies by being stupid by giving money to a country like Pakistan, which obviously hates our guts, when they hide the man who murdered thousands of people on 9/11 and then suggest they didn't know it, and then arrest the person who helped us find that murderer.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in prohibiting any more of our money—especially borrowed money, as we are borrowing it today—from going to these people in Pakistan, the leadership who are committing crimes against us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire conventionally armed air launched cruise missiles (AGM–86 C/D).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a very simple amendment that would help keep America's strategic forces strong and robust. My amendment would make sure that the U.S. Air Force keeps the air-launched cruise missile in their arsenal. That is the AGM–86 and its variants C and D.

The replacement missile, which I agree needs to happen, the long-range standoff weapon, has faced continuous delays. At this point, the replacement missile still remains years and years away from fielding.

I would like to applaud Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the committee for taking action in light of the numerous setbacks and delays of this program by appropriately rephasing funds in the underlying bill.

With such development uncertainty, I am disappointed to say that further delays are almost guaranteed.

In this high-threat environment, with heightened Russian aggression, their violations of the INF Treaty, which are now public, and also hostile Chinese adventurism in the South Pacific, we need to ensure that this Nation's defense is without a gap.

We simply can't afford to take these weapons out of the arsenal at this current moment until a replacement is up and operational. It is critically important that we maintain our existing inventory.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Let me say, we admire his strong conviction and advocacy for this program. We are prepared to accept his amendment with the understanding that we will need to study and discuss it with the Air Force to understand its full impact.

Mr. NUGENT. I absolutely appreciate the chairman doing that and would love to work with him.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____ (a) Notwithstanding section 8005 and 9003, of the unobligated funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2016 and made available in this Act, $3,500,000,000 is available to transfer to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, as authorized by subsection (b) of section 1022 of Public Law 113–291.

Mr. FORBES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, this is the second part of a two-part amendment that deals with the sea-based deterrence fund. We began this 4 weeks ago when the Armed Services Committee put in this fund. We, at that particular point in time, transferred $1.4 billion to the fund. In addition to that, we gave authorities for additional moneys to be transferred by the Department of Defense. Four weeks ago, we had 375 Members who voted in favor of that provision. When it was challenged on the floor a few hours ago, we had 321 Members who have supported that. All of the same individuals are supporting this fund that did so earlier.

I could repeat all that, but we have already done that, so I would just say all of the arguments we had earlier and all of the people who supported it then continue to support it now. I hope the will of the House will prevail and that the amendment will be accepted. If not, I hope it will be adopted by the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORBES) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE TO THE UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
Mr. DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
Ms. FRANKEL, Florida
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 611. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 653. An act to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 11, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1772. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael T. Linnington, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1773. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criterion —— First in the World Program [Docket No.: ED-2015-OPE-0001; CFDA Nos.: 84.116F and 84.116X] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1774. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Clarification for Energy Conservation Standards and Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1775. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Synthetic Iron Oxide; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2013-C-1008) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1776. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Postmarketing Safety Reports for Human Drug and Biological Products; Electronic Submission Requirements; Delay of Compliance Date; Safety Reporting Portal of Electronic Submission of Postmarketing Safety

Reports for Human Drugs and Nonvaccine Biological Products [Docket No.: FDA-2008-N-0334] (RIN: 0910-AF96) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1777. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Banned Devices; General Provisions; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0011] received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterinary Feed Directive [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0155] (RIN: 0910-AG95) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Grain Vacuuming Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Rescission Rules [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0358; FRL-9928-90-Region 7] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0246; FRL-9928-09-Region 9] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Decommissioning of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems and Amending Stage I Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0818; A-1-FRL-9928-86-Region 1] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard and Repeal of Cement Kilns Rule [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0821; FRL-9928-80-Region 6] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1783. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0938; FRL-9928-79-Region 6] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1784. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0423; FRL-9928-78-Region 3] received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1785. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-24; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1786. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that the President has directed the Secretary of State to inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his intent to exercise his authority to designate Tunisia as a Major Non-NATO Ally, pursuant to Sec. 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, (FAA), (22 U.S.C. 2321k); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1787. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting for consideration, draft legislation to extend, by 15 years, the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1788. A letter from the Chairwoman, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014, to March 31, 2015, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1789. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1790. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the 2014 Statement on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106, and the Bank's 2014 audited financial statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1791. A letter from the Director of National Intelligence, Intelligence Community, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 103H of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1792. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2014, to March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of Pub. L. 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1793. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the ''Fiscal Year 2014 Naval Petroleum Reserves Annual Report of Operations'', prepared by the Office of Fossil Energy, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7431(c); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1794. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lakeside July 4th Fireworks, Lake Erie; Lakeside, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0388] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1795. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones, Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1796. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in the Sector Columbia River Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0300] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1797. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage Rates — 2015 Annual Review and Adjustment [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0481] (RIN: 1625-AC22) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1798. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Loading and Outbound Transit of TUG THOMAS and BARGE OCEANUS, Savannah River; Savannah, GA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0280] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1799. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Biscayne Bay, Miami Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0719] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1800. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Detroit Belle Isle Grand Prix, Detroit River; Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0389] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1801. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Special Local Regulation, Annual Dragon Boat Races, Portland Oregon [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0453] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1802. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0415; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-18152; AD 2015-09-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 305. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to

an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, and providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory (Rept. 114–146). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants for career support for skilled internationally-educated health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 2710. A bill to revise various laws that interfere with the right of the people to obtain and use firearms for all lawful purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2711. A bill to delay the provision of the Affordable Care Act premium and cost-sharing subsidies until the eligibility verification process for such subsidies is completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2712. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the health care premium tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 2713. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2714. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2715. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 2716. A bill to empower States with authority for most taxing and spending for highway programs and mass transit programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2717. A bill to modify the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2718. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian tribes to further achievement of tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2720. A bill to require institutions of higher education to report annually on the use of race, color, or national origin in the admissions process; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2721. A bill to strengthen and expand proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BERA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. LEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HARDY, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TROTT, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HILL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOOLENAAR,

Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YODER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BLUM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2722. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2723. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Arthur Schneier in recognition of his pioneering role in promoting religious freedom and human rights throughout the world, for close to half a century; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to expand the use of telehealth under the TRICARE program and in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 2726. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the first manned landing on the moon; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2727. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving Fort Hood, Texas, and the City of Copperas Cove, Texas, to support the city's efforts to improve arterial transportation routes in the vicinity of Fort Hood and to promote economic development; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all trade agreements the United States enters into, should provide reasonable access and collaboration of each nation involved in such an agreement, for the purpose of search and recovery activities relating to members of the United States Armed Forces missing in action from prior wars or military conflicts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 304. A resolution electing certain Members to standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 306. A resolution recognizing the centennial of the wreck of the U.S.S. Memphis and encouraging the commemoration of such wreck with appropriate events and activities; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H. Res. 307. A resolution condemning the Republic of the Sudan for its actions to pardon Mubarak Mustafa, who was responsible for the escape of two men convicted of the assassination of John Granville on January 1, 2008, and calling on the United States Department of State to continue to include Sudan on the list of state sponsors of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 308. A resolution recognizing the importance of the Wisconsin Idea and the University of Wisconsin System for the benefit they have brought and continue to bring to the State of Wisconsin, the United States, and the world; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

53. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, urging the United States Congress and United States Fish and Wildlife Service to take certain actions to reduce the impact of common ravens on the greater sage grouse and desert tortoise populations in this State; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

54. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, expressing support for the 2014 Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan developed by the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council and urging the United States Fish and Wildlife Service not to list the greater sage-grouse as an endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Second Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DeSANTIS:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 2717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18; the Commerce clause and Necessary and Proper clause, which grant Congress the power to make laws that regulate commerce.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I of the Constitution of the United States of America:

''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

14th Amendment, U.S. Constitution; Article 1, U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. ''The Congress shall have Power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;''

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clauses 12

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 167: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 210: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 213: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 217: Mr. CARTER of Texas and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 232: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 276: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 287: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 335: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 427: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 448: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 449: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 465: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 472: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 492: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 525: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 528: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 563: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 653: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 676: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 686: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 692: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 699: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 702: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 721: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 746: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 766: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 767: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 794: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 825: Mr. DOLD and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 829: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 835: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 842: Mr. HARDY and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 846: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 868: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 885: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 912: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 918: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 920: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 923: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 940: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 953: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 994: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 999: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1002: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 1057: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1157: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1174: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1180: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1194: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1197: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1199: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1271: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1278: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1310: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1321: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1333: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1338: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1340: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1384: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1388: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1399: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1427: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1434: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1453: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1462: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1516: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1537: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1553: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1567: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1571: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1600: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1610: Mr. RUIZ and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1635: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1665: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1674: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1676: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1725: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1728: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1737: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1766: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1779: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1786: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1804: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1817: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1844: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1855: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1856: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1875: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1877: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1941: Mr. WOODALL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1943: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1969: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. JONES, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1977: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1994: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 2010: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2016: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2019: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2031: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2050: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2061: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 2072: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2133: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2142: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2152: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2170: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2177: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2191: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2212: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2216: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2233: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2238: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2251: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2255: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2259: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2280: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2303: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2304: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2309: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2315: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2350: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2355: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2358: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KLINE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2366: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2378: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2398: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2400: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2404: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2406: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2407: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2410: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2429: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2477: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2505: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2513: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2524: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2530: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2560: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 2563: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2603: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 2607: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2611: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2639: Mr. JONES and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2646: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2652: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2653: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2663: Ms. TITUS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HARDY.
H.R. 2675: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2680: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2689: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2692: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 2698: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. YODER.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. ROSS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. HARDY.
H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 12: Mr. POMPEO.
H. Res. 54: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 110: Mr. SALMON.
H. Res. 183: Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 207: Mr. PERRY and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 233: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 294: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 297: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1295

OFFERED BY: MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

AMENDMENT NO.1: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Findings.
Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.
Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.
Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.
Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.
Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.
Sec. 110. Reports.
Sec. 111. Technical amendments.
Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.
Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.
Sec. 402. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.
Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. Customs user fees.
Sec. 602. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.
Sec. 603. Elimination of modification of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.
Sec. 604. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.
Sec. 605. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.
Sec. 606. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''11 succeeding'' and inserting ''21 succeeding''; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''SEPTEMBER30,2015'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER30,2025'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.''.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol ''D'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol ''A'' or ''A*'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''If the President'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

''(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

''(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

''(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

''(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

''(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

''(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

''(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

''(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

''(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

''(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''for men and women'' after ''rights''.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as ''AGOA utilization strategies'');

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest'' and inserting '', through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have''; and

(B) by striking ''and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States'' and inserting '', complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''20'' and inserting ''30''; and

(B) by inserting after ''from those countries'' the following: '', particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.''.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have a expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) TERMINATION.—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African country'' means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED ARTICLE.—The term ''covered article'' means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms ''enter'' and ''entry'' include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.''.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''October 1'' for ''July 1'' each place such date appears.

(b) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4) and (5)'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''Footwear'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

''(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

''(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

''(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking ''succeeding 11 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(II) by striking ''December 19, 2018'' and inserting ''December 19, 2025''.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2020'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking ''For the purposes of subheadings'' and all that follows through ''6211.20.15'' and inserting ''For purposes of this chapter'';

(B) by striking ''garments classifiable in those subheadings'' and inserting ''a garment''; and

(C) by striking ''D 3600-81'' and inserting ''D 3779–81''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

''3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term 'recreational performance outerwear' means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

''(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

''(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

''(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

''(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

''(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

''(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

''(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

''(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

''(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

''(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

''(xi) Odor control technology.

The term 'recreational performance outerwear' does not include occupational outerwear.

''(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

''(i) The term 'treated with plastics' refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

''(ii) The term 'sealed seams' means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

''(iii) The term 'critically sealed seams' means—

''(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

''(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

''(iv) The term 'insulation for cold weather protection' means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

''(v) The term 'venting' refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

''(vi) The term 'articulated elbows or knees' refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

''(vii) The term 'reinforcement' refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

''(viii) The term 'weatherproof closure' means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

''(ix) The term 'multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar' means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

''(x) The terms 'adjustable powder skirt' and 'inner protective skirt' refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

''(xi) The term 'arm gusset' means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

''(xii) The term 'radial arm movement' refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

''(xiii) The term 'odor control technology' means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

''(xiv) The term 'occupational outerwear' means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

''(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as 'recreational performance outerwear'.

''(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.''.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:

	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	...
		Other:				...
	6201.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	...
		Other:				...
	6201.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	...
	6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6201.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	

	6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.30	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	".

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				

	6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%
		Other:			
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%

6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.40	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.93.45	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				

6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO,IL, JO,KR, MA,MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.41.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.20	Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	''.

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6203.43.15	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.25	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.35	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
	6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
	6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				

6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.49.15	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	''.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.61.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	''.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.20	Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.30	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
	6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	".

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6204.63.12	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				

6204.63.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	Other:				
6204.63.30	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	''.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.69	Of other textile materials:				
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
	6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Of silk or silk waste:				
	6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
	6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.40.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	

	6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.50.30	Having an outer surface impreg- nated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.32	Of cotton:				
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
	6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%	
	6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%	”.

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.39.10	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM)	58.5%	
	6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.42	Of cotton:				
	6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	
	6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	".

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
	6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	
	6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	".

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.49.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	".

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

"6. For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term 'protective active footwear' means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over $24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.".

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

"	6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	".

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

"	6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	".

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2024'' and inserting ''July 7, 2025''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2021'' and inserting ''June 30, 2025''.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than $1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. ELIMINATION OF MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking ''0.25 percent'' and inserting ''0.0 percent''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted and if the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, such amendment shall be executed as if this Act had been enacted after the date of the enactment of such other Act

SEC. 604. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.''.

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.''.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

''(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.''.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual's TIN.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 606. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(2) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$30'' and inserting ''$50'',

(B) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(C) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$60'' and inserting ''$100'',

(B) by striking ''$100'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$250'', and

(C) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN $5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000'',

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$175,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(B) by striking ''$500,000'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''$250'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500'', and

(2) by striking ''$1,500,000'' in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$30'' and inserting ''$50'',

(ii) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250'', and

(iii) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$60'' and inserting ''$100'',

(ii) by striking ''$100'' (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting ''$250'', and

(iii) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN $5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000'',

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$175,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000'', and

(ii) by striking ''$500,000'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$250'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500'', and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. DELANEY

AMENDMENT NO.6: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,463,000)''.

Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2015.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. NOLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SABLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,300,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $21,300,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. TAKAI

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000) (increased by $25,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used on the ground-based strategic deterrence unless the annual report that is submitted in 2016 under section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1576) includes a 25-year cost estimate of modernizing and sustaining the nuclear enterprise.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not more than $500,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used on the research and development of the long-range strike bomber until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the justification for procuring both the long-range strike bomber and the long-range standoff weapon.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,543,000) (increased by $3,543,000)''.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult, as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the assurance provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3(c)(1)(A).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by any department or agency of the United States other than the Armed Forces to operate an armed unmanned aerial vehicle.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 21: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Iraq Train and Equip Fund'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 22: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under section 9014 for ''Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine'' may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. YOHO

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deploy United States troops on the ground of Iraq or Syria (other than deployment of such troops for purposes of protecting United States embassies and consulates) unless Congress has enacted a specific authorization for the deployment of such troops.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SABLAN

AMENDMENT NO. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in contravention of section 801 of Public Law 94–241 or section 2663 of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Sections (3)(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(g), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of Executive Order 13963.

(4) Subsections (c)(4), (c)(9), (c)(10), (c)(12), or (e) of section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) Sections 400AA or 400FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(6) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(7) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHIFF

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. ROHRABACHER

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.