The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, from whom we come and to whom we go at last, in this quiet moment of prayer, we praise You for Your providence that undergirds our Nation and its leaders. Let Your Kingdom come and Your will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven.

Today, give our lawmakers grace to distinguish between that which is nation-serving and that which is self-serving. Make them committed to serving You by serving others. Give them the wisdom to separate the important from the unimportant, the big concern from the trivial contention. Use our Senators for the betterment of this Nation and the building of Your Kingdom.

And, Lord, we thank You for the wonderful work of our pages.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will continue its work on the National Defense Authorization Act today. Both the Republican and Democratic bill managers have called for Senators on both sides to get their amendments offered so we can get the process moving. I urge all of my colleagues to do so.

OBAMACARE
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, we have heard a lot about the Supreme Court’s imminent decision on ObamaCare and its latest problems. No one can say for sure how the Court will rule, but one thing we do know is this: ObamaCare is a mess. It is a law filled with broken promises, one that has been plagued by failure and one that has caused costs to skyrocket for millions after the supporters of this law promised the costs would actually fall.

I speak to you in the wake of a bombshell revelation from the administration that many insurers are now requesting to raise premiums by double digits all across the country. For instance, numbers for Kentucky just came out yesterday, and most of the insurers on the Commonwealth’s ObamaCare exchange are looking to raise premiums. Some of the proposed increases are as high as 25 percent, and some Kentuckians may now face double-digit premium increases for the second or even the third year in a row. This is more bad ObamaCare news for the people I represent.

In some States, the proposed increases are even more alarming, if you can believe it. Kentuckians can look next door for proof of that, where some Hoosiers could be hit with a 36-percent jump in their premiums, or if they look south to Tennessee, they will see that premium hikes of 36 percent have been proposed.

These are huge numbers, and they affect real people. We have seen the truth of that statement in the stories we hear from constituents about how ObamaCare’s massive cost burdens affect all of them. Take the Kentucky small business owner who wrote to say that his plan is now being canceled thanks to ObamaCare. Here is what he had to say: “My monthly premium will increase from $610 to [approximately] $1,200,” he said, “and this is with very high deductibles.” Or take the constituent of mine from Floyd County who recently wrote to say she can no longer afford her silver ObamaCare plan after the monthly premium is increased by more than 75 percent. “I was forced to take the Bronze Plan,” she said, “which isn’t worth the paper or ink to print it on.”

These are the kinds of stories that have become all too familiar in the age of ObamaCare. They are compounded by a continual drip, drip of bad news about this law, such as the recent report that showed how ObamaCare’s multibillion-dollar attack on hospitals in Kentucky is expected to result in a net loss of $1 billion over the next few years—a net loss of $1 billion to Kentucky hospitals.

This is after ObamaCare already compelled taxpayers to shell out billions for Web sites that never worked, along with some pretty sad and desperate but expensive taxpayer-financed marketing campaigns that often just directed users to some technological nightmare, not affordable health care. Take Oregon, for instance. Taxpayers spent over $300 million on that State’s exchange, only to have it taken over by the Federal Government and then, along with the ObamaCare exchange in Massachusetts, placed under Federal criminal investigation. Look at Hawaii, which received more than $205 million to establish its exchange. We learned just last month that the Hawaii exchange is planning to shut down operations by September 30 since lawmakers couldn’t decide on a path forward to pay for it. And then there is Vermont. This morning, the New York Times reported on the spectacular
crash of Vermont’s even more ambitious version of ObamaCare. Many on the left thought Vermont’s experiment would light the way forward on health care. In the end, it turned out to be a remarkable failure and, as one Vermont official put it, “an unending money pit.” The State’s health official now says that ObamaCare’s exchanges “just [weren’t] set up for success.” That is in Vermont.

ObamaCare is hitting small and mid-sized businesses, too. These are the engine of job growth in our economy, but too many of them are now facing premium hikes of nearly 20 percent because of ObamaCare. One 54-person company in Connecticut is facing up to $100,000 in new costs. Its owner says that ObamaCare “punishes companies for hiring new, younger workers,” and, indeed, the uncertainty is causing her company to hire temporary workers rather than create permanent jobs.

So while it is possible that ObamaCare will achieve its latter crisis, that is not going to change the grim reality of this law. It won’t change the broken promises, it won’t change the repeated failures, and it won’t change the fact that ObamaCare has led to skyrocketing costs for taxpayers, the small businesses that drive the American dream, and, most importantly, for middle-class Americans who work hard every single day and play by the rules.

It is about time the President and his party worked constructively with us to start over on real health reform that can lower costs and increase choice instead of hurting the middle class the way ObamaCare does. That is what the American people deserve.

BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, several weeks ago, I had the pleasure of meeting with Shwe Mann, speaker of the Burmese Parliament, on his visit to Washington. It was the third time we met. We had a cordial but frank discussion about the challenges and opportunities facing his country in 2015. There are obviously many issues that fall into both categories.

When it comes to challenges, there is the need for the government to do all it can to protect and assume responsibility for members of a long-suffering religious minority group, the Rohingya, thousands of whom have been forced to take to the high seas on dangerous makeshift vessels to escape persecution. There is the longstanding need for the government to continue its work with other ethnic minorities toward a permanent peace agreement that calls for political settlements in order to end a conflict as old as the modern Burmese State itself. Then there is the need for a constitutional reform to enhance civilian control of the military, along with more progress on efforts to protect liberties, such as freedom of the press, freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, and freedom of assembly. Those are just a few of the challenges facing Burma in 2015. But it is also true that Burma has come a long way from where it was just a few years ago. Reform has occurred, and considering the conditions within Burma when reform began, this is no small achievement. That is why there are opportunities as well.

The parliamentary election that will be held later this year represents a clear opportunity to demonstrate how far Burma has progressed. There are some encouraging signs that the election will be more credible, more inclusive, and more transparent than what we have seen in the past in that country. Unlike recent Burmese elections, international election monitors have been permitted to observe. By and large, the work of the Union Election Commission has been encouraging thus far, especially as it relates to serious budget constraints and the will to make it easier to run for office. And our Embassy, under the capable leadership of Ambassador Derek Mitchell, has been engaged in the process as well.

There are all positive signs, but it is going to take a sustained commitment by President Thein Sein’s government to ensure that as free and fair an election as possible takes place this fall because for all of the positive change we have seen in recent years, it is obvious that Burma still has much further to go. There are signs that its political reform effort has begun to falter, which is worrying for all of us who care about the Burmese people. It doesn’t mean Burmese officials can’t turn things around, I believe they can, which is what I indicated to the speaker when I met with him. I believe there is still time before the next critical test of Burma’s slow democratic development begins.

There may still be time to amend the Constitution, for instance, to ensure that it promotes rather than inhibits Burma’s democratic development. It is hard to claim democratic legitimacy with a Constitution that unreasonably limits who can run for President or that effectively locks in a parliamentary veto for the military.

At the very least, the six-party talks we have seen between President Thein Sein, Shwe Mann, opposition leader Aung San Suu Kyi, the military, ethnic groups, and others certainly represent progress. They should continue in a sustained fashion.

I also hope to see further progress on the draft national ceasefire reached between the Burmese Government and representatives from 16 ethnic groups in March.

Those of us who follow Burma want the country to succeed. We want it to succeed in carrying out a transparent, inclusive, and credible election on a broad scale. We know this standard goes far beyond simply holding an election without mass casualties or violence. It needs to be more than just holding an election without mass casualties or violence. It means the lead-up to the election must be transparent, inclusive, and credible, too. It means there should not be political favoritism shown by the state or its media organs. It means the freedom of the press and a peaceful assembly must be ensured. It means citizens must be allowed to register and to vote without harassment, and it means they must be granted equal opportunities to organize, to campaign, and to participate fully in the electoral process without fear and violence.

These basic standards of fairness are minimum goals Burmese officials must strive toward. If the Burmese Government gets this right, if it ensures a transparent, inclusive, and credible election, with results accepted by competing parties, that would go a long way toward reassuring Burma’s friends around the globe that it remains committed to political reform. But if we end up with an election not accepted by the Burmese people as reflecting their will, it will make further normalization of relations—at least as it concerns the legislative branch of our government—much more difficult.

For example, such an outcome would likely hinder further enhancement of U.S.-Burma economic ties and military-to-military relations. Further, an erosion of congressional confidence in Burma’s reform efforts would also make it more difficult for the executive branch to include Burma in the Generalized System of Preferences program or to enhance political military relations.

So these are some of the most pressing challenges and opportunities awaiting Burma in 2015. I noted many of them in my discussion with Burma’s parliamentary speaker.

I would close by making it clear that we in the United States will be watching intently to see what happens in Burma in the coming months, and we are prepared to continue doing what we can to encourage more positive change in that country.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

BURMA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have watched over the last decade Senator MCCONNELL, now focusing attention on Burma. It is remarkable the good he has done for that country. His vigilance in watching literally every move that government has made has been good for that country and I think good for the world, and I admire and appreciate the work he has done. There has not been a watchdog over any country that I am aware of who has been more intense than the senior Senator from Kentucky, keeping an eye on what goes
on in Burma. I appreciate his remarks today in that regard.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader can’t see the forest for the trees when it comes to health care. I understand that. He has given many speeches denigrating ObamaCare.

The facts are that more people are getting access to health care today under the Affordable Care Act than ever before. The share without insurance is now at an all-time low.

The cost growth in health care has never been lower than it has been since ObamaCare kicked in. I was telling one of my Senate friends yesterday that when I went home during the Memorial Day recess, I had two people come to me. I know that is not a great sampling, but it shows how impactful the legislation has been. Both of them had children with significant challenges, physical and mental. These young men and women now have the ability to get health care. They cannot be denied insurance because of their preexisting disability. This law that was passed not only applies to people with disabilities about which I have just spoken, but it applies to people with disabilities such as diabetes. Prior to ObamaCare, women could be charged more for their health care. So people are extremely satisfied with health care.

The Supreme Court should understand that about 7 million people who are happy with their health care and who are receiving subsidies for their insurance to take care of themselves would lose that. They would lose those subsidies. It would be a devastating blow to 7 million people, as well as to the economy. Also, those people who don’t need subsidies benefit significantly. The people who have had increased premiums—my friend was very selective in whom he chose, because the increases are very minimal. I will have more to say about that at some subsequent time in the near future.

ObamaCare is working. Reports out this week show that all the targets have been met as to people who have purchased insurance and they are paying their premiums. So I think we should try to improve the law rather than my Republican friends continually trying to talk about the failures that don’t exist.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every Senator wants to keep America safe, and that is why every Senator should be concerned about a particular threat to our national security. This threat to our national security is called sequestration. Sequestration puts in place drastic cuts to all funding, defense and nondefense. The Defense authorization bill that is before us today doesn’t fix that—and that is a gross understatement. We should not start spending until we develop a bipartisan budget that does. That is the only responsible way to protect both our national security and America’s middle class.

Sequestration results from what happened 4 years ago with another threat of a government shutdown because the Republicans couldn’t get their financial house in order.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 passed. That is a number of significant spending cuts and established a supercommittee led by Senator MURRAY and Congressman HENSARLING from Texas to produce a balanced, bipartisan agreement for additional deficit reduction. Unfortunately, Republicans could never agree. There was a lot of this: Yes, we are almost there, we are almost there. But they could never pull the trigger and agree. There was a refusal to close a single tax loophole to reduce the deficit; not a single one could they agree on.

So the supercommittee failed to reach an agreement, and the Budget Control Act triggered deep, automatic cuts.

Sequestration was never intended to happen. The point was to threaten cuts so deep and so stupid that Congress would never let them happen. But never put that beyond this Republican group over the last 10 years and who are still here in Congress. They allowed this stupid thing to happen. The cuts affected both defense and nondefense programs so everyone would feel compelled to move it, because the cuts were equal.

Unfortunately, what was stupid in 2011 is now official Republican policy. Congressional Republicans incorporated sequestration into their recent budget resolution. That resolution leaves sequestration cuts in place in parts of the budget that affect the middle class and also directly threaten our national security. There are many examples of this.

How does it affect the middle class? The list is really endless. It cuts investments in roads, bridges, rail, and transit. That costs jobs—lots and lots of jobs, hundreds of thousands of jobs. It puts travelers at risk, and it weakens our economy.

Sequestration cuts education. That means fewer children with a shot at going to college thanks to that, they don’t have a shot at success. It means fewer Americans who can afford college. That is the way it is. It means less economic opportunity for millions of Americans.

Sequestration cuts research. That means fewer chances to beat cancer, heart disease, and Alzheimer’s. As a result of sequestration, the National Institutes of Health, the premier medical research institution in the world, was whacked by sequestration to the tune of $1.6 billion in the 2015 fiscal year. They have never, ever gotten that money back. It stopped the finalization work done on the universal flu vaccine. The list is endless as to what they can’t do because of that money being lost.

While sequestration is a dagger pointed at the middle class, it also represents a threat to our society in many different ways. It means fewer opportunities for American businesses and consumers to benefit from cutting edge innovations.

Sequestration threatens cuts to the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It means fewer FBI resources devoted to terrorists and hunting them down.

Sequestration threatens cuts for the Transportation Security Administration, which helps protect us from another 9/11.

Sequestration threatens cuts for fusion centers, which have worked so well—these centers help law enforcement officials work together—and for the Coast Guard and border security officials who protect Americans from dangers from abroad.

These are cuts that are in place right now.

The bill before us is designed to provide an end run around sequestration for the Department of Defense by eliminating a provision that exempts Defense from spending cuts that apply to overseas contingency operations, or OCO. We all know that OCO was put in the budget many years ago, and it was set there so we would have the money to fight wars. It is always very hard to determine how much it is going to cost. We know that because we had to borrow almost $2 trillion for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, especially in Iraq.

But the OCO gimmick does not solve the problem of sequestration, and that is true. I am disappointed that even Senators who long have had a reputation for fiscal honesty, such as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my friend, are turning a blind eye to the OCO gimmick. There has not been a word from people who have had a reputation for fiscal honesty—not a word—about this gimmick.

The Department of Defense says it won’t work. It is just a 1-year gimmick, and that will make it impossible for military leaders to prepare for threats we face in the future.

The OCO gimmick does nothing for agencies that protect us here at home, such as, as I have indicated, the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security. That leaves all Americans vulnerable to attacks if they don’t get the resources they need.

So until we reach a balanced, bipartisan agreement on the budget—an agreement that protects both national security and the middle class—not a single spending bill will become law. If any bill reaches the President, he will veto it. He has said so publicly many times. He should. It is critical for the middle class, and it is the only way to be fiscally responsible. We ought to budget before we spend.

Days after letting critical national security tools expire on their watch,
Republicans are showing yet another way they can’t govern. Now we are wasting time on a bill that has no chance of becoming law—no chance. No troops will be helped by a bill that can’t be signed into law by the President. Our military needs all the help they can get, so let’s get serious.

If Republicans want to join us in supporting our troops, they should start taking their responsibility to govern seriously and work with us on a Defense bill that can actually become law to help those in our Armed Forces.

Let’s be straight. At the moment, we don’t have a budget.

Without the vote of a single Democrat, Republicans approved a non-binding resolution with their own wish list. It means nothing. The budget means nothing. There was a lot of back-slapping here: Oh, it is a great budget; we are going to balance the budget. But everyone knows that is just a farce.

Unless both parties join together, the government does not have a budget to actually guide decisionmaking. We need one.

This is not rocket science. After all, budgeting for the Federal Government is not that different than budgeting for a family. If two spouses are trying to resolve differences over their own budget, would it be responsible for one spouse to go out and buy a new car on credit? We all know the answer to that. It is the same here in Washington. Shouldn’t we agree on a budget first and spend later? That is not asking too much. I don’t believe.

We don’t need political theater and meaningless votes on bills that are going nowhere. We don’t need another manufactured crisis. We just need to sit down, get real, and fix sequestration in a way that protects both national security and the middle class. They go together.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1468 to amendment No. 1463, to limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending receipt from the President of the views limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Portman amendment No. 1522 to amendment No. 1463, to provide additional procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades, and to provide an offset.

Reed (for Bennett) amendment No. 1540 to amendment No. 1463, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to brief and submit a report to Congress on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facilities.

Cornyn amendment No. 1498 to amendment No. 1463, to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Reed (for Johnson) amendment No. 1494 to amendment No. 1462, to revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse.

Tillis amendment No. 1506 to amendment No. 1463, to provide for the stationing of C-190 aircraft of the Airworthy Modernization Program (AMP) in support of daily training and contingency requirements for Airborne and Special Operations Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate prior to the vote.

Mr. MCCAin. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be a vote at 10:15 a.m.; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 30 minutes of debate prior to the vote.

Mr. MCCAin. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I just listened to the words of the Senate minority leader concerning his views on an authorization bill—not an appropriations bill, not a funding bill but an authorization bill. I would hope the majority leader and, frankly, my colleague and friend, Senator Reid, would pay attention to what is going on in the world today.

I refer to the Washington Post this morning and an article entitled “Deadly fighting tests truce in Ukraine.” As many of us predicted, Vladimir Putin will continue his aggression and dismemberment of the Ukrainian nation for the first time in 70 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled “Deadly fighting tests truce in Ukraine” be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 2015]

DEADLY FIGHTING TESTS TRUCE IN UKRAINE

(By Karoun Demirjian)

Moscow—Continued skirmishes between pro-Russian rebels and government forces in eastern Ukraine Wednesday brought the intensity of attacks involving barrel bombs on rebel-held areas in northern Syria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 2015]

SYRIA LIKELY USED CHLORINE GAS IN RECENT BOMBING RAIDS, RIGHTS GROUP SAYS

(By Hugh Naylor)

BEIRUT—A prominent human rights group accused the Syrian government Wednesday of using toxic chemicals during a recent air-bombing raid on a rebel-held area near the outskirts of the city of Homs.

A human rights group said that an attack on Wednesday killed at least 18 dead and further threatening a ten-year cease-fire agreement signed in February. Both sides traded accusations about who had started the fighting in Marinka, a suburb of the government-held side of the cease-fire line. Separatists reported 15 dead, and three Ukrainian soldiers were killed, according to a Facebook post by Yevgeny Prigozhin, a Russian youth to Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko.

“They tried to move forward. The Ukrainian army is repelling all attacks, and the situation is under control.” Col. Andriy Lysenko, a spokesman for Ukraine’s National Security and Defense Council, said at a news conference Wednesday in Kiev.

Mr. President, we are showing yet another major example of yet another emergency session to give President Vladimir Putin the authority to send troops abroad.

On Wednesday, the speaker of the upper house of the Russian parliament met in an emergency session to give President Vladimir Putin the authority to send troops abroad.

It is too early to say whether this emergency session will take place. It is too early to say whether this emergency session will take place. It is too early to sign.

The surge in violence also comes as Western nations are gearing up for this weekend’s Group of Seven summit in Germany—an assembly of nations from which Russia was ousted when it annexed Crimea last year.

That annexation happened after the upper house of the Russian parliament met in an emergency session to give President Vladimir Putin the authority to send troops abroad.

A prominent human rights group accused the Syrian government Wednesday of using toxic chemicals during a recent air-bombing raid on a rebel-held area near the outskirts of the city of Homs.
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SYRIA LIKELY USED CHLORINE GAS IN RECENT BOMBING RAIDS, RIGHTS GROUP SAYS
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BEIRUT—A prominent human rights group accused the Syrian government Wednesday of using toxic chemicals during a recent air-bombing raid on a rebel-held area near the outskirts of the city of Homs.
surge in attacks involving barrel bombs on rebel-held areas in northern Syria.

Human Rights Watch said chlorine gas was probably used in at least three bombing raids that targeted several towns in Idlib province in April and May. At the same time, it responds brutally to any other Sunni group, militant or civilian, accusing President Bashar al-Assad in the north and east of Syria.

A Assad’s government has been accused by Western countries of using chemical weapons over the course of the four-year conflict, including an attack involving sarin gas in 2013 that killed hundreds of people in a suburb of the capital. Regime opponents and activists allege that Assad’s forces have punished residents in rebel-controlled areas with barrages of the crude weapons, which are built from oil drums or gas cylinders and can be filled with toxic chemicals such as chlorine gas. Barrel bombs have been dropped by regime helicopters and airplanes on residential areas, hospitals and markets, killing thousands of civilians, according to human rights groups.

Another group said two barrel bombings on Wednesday killed at least 24 people, including children, in Idlib and rebel-held areas of Aleppo province. The British-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights said that it expected the death toll to climb from those attacks. In its Wednesday report, Human Right Watch said evidence indicates that three attacks on towns in Idlib involved barrel bombs containing toxic chemicals. The group was unable to confirm the exact toxin used in the attacks, which it said killed 12 civilians and affected 22. It cited chlorine as the likely culprit based on interviews with first responders and doctors, as well as an examination of photographs and videos.

While the total number of attacks involving chlorine gas during that time is probably much higher, according to the report, which was released to coincide with the U.N. Security Council’s regular monthly meeting on chemical weapons in Syria. Citing evidence provided by doctors in Idlib, the group said 24 suspected chlorine gas attacks were carried out between May 16 and May 19, killing at least nine people and affecting over 500. "While council members debate over next steps at a snail’s pace, toxic chemicals are raining down on civilians in Syria," said Philip B androp, Human Rights Watch’s U.N. and crisis advocacy director, said in a statement. He said the Security Council should impose sanctions for the attacks.

In 2013, the Syrian government agreed to a deal brokered by the United States and Russia to eliminate its chemical weapons arsenal, forestalling potential U.S. airstrikes. The Syria agreement, which denies using chemical weapons, agreed to join the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) as part of the agreement. Last month emerged that OPCW inspectors found traces of sarin and VX nerve agent at a military research site in Syria, raising suspicion that the government had not eliminated its chemical weapons stockpiles.

Mr. MCCAIN. On the front page of the New York Times this morning: “ISIS Making Political Gains, Group Stakes Claim of Sunnis.” Ideologically unified, the Islamic State is emerging as a political movement in many Sunni areas, filling a void in the absence of solid national identity and security. At the same time, it responds brutally to any other Sunni group, militant or civilian, that poses a challenge to its supremacy.

That dual strategy, purporting to represent Sunni interests and attacking any group that vies to play the same role, has allowed it to grow in the face of withering air strikes.

In the news yesterday:

ISIS has closed off a dam to the north of Ramadi, cutting water supplies to pro-govern ment towns downstream and making it easier for its fighters to attack government forces. The U.S. has supported Sunni-led forces in maintaining only two or three of the dam’s 26 gates on the Euphrates River, denying water to numerous cities and using water to flood and damage civilian and military infrastructure.

"Iraq: ISIS fighters close Ramadi dam gates, cut off water to loyalist towns," that was on CNN.

"President Hassan Rouhani stated on Tuesday that," according to Reuters, "the Iranian nation and government will remain at the side of the Syrian nation and government until the end of the road." He also pledged to send reinforcements in backing Bashar al-Assad.

"U.S.: Shiite Fighters in Iraq Are a Necessary, if Unlikely, Ally"

Retired Marine Gen. John Allen, said the militias have an important role to play in liberating Anbar, so long as they “take command from the central authority.”

“Embedding U.S. forces can help inject energy into leadership development of new and weaker Iraqi commanders...”

AFP Beirut: “Iraq, Iran fighters deployed to defend Damascus.”

Thousands of Iranian and Iraqi forces have been deployed in Syria in recent weeks to bolster the defences of Damascus and its surroundings, a Syrian security force told AFP on Wednesday.

Iran’s official news agency IRNA quoted elite Revolutionary Guards General Qassem Soleimani as saying “in the coming days the world will be surprised by what we are preparing, in cooperation with Syrian military leaders.”

I point out to my colleagues, Qassem Soleimani is the guy who sent the cop- ertipped IEDs into Iraq that killed hundreds of soldiers and was also seen prominently in Baghdad and other parts of Iraq leading the Shi’ite militias.

Some of that is complicated. Some of it is impossible to make up.
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Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is correct, every uniformed Chief of service came before us and said the greatest crisis facing the military was the sequestration. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Budget Control Act, and they asked us to change it, and we didn’t change it.

If we are going to change it, then we have to make every effort and take every step we can to change that, and that is the point I have tried to raise in this committee—not by eliminating the funds available to the military but by making those funds subject to responsible action with following the request of the defense officials to eliminate sequestration. I think we should do it as soon as possible. If we don’t take every opportunity to make that case and every action possible to make that case, then we will be essentially rejecting the advice of our senior military leaders.

Suggesting that this bill is somehow so totally disconnected to the appropriations process is belied by the title of the bill. This is an act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense, for military construction, the defense activities in the Department of Energy. We are directly linked to the appropriations process. In the ideal world, the one that we authorize and would like to see, nothing can be appropriated, no dime can be spent, unless we have authorized it.

What we have done, effectively, in the bill—and I think it is not because it is the chairman’s first choice but because it was the only available option given the budget resolution—is that we have taken the overseas contingency account, bolstered it up dramatically, and set a new sort of pathway, which next year, unless we resolve this issue of the Budget Control Act, we will come back again with more money—and the following year.

Also, as has been pointed out, we will have situations where we will find some very strange things happening in our OCO account, because we can’t fund legitimate concerns of the government in other areas because of caps. That is essentially what happened in the eighties. That is why we have a significant amount of medical research money in the Department of Defense—not because the Department of Defense does it but because that was the only available option in the eighties and nineties to get money to where we thought we would need it.

I think the other issue here, too, is very implicit in our activity, which is that this bill is aimed at the Department of Defense and the military activities of the Department of Energy. Our national security is much more than that. The chairman read quite accurately reports about activity in the world, but up my way, in Roslindale, MA, there was an alleged terrorist who was confronted by an FBI agent and a Massachusetts police officer. That is the kind of terrorism a lot of people are concerned about, and if we sequester and cut off funding for the Department of Justice and the FBI and the Customs Service, et cetera, we will see this threat growing. So this is about a broader view, a wider view, and the overall mass security of the United States.

I know we have some votes pending, and I would like to go ahead and allow for my colleague to speak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes—the vote was scheduled at a quarter after—an additional 5 minutes in order to allow 3 minutes for the Senator from Colorado and 3 minutes for the other Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the Senator from Arizona and the chairman for his commitment and the rank-and-file responsibility on an enormous Federal project never happen again, but we all concluded that with greater accountability and transparency the right thing to do is to move forward and complete this critical facility.

As many of us have experienced up here in our own situation, the GAO has the necessary expertise to identify realistic, hard reforms and to make them stick.

Mr. President, I am very concerned about the VA and Congress are going to have to work together to get this project back on track. Finding the money to do this will be painful. It will be difficult, which is why we need to ensure that we account for every dollar that has been spent. But failing to complete this hospital, a hospital that would be a broken promise. Having a half-finished hospital in Colorado would be a national disgrace, and on behalf of our veterans, we cannot allow it to happen.

It would be a disservice—worse than a disservice—a national disgrace, to the worst kind to the hundreds of thousands of veterans across the Rocky Mountain region and throughout the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague from Colorado, Senator GARDNER, for joining me on this important amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I, too, echo the thanks to my colleague from Colorado, Senator BENNET, for his leadership on this effort. It is time that we take the VA hospital from the thorn of the budgetary process to the VA system, which we know it will be once it is completed. But in the meantime, there is a tremendous amount of work we have to do. I would like to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for allowing this time today on the floor.

I would note that there are four Members of this body who have actually visited the facility in Denver in recent months. The Presiding Officer has witnessed this hole in the ground right now that has already spent hundreds of millions of dollars, projected to be $1.73 billion at this point.

We have talked about the need to complete it and have committed to the country to finish this project, along with the chairman of the Veterans’ Committee, who has joined us on the floor today, Senator ISAKSON, who is here today with us, who is in support of this amendment to bring more accountability to the VA system so that we can understand what went wrong when they were building not only the Aurora facility but what went wrong around the country as project after project has seen cost overruns and delays.

Veterans gathered this past week in Colorado to rally to finish the darn thing. We have a Veterans’ Administration that time and time again has failed to take into account the necessity of measures and policies to fix it and to prevent it from ever happening again. With this amendment, we can start to find out where they went wrong and to hold them accountable. When the only person who has been fired is the person who said we were going to have a problem, there is something wrong with that.

I commend Senator BENNET for his leadership on fixing this problem.
building the hospital, and giving our veterans what they were promised.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his time today. I thank the chairman of the committee for enduring this conversation this morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

FLOOR PRIVILEGES

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I have a list of staff members of the Committee on Armed Services and I ask unanimously that the names on the list be granted the privilege of the floor at all times during the Senate's consideration of and votes relating to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

The list is as follows:

Barber, Adam; Barney, Steven; Bennett, Jody; Borawski, June; Brewer, Leah; Brose, Christian; Chuhua, Carolyn; Clark, Jon; Clark, Samantha; Davis, Lauren; Donovan, Matt; Edelman, Kathryn; Edwards, Allen; Epstein, Jonathan; Everett, Elizabeth; Goel, Anish; Goffus, Tom; Greene, Creighton; Greenwald, Bill; Guzelian, Ozge; Hayes, Jeremy; Hickey, James; Howard, Gary; Kerber, Jackie; King, Elizabeth; Kuken, Mike.

Leeling, Gary; Lehman, John; Lerner, Daniel; Lilly, Greg; McConnell, Kirk; McMamara, Maggie; Mcmahon, Bill; Nicolas, Natalie; Noblet, Mike; Patout, Brad; Potter, Jason; Quirk, John; Salmon, Diem; Sawyer, Brendan; Sayers, Eric; Schenemann, Leah; Seraphin, Arundhati; Sterling, Cord; Waisanen, Robert; Walker, Barry; Walker, Dustin; Wheelbarger, Katie; White, Jennifer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 122

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the amendment pending before us now is the Portman amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio. We spoke about it yesterday.

First, let me recognize that he is trying to do a very good job in modernizing the Stryker, which is a very critical piece of equipment. But I want to reiterate some of the concerns I have about the amendment. I know Senator PORTMAN will be here shortly to make a final comment on the amendment. The amendment would add $371 million of funding for procurement, research, and development of the lethality upgrade to the Stryker program.

I do not have to tell anyone around here that we are in a very tough budget situation and we look very closely at every request. The traditional way it is done is that there will be in the President's budget the request by the service department, including the Department of Army, and then the Army will submit an unfunded requirements list—that's priority elements that have not made the cut, if you will, in the President's budget. That was done in March. I understand that this whole requirement for the Stryker lethality upgrade came in in April. There is an issue of timing. But I think, nevertheless, because we did not have the opportunity to look at this as part of the overall unfunded requirements list—nor the Army, for that matter—we really do not have a sense of the priority. Is this the most important program that we can invest $371 million in at this moment for the benefit of the Army? Therefore, I am very concerned with moving forward without full and careful analysis both by the Department of the Army and by the committee, and we need, at this particular moment, this difficult time, to have that type of analysis.

The other thing is that this is the first step in a multiphase process. We are not quite sure how much additional funding will be needed over the next several years. It is clear from the Army that additional funding will be needed.

So we are at this time, without the usual review by the Army and by the committee, committing ourselves, perhaps, to significant funding going forward. The present estimate is that it will cost $3.8 million per vehicle. The plan is to upgrade about 81 vehicles. But it is something that, again, could be more expensive and will commit us over several years.

The funding for the vast majority of it—is going to be dedicated to one plant in a single State. Indeed, I think, generally and appropriately, it is a concern of the Senator from Ohio because most of the work will be done in Ohio. I think, again, he should be commended for being interested in what is happening in his home State.

So I appreciate the demand, but I just do not think this has gone through the process sufficiently for us to make that type of commitment today on the floor, and I will be opposing it right now.

I would also point out two other factors. First, the Army has the capability going forward, if this program becomes so critical and they raise it to the highest priority, to request a reprogramming of funds, to move money from one less significant priority to this program, if that is what they have, and that is an option they may well choose to use, but it will only be after their careful consideration of the other priorities that are facing the Army. I think that is a better way to do it.

The other factor I would point out is that the pay-for for this program is the foreign currency account. Basically, that is a hedge within the Department of Defense for their international transactions and the value of the U.S. dollar overseas. Well, the dollar is strong, and so there appears to be additional excess funds in that account, but currency over the next year could change dramatically. We have already put significant pressure on the dollar, so I am concerned that the Department of Defense has made for this hedge fund, if you will, against currency changes in the world going forward in their acquisition strategy. The House has used more. But I think we have been careful not to put too much weight on this account.

So for all of these reasons, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. Later, there will be an opportunity for the Department of the Army to reprogram funds if it is necessary.

I think this should have been done in the context of a careful review of all their priorities so we know exactly where it stands. Again, I think we are putting too much pressure on this currency account. It might turn out to evaporate these supposed savings. I yield the floor to see the Senator from Ohio has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I talked about an amendment that is absolutely crucial that we include in this legislation. Again, I commend the chairman, Senator McCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, for their work on this underlying bill. The amendment I am referring to is one that the Senate from Ohio has arrived.

Last night, as some of you know, Russian and separatist forces launched another aggressive act in the east of Ukraine, which is the largest attack since the February Minsk agreement. So this is just what so many people predicted, including President Poroshenko and others in Ukraine, which is that things are heating up again on the eastern border of Ukraine. We do not have the ability in Europe, because we have pulled our armored units out, and with credit having evaporated, we do not have the capacity to address the very real challenge now, unfortunately, that is emerging in Europe.

We have moved our armored units out, meaning there are not Abrams tanks there, except for a few units that were up in the Baltics on a temporary basis this spring. I visited them a couple of months ago. They are doing a terrific job, but they are leaving.

What the Army has said is, we want to allow our troops who are there to be able to up-arm, particularly with a weapon—a 30-millimeter cannon rather than a .50-caliber machine gun—on our vehicles to be able to have some credibility to say they can respond to this. We have pulled our armored units out, meaning there are not Abrams tanks there, except for a few units that were up in the Baltics on a temporary basis this spring. I visited them a couple of months ago. They are doing a terrific job, but they are leaving.

What the Army has said is, we want to allow our troops who are there to be able to up-arm, particularly with a weapon—a 30-millimeter cannon rather than a .50-caliber machine gun—on our vehicles to be able to have some credibility to say they can respond to this. We have pulled our armored units out, meaning there are not Abrams tanks there, except for a few units that were up in the Baltics on a temporary basis this spring. I visited them a couple of months ago. They are doing a terrific job, but they are leaving.

What the Army has said is, we want to allow our troops who are there to be able to up-arm, particularly with a weapon—a 30-millimeter cannon rather than a .50-caliber machine gun—on our vehicles to be able to have some credibility to say they can respond to this. We have pulled our armored units out, meaning there are not Abrams tanks there, except for a few units that were up in the Baltics on a temporary basis this spring. I visited them a couple of months ago. They are doing a terrific job, but they are leaving.
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taking this out of an account that is already being used for other purposes. It is already being used by the House Armed Services Committee. In fact, the House Armed Services Committee has already taken more funds out of this account than all of the funds in the SASC council, the Senate Appropriations Committee, plus this amount that I believe ought to be taken out of this account. This is called the foreign currency fluctuation account at the Department of Defense.

GAO, which is the body that looks at these issues from our perspective, from a legislative branch perspective—they are the auditors—GAO has estimated that the Pentagon will have $1.86 billion in surplus from these fluctuations by the end of fiscal year 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. So GAO has looked at this. They have said there will be $1.86 billion in surplus in these fluctuation accounts at the end of fiscal year 2016. They have significantly updated their figures now with even more recent data, and they have just adjusted the 2016 surplus even higher to $2.02 billion. No one has produced a currency projection to counter this GAO estimate. So we are talking about over $2 billion in this account that is available.

By the way, the money we are talking about here is not going to be taken and used for other readiness priorities because the SASC bill has already swept up that money for readiness. This money will be sitting in a reserve fund. The Pentagon does not need to be sitting on this size of a reserve fund—essentially a slush fund—when we do have these needs that have been identified. The Army has made a formal request for these. They have asked for assistance here. These deployed units need this assistance. They said they need it. We ought to put this to good use—namely, for an urgent requirement like this one.

Again, if you look at the House bill versus the Senate bill, the House has used more of this funding in this reserve fund, this slush fund, than we have used even when you include this additional requirement I am talking about today.

So this notion that somehow we cannot do this because the offset is not good—it just does not make any sense. It does not fit with what GAO has said, and it does not fit with what the House has done. So I do not know what the objection is, but I tell you what—if you vote against this, then you are saying that our troops in Europe ought not to have the capability that they have asked for, that they need.

Additionally, this came late. I am sorry about that. It should have come with it sooner. This was a requirement they had identified, but they had identified needing it later by 2020. Now, they need it now, and they need it now because the situation has changed in Europe.

We have to be flexible to be able to respond to that change. If we wait another 12 months, another year to do this, who knows what is going to happen. But I know one thing, having been in Eastern Europe recently, I know those countries of Eastern Europe and, in fact, those countries on the European Continent—our NATO partners, in particular, but also Ukraine—are looking to the United States of America to show that the commitment we have made on paper, to ensure we have that commitment in terms of our capability on the ground in Europe.

Again, this is an issue where I think we should come together as Democrats and Republicans. It is a bipartisan amendment. I commend Senator PETERS for identifying this need with the Army.

I understand Senator REED’s concern that this came late in the process, but it is here. The request has been made. I would sure hope we would be able to come together today, given what is happening right now on the eastern border of the United States of America, to ensure that we send a strong message that at a minimum, we are going to meet these requirements that the Army has insisted they need to be able to give our troops what they need to be able to keep the peace in this important part of the world.

I thank the President Pro tempore for the time. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, again, I recognize the way that the Senator from Ohio is articulating a need of the Army. The Army has made a formal request for these. They have asked for assistance here. These deployed units need this assistance. They said they need it. We ought to put this to good use—namely, for an urgent requirement like this one.

Again, if you look at the House bill versus the Senate bill, the House has used more of this funding in this reserve fund, this slush fund, than we have used even when you include this additional requirement I am talking about today.

So this notion that somehow we cannot do this because the offset is not good—it just does not make any sense. It does not fit with what GAO has said, and it does not fit with what the House has done. So I do not know what the objection is, but I tell you what—if you vote against this, then you are saying that our troops in Europe ought not to have the capability that they have asked for, that they need.

Admittedly, this came late. I am sorry about that. It should have come with it sooner. This was a requirement they had identified, but they had identified needing it later by 2020. Now, they need it now, and they need it now because the situation has changed in Europe.

We have to be flexible to be able to respond to that change. If we wait another 12 months, another year to do this, who knows what is going to happen. But I know one thing, having been in Eastern Europe recently, I know those countries of Eastern Europe and, in fact, those countries on the European Continent—our NATO partners, in particular, but also Ukraine—are looking to the United States of America to show that the commitment we have made on paper, to ensure we have that commitment in terms of our capability on the ground in Europe.

Again, this is an issue where I think we should come together as Democrats and Republicans. It is a bipartisan amendment. I commend Senator PETERS for identifying this need with the Army.

I understand Senator REED’s concern that this came late in the process, but it is here. The request has been made. I would sure hope we would be able to come together today, given what is happening right now on the eastern border of the United States of America, to ensure that we send a strong message that at a minimum, we are going to meet these requirements that the Army has insisted they need to be able to give our troops what they need to be able to keep the peace in this important part of the world.

I thank the President Pro tempore for the time. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, again, I recognize the way that the Senator from Ohio is articulating a need of the military. The question is how high the priority is.

Just one point I wish to make is that we do understand acutely the crisis in the Crimea, et cetera. The availability of this equipment would not be instantaneous. It would take many months to do the upgrade, to do the evaluations, et cetera.

Again, I think the best approach would be to allow the Department of the Army to make a judgment, to reprogram, if necessary, and to get this moving.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1522, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, for Mr. BENNET.

If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1522) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1540

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on amendment No. 1540, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, for Mr. BENNET.

If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1473. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

(Silence)

I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 1473) was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the retirement of Army combat units)

On page 38, line 12, insert after “FIGHTER AIRCRAFT” the following: “AND ARMY COMBAT UNITS.”

On page 43, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(e) **MINIMUM NUMBER OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.**—Section 3062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the section the following:

```
“(e)(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall maintain a total number of brigade combat teams for the regular Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘brigade combat team’ means any unit that consists of—

“(A) an arms branch maneuver brigade;

“(B) its assigned support units; and

“(C) its assigned fire teams.

(f) **LIMITATION ON ELIMINATION OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.**—

“(1) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not proceed with any decision to reduce the number of brigade combat teams for the regular Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

“(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT.—The Secretary may not eliminate any brigade combat team from the brigade combat teams of the regular Army as of the date of the enactment of this Act until the later of the following:

“(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required under paragraph (3).

“(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

“(i) the elimination of Army brigade combat teams will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy; and

“(ii) the reduction of such combat teams does not reduce the total number of brigade combat teams of the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

(g) **REPORT ON ELIMINATION OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.**—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

“(A) A justification for any proposed reduction of the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), and an operational analysis of the total strength of the Army that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the personnel of the Army so reduced.

“(B) An assessment of the implications for the Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve of the force mix ratio of Army troop strengths and combat units after such reduction.

“(C) Other matters relating to the reduction of the total strength of the Army as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days before the date on which the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, is reduced below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), the Secretary of the Army shall—

“(i) credit in the budget with (where applicable) the Director of the Army National Guard or Chief of the Army Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the reduction.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) A list of each major combat unit of the Army that will remain after the reduction, organized by division and enumerated down to the brigade combat team level or its equivalent, including for each such brigade combat team—

“(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

“(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

“(B) A list of each brigade combat team proposed for disestablishment, including for each such unit—

“(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

“(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

“(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

“(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed disestablishment.

“(E) A description of any anticipated changes to mobilization as a result of a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B).”
```

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I will return to the floor soon to lay out more fully what this amendment does. Fundamentally, it tries to protect our force structure, our personnel and, in particular, the core component of brigade combat teams as the Pentagon—the Defense Department—deals with curtailed resources.

I am very concerned, as are so many of us, that as defense budgets are cut, personnel and core resources in terms of end strength, including brigade combat teams, will suffer cuts that go well beyond fat and into meat and bone. We need to limit that. We need to avoid that. This amendment would do that with regard to brigade combat teams.

It does not increase spending. It reduces personnel and core resources in terms of end strength, including brigade combat teams, will suffer cuts that go well beyond fat and into meat and bone. We need to limit that. We need to avoid that. This amendment would do that with regard to brigade combat teams.

Mr. REED. Madam President, also I believe we anticipate taking up by voice vote the Tillis amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, for the benefit and in agreement with Senator REED, we will be having the Shaheen amendment, followed by side-by-side Markey and Cortyn amendments. And those votes, we are planning on, but haven’t confirmed, will probably be at around 1:45 p.m., and that would complete our activities. That is not totally agreed to, but that is the plan.

Mr. REED. Madam President, also I believe we anticipate taking up by voice vote the Tillis amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. We will voice vote the Tillis amendment, and we will be looking, hopefully, at a manager’s package, as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.
loved, she was not only going to lose a portion of her benefits but the VA was also going to withhold her future payments until she paid the VA back. This is just disgraceful—to cut the benefits earned by a combat veteran and then also require that she pay back the VA all because she was married and where she lives. Perhaps the most frustrating part of this story is knowing that if this woman moved across the border to another State, she would have no problems with the VA.

My amendment would fix this issue for these men and women who have volunteered to serve in our Armed Forces. They have volunteered to put themselves in harm’s way, to leave their families and their homes, and to travel around the world to protect America and our way of life. Yet they are being deprived of the very rights they have risked their lives to protect.

So again, let’s be clear what we are talking about. The Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional to deny Federal benefits to legally married, same-sex couples and their children. Yet, due to unrelated provisions of the Federal Code, State legislatures have the ability to indirectly deny Federal benefits to disabled veterans and their families solely because they are in a same-sex marriage. It is unjust and, according to the Supreme Court, it is unconstitutional.

Now, my amendment is not new to the Senate. The Veterans’ Affairs Committee approved it by a voice vote, and earlier this year, 57 Senators voted in favor of a budget resolution amendment on this issue. Now, when we vote—hopefully very soon on this amendment—Senators will have the opportunity to end an unjust and unconstitutional provision of law that discriminates against veterans.

Many of us talk about the need to honor the service of our veterans and to make sure that they have access to care they deserve, and we should all do that. But if you believe that all veterans, regardless of their sexual orientation, deserve equal access to the benefits they have risked their lives for, regardless of where they live, then you will vote in favor of this amendment.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of this amendment when it comes up for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I thank Senator REED, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, who has a distinguished military career of his own, for his support of this effort and his understanding of how important this is to so many veterans who have served.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 1645 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1643

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up the following amendment: Markey No. 1645. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) proposes an amendment numbered 1645 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil)

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

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EX- PORTS OF CRUDE OIL.

It is the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to allies and partners of the United States should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest and the purposes of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, what we are about to do is have a discussion about whether the United States of America should start exporting our oil—exporting our oil.

The United States right now, along with China, is the largest importer of oil in the world. We are not exactly at the intermediate. That is a price set in Cush- ing, OK.

If you are an oil company, you want to get our U.S. crude out on the world market because they will then be able to sell it for a much higher price. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with this? Is it to have the consumers will not get that oil at the lower price, and we will still have to import oil into our country because we are still short by millions of barrels of oil per day.

The consumer in America is the one who will be paying this tax on their price at the pump. That is the essence of what this whole strategy is about. It is to get the oil companies the highest price for the oil which is on the world market. But who is going to pay? Who has to have to have the price flipped upside down at the pump and have money shaked out of them so they have to pay a higher price? It will be the consumers.

If we want to give more money to the defense budget, let’s just do it. Let’s have a big debate about increasing the defense budget. Let’s have that debate. But let’s not have the American consumer at the pump be a special tax that is imposed in order to help our allies overseas. Ultimately, there is a beautiful access there where the oil industry is saying: Yes, sir, we are willing to put our crude oil on ships and send it overseas.

It is just a bad, bad economic policy for our country. We are already paying a high price at home. This exportation of our oil would also defray what our own Department of Energy is saying. Our Department of Energy is saying that in 2020, our oil production in America is going to peak, and then we are going to begin to go down once again in our oil production.

Who is saying this? Our Government. Who is saying this? The Energy Information Administration of the United States of America. What we are engaging in here is a premature attempt to export oil with the likelihood that by 2019 and 2020 our oil production is going to start to go down again. It also hurts our domestic oil refining industry. The Energy Information Administration has found that lifting this ban on the exportation of our own domestic crude could lead to a fundamental reduction in the amount of investment made by the American refining industry here on our own soil. Some $9 billion less would be invested because the oil would be sent overseas. The crude oil would get refined overseas. It would not be refined here in our own country with American workers and American companies doing it here on our own soil, helping our economy here.

This decision, by the way, that Members are going to be asked to make

It is called the Brent price. The Brent price is the world price of oil. That price is traditionally higher, much higher than the price of crude oil in the United States that is produced in the United States. That is West Texas intermediate. That is a price set in Cushing, OK.
today is opposed by the AFL-CIO. It is opposed by the steel workers, it is opposed by the League of Conservation Voters, by the Sierra Club, by Public Citizen, and by an entire group of American refiners.

This is a very broad coalition that has been put together. It is a broad base of interest in our own country that wants to make America stronger. How in the world can we be strong if we are exporting oil while we are still importing oil? So we have to import more and more oil, and the price is going to go up because they have to transport oil while we are still importing oil. Last year, we imported 5 million barrels of oil from Saudi Arabia, whereas we were exporting 6 million barrels. We have a foreign policy in the Middle East, and we are importing oil from Saudi Arabia. This is a disaster for consumers. It puts more money in their pockets.

From my perspective, this is about as desperate an attempt as the oil industry can have to get out from underneath the 1975 law. They have been looking for an opportunity. But, obviously, the instability in the Middle East makes us very cautious at this time. The oil fields of Saudi Arabia are now very vulnerable. They are right on the border. The Houthis being supported by Iran, right at the bottom of the Red Sea, makes that juncture very vulnerable. So we need an energy policy that is going to protect our interests.

We need a big debate in our country about oil and war in the Middle East. We are at a pivotal point here where the Ottoman Empire and all of the lines that were drawn 100 years ago are being erased and with that the protection of oil resources in the Middle East. We should not just have a debate on the Senate floor about cavalierly lifting the ban on the exportation of oil. We should have a debate about what this is going to mean for our country and oil area after oil area means for our country.

I would say to you that we should err in a way that is going to protect our own economy. That is what makes it possible for us to project the power around the world. It is that we are the strongest economy in the world, and the indispenensible life’s blood of economic growth is low-energy cost for every single country and every single consumer. It puts more money in their pockets.

This decision that the amendment of the Senator from Texas asks us to make will send us in the wrong direction. This is a disaster for consumers in our country. It is a disaster for the refiners in our country, and it is a disaster for the national security of our country. We should keep our resources here at home for American families, American businesses, to enhance our national security. The oil industry is going to tell you that it is in their economic interests, and I urge an aye vote on the amendment.

I ask for a rollcall on the amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, this morning, Majority Leader McConnell spoke about the need to bring down costs, the broken promises, and the repeated failures of the President’s health care law. He pointed out specifically how so many Americans are facing double-digit premium increases because of Obamacare. In his home State of Kentucky, some people face proposed increases as high as 25 percent. He noted that some people in Indiana could be hit with a 46-percent jump in their premiums.

So how did Democratic Leader Reid respond to the news of double-digit premium increases? He said people are extremely satisfied with health care. He said the people Majority Leader McConnell spoke about are having increases that are “very, very minimal.”

I wish to repeat that. The Democratic leader, on the floor of the Senate today, called premium increases of 25 and 46 percent very, very minimal. What world is he living in? How can Senate Democrats believe Americans are satisfied with their health care when they are facing double-digit premium increases? How on Earth can the Senate Democratic leader believe these increases are very, very minimal? They are shocking.

The Democrats have their head in the sand about the health care law. We can pick up Investor’s Business Daily, Monday, June 1: “ObamaCare Deductibles Soaring to $6,500 for Silver-Level Plan.”

Pick up the Wall Street Journal, Friday, May 22: “Health Insurers Seek Big Increases.”
I wish to speak a little bit about the reality of the law and why Republicans are committed to helping all Americans finally have access to affordable care.

We all remember when President Obama promised that his health care law would cause insurance premiums to go down—down—by an average of $2,500 per year, per family. So where do we stand now? A couple of weeks ago was the deadline for insurance companies to say what they intended to charge people for health care next year. This is the first time companies have been able to set their prices based on a full year of information about what much Obamacare actually costs. From what we have seen so far, the cost is enormous. A lot of Americans are going to be shocked by how much more their health insurance will be.

These higher premiums are just the latest evidence that Obamacare is an expensive failure. We have seen reports about a New Mexico company in New Mexico saying it wants to raise rates by almost 52 percent next year. The biggest insurer in Tennessee wants to raise its rates 36 percent. In Maryland, the largest insurer is planning to increase premiums by more than 30 percent. Yet, we hear Senator Reid on the Senate floor this morning saying these things don’t matter.

People who are in the President’s home State of Illinois right now are facing an average rate increase of 30 percent. It seems as though there is another headline every day about how expensive health care insurance is becoming.

The Wall Street Journal Tuesday: “Insurers Seek Big Premium Increases.”

I know there are some supporters of the law who like to say lots of people have insurance under Obamacare. How many of them are actually going to be paying these double-digit rate increases next year because of Obamacare? That is what Americans want to know.

On Monday, the Obama administration released information on rate hikes for people living in about 41 States. It turns out that 676 different insurance plans—different Obamacare insurance plans—offered for sale in these 41 States plan to raise their rates by double digits—by at least double digits. The average increase is 21 percent. About 6 million people getting their insurance from these plans will face double-digit rate increases next year. Do Democrats who voted for Obamacare think a 21-percent rate increase is affordable? Do they think a double-digit increase will help these 6 million hard-working Americans?

These numbers are so large, it is hard to even understand what they mean for a typical person. What does it mean that health insurance policies in Maryland might have an average rate increase of 30 percent? How does that impact someone’s life, their quality of life?

Let’s say there is a 40-year-old nonsmoker living in Annapolis, MD. He buys a silver plan from CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield, which is the biggest insurer in Maryland and the most popular kind of plan. According to the Wall Street Journal, the rates would go from about $2,900 for the year to nearly $3,700 next year. That is an $800-a-year increase. The President promised it would go down $2,500, and now it has gone up $800. That is how expensive Obamacare has become. It is far more costly than people thought it was going to be, than the insurers thought it was going to cost, and far more costly than the American people were told it was going to be.

I have heard Democrats who support this law say these are just the requested rates. They say we shouldn’t worry because State insurance agencies won’t allow these huge rate increases to take effect. Well, CareFirst, the company in Maryland that wants a 30-percent rate increase next year, raised its rates 16 percent last year. Hard-working people across the country are going to have to pay these enormous premiums because the President mandates they buy it. And many of them still won’t be able to actually use their insurance because the deductibles and the copays are so high.

This year, the average deductible for an Obamacare silver plan is almost $3,000 per person and more than $6,000 per family.

One has to ask, why are costs going up so much so fast? That is what a radio station in Kansas City, MO, KCUR-FM, asked. They reported last week, on May 27, that premiums for some plans in Kansas are going to go up 38 percent. According to the radio station, the increases “appear to be driven by requirements in the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare.” That is what they report.

The Kansas State Insurance Department said it was because of things like all of the coverage mandates in the law. Families are now paying for coverage they don’t need, and pay more than they want, and more than they can afford. A spokesman for the State insurance agency in the State of Kansas told the radio station, “These things cost money.”

What do people think about these enormous increases in their premiums? Are people happy because of all the extra money they have to pay because of Obamacare?

Let’s look at Connecticut. In Connecticut, they have been writing to the American families can’t afford Obamacare any longer.

Democrats need to admit that their health care law has been and continues to be an expensive failure. If they are ready to do that, then Republicans will work with them to help give people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise today to speak on my amendment No. 1578, the Military Justice Improvement Act, to ensure that survivors of military sexual assault group and then the President a professionalized military justice system.

Last year, despite earning the support of 55 Senators—a coalition spanning the entire ideological spectrum,
We can accept a system where women who were sexually harassed were 1,400 percent more likely to be sexually assaulted that same year or we can act.

We can accept a climate where supervisors and unit leaders were responsible for a significant portion of gender-based harassment and discrimination in nearly 60 percent of all cases or we can act.

My friends, I believe it is time that we provide our servicemembers with an unbiased justice system, one that is professionalized, where the decision-maker is trained in military justice. It is time to finally listen to the survivors who have told us over and over again that this reform is required to instill lost-confidence in the system.

It is very much time to do the right thing and act because every time we look at this problem, it seems to get worse. My office just reviewed 107 sexual assault case files from the largest base in the services. We requested that was for 1 year of sexual assaults. We requested the data to understand what actually happens once the reports are filed, how they are investigated, and how they move forward within the military justice system. We encountered all any other challenges we have to address. It took the Pentagon a year to respond to my document request. These 107 files are just a snapshot of the thousands of estimated cases that occur annually.

What we found, which was unexpected, was an alarming rate of assaults among two survivor groups who are not represented in the DOD survey. The DOD survey is all servicemembers. But what we found is that civilian women and military spouses are not counted in that survey, and of these 107 cases, in 53 percent of them, the survivor was either a military spouse or a civilian. These two categories of survivors are hidden in the shadows.

According to the DOD’s own SAPRO report, retaliation remains at 62 percent for women. Over one-third experienced administrative action, and 40 percent faced other forms of professional retaliation. That means your job changes in some meaningful way.

DOD admits they have made zero progress since 2012.

The carefully crafted and widely bipartisan Military Justice Improvement Act is designed to reduce the systemic failure that survivors of military sexual assault describe, in deciding whether to report the crimes committed against them, due to inherent conflicts of interest posed by the military chain of command’s current sole decisionmaking power over whether a case moves forward. This reform actually protects both the victim and the accused. We need to see an innocent person convicted any more than we want to see a guilty person go free.

Due process, professionalism, training, equal opportunity to justice is how we restore a broken system. It is time to move the sole decisionmaking power over whether serious crimes akin to a felony go to trial from the chain of command into the hands of nonbiased, professionally trained military prosecutors, where it belongs. And we do this while leaving military crime in the chain of command. So we completely carve-out anything that is military-related, such as missing in action or not honoring a command. In fact, the decision whether to prosecute the vast majority of crimes, including 37 serious crimes uniquely military in nature, plus all punishable crimes that have less than a year of confinement as a penalty, remain in the chain of command.

The brave men and women we sent to war to keep us safe deserve nothing
less than a justice system that is actually equal to their sacrifice. We owe that at least to them.

Thank you, Madam President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1211

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise in support of the NDAA that is on the floor now but also in strong support of an amendment that has been offered by Senator REED of Rhode Island to the NDAA. Actually, I have a deja vu feeling in the speech, because the speech is largely what I have offered an amendment to the NDAA in February of 2013; that is, the BCA budget caps and sequester.

To begin, before I focus on the amendment from my colleague from Rhode Island, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, I do think there is a lot of good policy in the NDAA. We worked on it together. That committee process is a productive one. I think we always find a great degree of bipartisanship as we are trying to craft a comprehensive description of our Nation’s military budget and support. There is much good policy, acquisition reform, and other key reforms that are part of this budget. There are some items that I feel very strongly about, dealing with shipbuilding and ship repair.

I think it is great that we are having the debate on the floor. We have had NDAAs passed, but we have not had a lot of floor time on them since 2013 and 2014. So the fact that we have are having this debate about the critical nature of our Nation’s defense and the authorizing bill on the floor is very positive.

There are some aspects of the NDAA that I do not like. There are some items that I wish were in there but that are not. That is part of the process. I think we could all say that, but I am glad we are having the debate on the floor. However, the item that is in the NDAA that I have the greatest concern about is the use of what I consider a flagrant budget gimmick to sneak defense spending caps that were imposed by the 2011 Budget Control Act.

I think it is dishonest, it is bad for the Nation’s defense. It is also bad for America’s non-defense priorities.

The good news is that the budget can be fixed. My colleague from Rhode Island, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, has a proposal to fix it. The proposal was offered in committee and rejected, and it has been offered again on the floor. I want to describe it and explain why I strongly support it.

First, there is the gimmick itself. Just for the public on this, in August of 2011, before either I or the President of the body, Congress passed the Budget Control Act that imposed a set of draconian budget caps on defense and nondefense spending as a punishment, in case Congress did not find a grand budget deal. So the wisdom of this body at that time was, we will sort of punish ourselves unless we can find a budget deal. I describe that colloquially as if we don’t do something smart, we will do something stupid.

Well, Congress did not do something smart. There wasn’t the grand budget deal that many hoped there would be. So on March 1, 2013, budget caps went into effect that put a significant crimp in both the defense and nondefense items in the Nation’s budget. The first speech I gave on the floor was in February 2013. After my first State recess week, I traveled around and I heard my constituents talk about how bad these caps would be, especially for the Nation’s defense. I shared what my constituents had described to me. But, nevertheless, the caps went into effect and we agreed, through the early 2020s, to limit in a very significant and tough way both defense and nondefense.

So what is the gimmick that is in this NDAA that is on the floor today? A decision was made that the world has changed since August 2011. ISIL has grown up and is gobbling up acres of territory. We are fighting against ISIL, as we were earlier in the year. North Korea is cyber-attacking major American corporations. Vladimir Putin has moved into Ukraine and is threatening other nations.

There are a lot of challenges. So it was the wisdom first of the President, in submitting the fiscal year 2016 budget, and then of the Armed Services Committee that living under the sequester was a bad idea. It is bad for the Nation. Instead of just saying: OK, the caps are a bad idea; let’s adjust the cap—which we can do with 60 votes in this body and the concurrence of the House—a decision was made: Let’s not adjust the cap, let’s end-run the cap.

So we want to exceed the cap. We want to exceed it by $38 billion in fiscal year 2016. But rather than adjust the cap, let’s do this: Let’s just take $38 billion in the OCO account. The OCO account, Overseas Contingency Operations. It is something that is not subject to the cap. It is supposed to be used for core warfighting activity. But the $38 billion does not represent core warfighting.

We spent $2 billion in the last year, for example, in the war on ISIL. We are not going to spend $38 billion in the next year. No, instead, we are going to fund all kinds of nonemergency, non-contingency, non-warfighting expenditures that would require an adjustment of the cap, and we are just going to put them into the OCO account, kind of a slush fund. By doing that, we end-run the law of Congress, the Budget Control Act.

I asserted, and I strongly believe, that this is dishonest, it is bad defense, and it is bad for the nondefense accounts. It is dishonest. It hurts defense. It is bad for nondefense. It is dishonest. It destroys the way the OCO account has been treated.

Once we go down that path, we are going to see everything going into the OCO account, and we will really end-run. So we are not being honest with ourselves, but especially, since we all know what the game is, we are not being honest with the public.

Second, putting this money, the $38 billion, in the OCO account is bad for defense. Defense spending caps that were imposed by the 2011 Budget Control Act. That is why we are doing this. That is why we are doing this. That is why we are doing this. By doing that, we end-run the budget caps. That is what we should do. We should not call expenditures for daily operations that are not core warfighting part of the OCO account. That violates the way the OCO account has been treated.

Once we go down that path, we are going to see everything going into the OCO account, and we will really end-run. So we are not being honest with ourselves, but especially, since we all know what the game is, we are not being honest with the public.

Second, putting this money, the $38 billion, in the OCO account is bad for defense. Defense spending caps that were imposed by the 2011 Budget Control Act. That is why we are doing this. That is why we are doing this. By doing that, we end-run the budget caps. That is what we should do. We should not call expenditures for daily operations that are not core warfighting part of the OCO account. That violates the way the OCO account has been treated.

Once we go down that path, we are going to see everything going into the OCO account, and we will really end-run. So we are not being honest with ourselves, but especially, since we all know what the game is, we are not being honest with the public.
I rise to say that the amendment that my colleague from Rhode Island, our ranking member, proposes does exactly that. It does exactly that. It takes the $38 billion that is in our budget, which I believe should be spent on defense, and it says that this money should be spent on defense and it should be spent the right way, as part of a base budget, not as part of OCO.

It puts a fence around those dollars and says that the money is there, and it is there for defense because the Nation needs it. The fence will keep the money from being utilized until we fix the BCA caps on both the defense and nondefense accounts.

If we do fix the BCA caps, that money will be available. Because of language included by the chair of the committee in the markup, fixing the budget caps would move the money from the OCO account into the defense base budget where it should be. I think we all know what the right answer is here, this $38 billion to be used to protect the Nation but to be part of the base budget, not the OCO account. To get there we need to fix the BCA caps across the board for defense and nondefense. The Reed amendment would accomplish that. That is the reason that I am on the floor today, to praise the debate on the NDAA but to say this is the right way to keep our Nation safe. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. today, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments: Shaheen No. 1494, spouse definition; Tillis No. 1506, C–130 aircraft; further, that there be no second-degree amendments in order to any of those amendments prior to the votes, and that the Shaheen amendment be subject to a 60 affirmative-vote threshold for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, on behalf of Senator PAUL of Kentucky, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1543.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeds to call the roll. There is no objection.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I rise with my friend from Arizona, Senator FLAKE, to speak about an amendment that he and I and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut have as part of this pending legislation.

Along with sports fans across America, I am thrilled to learn last month that many of the ceremonies honoring members of our armed services at NFL games are not actually being conducted out of a sense of patriotism but for profit in the form of millions of dollars in taxpayers' money going from the Department of Defense to wealthy NFL franchises.

In fact, NFL teams have received nearly $7 million in taxpayer dollars over the past 3 years from contracts with the Army National Guard, which include public tributes to American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. Our amendment would put an end to this shameful practice and ask the NFL to-forfeit the millions of dollars in revenues supporting our troops, veterans, and their families.

All Americans can agree that sports unite us, especially football. For generations, football has brought together people from every walk of life—from the first organized American football game between Rutgers and Princeton in 1869 to Super Bowl XLIX played in the great State of Arizona this February, which attracted more than 100 million viewers. This is the most watched TV program in history.

Football has been a unifying force for our Nation. Every weekend, from pee-too high school, college, and the NFL, for good seasons and bad. In combination, millions of passionate fans have bonded together. For many Americans, football is deeply patriotic and woven into the very fabric of our country's unique history and heritage. For several weeks every fall, this patriotic spirit grows, when the NFL takes time to honor the service and sacrifice of the brave young Americans serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Teams wear special camouflage uniforms, hold special game-day programming under the theme "Salute to Service." We have all been heartened by these patriotic displays, from the giant oversized flags and color guard pregame performances to half time tributes to hometown heroes. Every fan, whether united by team or divided by rivalry, comes together to thank those who have served and sacrificed on our Nation's behalf.

That is why I and so many other Americans were shocked and disappointed to learn that several NFL teams were not sponsoring these activities out of the goodness of their own hearts but were doing so to make an extra buck, taking money from American taxpayers in exchange for hours of Soldier Spotlights, that means many of the color guard performances and troop recognition ceremonies were actually funded with American tax dollars and pocketed by wealthy NFL teams.

For example, the Army National Guard spent $675,000 under contracts with the New England Patriots—hardly a deprived franchise—that included a program called "True Patriot," in which the team honored Guard soldiers at home games during halftime shows.

Other contracts funded color guard performances, flag ceremonies, and appearance fees to players for honoring local high school coaches and visiting students.

According to the information my office has received from the Army National Guard, the NFL received nearly $7 million in taxpayer dollars over the last 3 years from contracts for such activities including: pregame color guard ceremonies, pregame reenlistment ceremonies, pregame onfield American flag rollouts, ingame flag runners, half-time soldier recognition ceremonies, Guard-sponsored high school Player of the Week and Coach of the Week awards, and Guard-sponsored player appearances at local high schools.

The following teams had contracts in the past 3 years, according to the Army National Guard: Atlanta Falcons, $579,500; Baltimore Ravens, $350,000; Buffalo Bills, $350,000; Chicago Bears, $443,000; Cincinnati Bengals, $117,000; Dallas Cowboys, $302,500; Denver Broncos, $360,000; Detroit Lions, $193,000; Green Bay Packers, $300,000; Indianapolis Colts, $100,000; Miami Dolphins, Tampa Bay Buccaneers, and Jacksonville Jaguars, $160,000; Minnesota Vikings, $110,000; New Orleans Saints, $307,000; New York Giants, $212,500; Oakland Raiders, $275,000; Pittsburgh Steelers, $217,000; St. Louis Rams and Kansas City Chiefs, $60,000; San Diego Chargers, $453,500; San Francisco 49ers, $125,000; and Seattle Seahawks, $393,500.

What makes them all the more troubling is at the same time the Guard was spending millions on pro-sports advertising, it was also running out of money for critical training for our troops. In fact, at the end of fiscal year 2014, the National Guard Bureau and Army National Guard announced they were facing a $101 million shortfall in the account used to pay National Guardsmen and could face a delay in critical training and drills because they couldn't afford to pay soldiers despite the Guard was facing serious threats to meeting its primary mission and paying its current soldiers. It was spending millions of taxpayer dollars on speakership and advertising deals with professional sports leagues, such as the NFL.

This is obviously unacceptable. Providing for our common defense is the highest duty of the Federal Government. At a time of crippling budget cuts under sequestration, the Defense Department cannot use its limited resources for the benefit of sports leagues that rake in billions of dollars a year. Each of the four service Chiefs have warned before the Senate Armed Services Committee this year that sequestration is damaging our military readiness and putting American lives in danger. We must conserve every precious defense dollar we have at our disposal—which the NDAA does through important reforms to acquisition, military retirement, personnel, and contractors and which our amendment would support by ending taxpayer-funded soldier tributes at professional sporting events.
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In addition to ending this shameful practice, this amendment calls upon professional sports leagues like the NFL to donate—to donate—these ill-gotten profits to charities supporting American troops, veterans, and their families.

The NFL raked in revenues totaling some $9.5 billion. The absolute least they can do to begin to make up for this terrible misjudgment is to return those taxpayer dollars to charities supporting our troops, veterans, and military families.

I thank my fellow Senator from the State of Arizona, JEFF FLAKE, who has done terrific oversight of this issue. He was the first to expose it and similar cases of wasteful and excessive government spending.

I also commend Senator BLUMENTHAL for his longstanding commitment to our troops and veterans, as well as the other Members of this body who have supported our amendment.

Again, I thank the senior Senator from Arizona, JEFF FLAKE, who was first to blow the whistle on this egregious use of American tax dollars, and also Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I also thank the senior Senator from Arizona for helping me bring this amendment forward. I am proud to co-sponsor it with him and Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I wish to make a couple of points. We have asked the Pentagon for a full accounting, not just NFL teams but other teams that have received such money. We want to make sure this practice stops.

Part of the reason it needs to stop is these teams that were mentioned before by the senior Senator from Arizona and other teams that have received this kind of money do a lot for the military out of the goodness of their hearts. They do a lot for the military and for veterans who return, and we shouldn’t discount that and don’t want to discount that.

The problem is, when some teams are accepting money to do what has been termed “paid-for patriotism,” then it cheapens all the other good work that has been done by these sports teams and others. So it is important we stop this practice and make sure that when fans are there and they see this outpouring of support for the military, they know it is genuine—because there is a great deal of patriotism by those who attend these games. We want to make sure people recognize it is done for the right reason, and that is the reason for bringing this amendment forward.

I, again, thank the senior Senator from Arizona for his work on this amendment and other efforts to fight wasteful spending, making sure that the funding that goes to our military and that we appropriate for the Department of Defense—authorize for the Department of Defense—is used for military purposes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I withdraw my request with respect to amendment No. 1543. It is my understanding that the amendment No. 1543 is to go through and quite quickly. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I wish to comment briefly on the amendment proposed by my colleague from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, with respect to the stationing of the C-130 aircraft at Pope Army Airfield in North Carolina.

The amendment states that these aircraft shall be positioned in Pope Army Airfield. They are C-130 Avionics Modernization Program aircraft, the AMP program. Basically, they are C-130H models that were upgraded. In addition, the Air Force has C-130J models, the newest model. In the give-and-take of the budget deliberations over the last few years, this AMP modernization program is essentially curtailed dramatically because the choice has been made to buy new J models or fixing the old H models.

So, in effect, what we have is a group of C-130 modified aircraft that are at Little Rock Air Force Base. They are only being minimally maintained because the modified aircraft are not standard. They are different from the traditional hotel model, and they are as new or as modern as the J model, and they are not being supported with AMP-trained crews or AMP-unique logistics. Logistically, they are at Little Rock Air Force Base and sort of caught up in this funding and programmatic dilemma.

They are not fully deployable because of these conditions. They are just sort of additive to the structure of the C-130J. There are only three that are modified, with five more to be modified. That would be at $8 million per aircraft for about an additional multimillion dollar pricetag. Therefore, they are not as functional as a unit since there are only three aircraft and not a full complement. To operate these aircraft would require additional resources.

The thrust of the gentleman’s amendment is that these aircraft be transferred to Pope Air Force Base in North Carolina, but they would not really be effectively utilized by the forces there and would not, in my view at least, contribute to the training and the real-time operations of the 82nd Airborne Division, the XVIII Airborne Corps, and the special operations forces that are there.

So rather than doing that, what we did in the underlying legislation at section 126 is to go through and quite clearly mandate the adequacy of aircraft to support operations of the paratroop forces at Fort Bragg so that the Air Force is fully supportive of this very important issue. The 82nd is America’s most ready Army force, and of course we know special forces operators are all across the globe constantly.

So my comments are that this amendment would not essentially help what I think is the underlying goal, which is to ensure that our airborne forces have the platforms necessary. It would, in fact, restrict the flexibility of the Air Force in terms of using C-130 aircraft. It would practically have the effect of simply taking aircraft that because of their modification and their nonstandardization are being parked at Little Rock and moving them without effect, I think, on the operational capacity and capabilities of our airborne forces.

So as a result, I believe our best approach is to stay with the language in the underlying bill, section 126, which—to the credit of Senator TILLIS, he was very adamant about including—we should take a closer look at the operational capacity of the Air Force to support the airborne operations.

It would include the ability of commanders from the corps level, XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd, Special Operations Command, to consider effectively on whether the Air Force was doing this. After such a review and analysis, we could make better decisions about the allocation of the Air Force aircraft.

Part of the reason it needs to stop is these teams that were mentioned before by the senior Senator from Arizona and other teams that have received such money do a lot for the military and for veterans who return, and we shouldn’t discount that and don’t want to discount that.
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So as a result, I believe our best approach is to stay with the language in the underlying bill, section 126, which—to the credit of Senator TILLIS, he was very adamant about including—we should take a closer look at the operational capacity of the Air Force to support the airborne operations.

It would include the ability of commanders from the corps level, XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd, Special Operations Command, to consider effectively on whether the Air Force was doing this. After such a review and analysis, we could make better decisions about the allocation of the Air Force aircraft.

Again, I thank JEFF FLAKE, who was first to blow the whistle on this egregious use of American tax dollars, and also Senator BLUMENTHAL.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I also thank the senior Senator from Arizona for helping me bring this amendment forward. I am proud to co-sponsor it with him and Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I wish to make a couple of points. We have asked the Pentagon for a full accounting, not just NFL teams but other teams that have received such money. We want to make sure this practice stops.

The problem is, when some teams are accepting money to do what has been termed “paid-for patriotism,” then it cheapens all the other good work that has been done by these sports teams and others. So it is important we stop this practice and make sure that when fans are there and they see this outpouring of support for the military, they know it is genuine—because there is a great deal of patriotism by those who attend these games. We want to make sure people recognize it is done for the right reason, and that is the reason for bringing this amendment forward.
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Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I also thank the senior Senator from Arizona for helping me bring this amendment forward. I am proud to co-sponsor it with him and Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I wish to make a couple of points. We have asked the Pentagon for a full accounting, not just NFL teams but other teams that have received such money. We want to make sure this practice stops.

The problem is, when some teams are accepting money to do what has been termed “paid-for patriotism,” then it cheapens all the other good work that has been done by these sports teams and others. So it is important we stop this practice and make sure that when fans are there and they see this outpouring of support for the military, they know it is genuine—because there is a great deal of patriotism by those who attend these games. We want to make sure people recognize it is done for the right reason, and that is the reason for bringing this amendment forward.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I also thank the senior Senator from Arizona for helping me bring this amendment forward. I am proud to co-sponsor it with him and Senator BLUMENTHAL.

I yield the floor.
It is my belief Joe Biden has known for some period of time the progression of his son, Beau’s, cancer and, as a result, he has continued to carry on his public duties while at the same time carrying this huge burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech Joe Biden made to the Yale graduating class about 2 weeks ago on Class Day.

There being no objection, the material set forth below is hereby printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT YALE UNIVERSITY CLASS DAY, YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Hello, Yale! (Applause.) Great to see you all. (Applause.) Thank you very, very much.

Jeremy and Kiki, the entire Class of 2015, congratulations and thank you for inviting me to be part of this special day. You’re talented. You’ve worked hard, and you’ve earned this day.

Mr. or Ms. faculty, staff, it’s an honor to be here with all of you.

My wife teaches full-time. I want you to know that—at a community college, and has attended numerous commencement ceremonies, similar versions of Class Day, and I know they can hardly wait for the speaker to finish. (Laughter.) But I’ll do my best as quickly as possible.

To the parents, grandparents, siblings, family members, the Class of 2015—congratulations. I know how proud you must be. But, the Class of 2015, before I speak to you—please stand and applaud the ones who loved you no matter what you’re wearing on your head right now in this daylight. (Laughter and applause.) I promise you all this is a bigger day for them than it is for you. (Laughter.)

When President Obama asked me to be his Vice President, I said I only had two conditions: One, I wouldn’t wear any funny hats, even on Class Day. (Laughter.) And two, I wouldn’t change my brand. (Applause.)

Now, look, I realize no one ever doubts I mean what I say, the problem occasionally is I want to do more. There have been times when I’ve been up in the Senate or House, and moved heaven and earth to try to get something done. (Laughter.) And some of you have known me long enough to know what I go through to get something done and know what I go through to get something done.

Now, look, folks, I spent a lot of time thinking about what I should say to you today, but the more I thought about it, the more I thought that any Class Day speech is likely to be redundant. You already heard from Jessie J at Spring Fling. (Laughter.) So what in heaven could I possibly say.

Look, I’m deeply honored that Jeremy and Kiki selected me. I don’t know how the hell you trusted them to do that. (Laughter.) I hope you agree with their choice. Actually, I hope by the end of this speech, they agree with their choice. (Laughter.)

In their flattering invitation letter, they asked me to bring along a sense of humor, speak about my commitment to public service and family, talk about resiliency, compassion, and leadership in a changing world. Petty at all, (Laughter.) I probably already flunked the first part of the test.

But with the rest let me say upfront, and I mean this sincerely, there’s nothing particularly similar to mine or much worse than what I’ve suffered through personal loss and personal pain. But with the rest, I hope you’ll agree that there are some things I can say that you can agree with your choice. I hope by the end of this speech, they agree with their choice. (Laughter.)

Those who know me well know that I am not a great speaker. I’m not a great writer. I’m not a great musician. But what I do have is a real appreciation for the people in this room. Not only for the members of my family, but for the grace of God, there go you—but for the grace of God, there go you.

And a father who lived his motto that, failure is the beginning, and success is not the end. And like many of you and your parents, I was fortunate. I learned early on what I wanted to do, what fulfilled me the most, what made me happy, what I believed in—faith, family was the beginning, the middle, and the end. And like many of you and your parents, I was fortunate. I learned early on what I wanted to do, what fulfilled me the most, what made me happy, what I believed in—faith, family was the beginning, the middle, and the end. And like many of you and your parents, I was fortunate. I learned early on what I wanted to do, what fulfilled me the most, what made me happy, what I believed in—faith, family was the beginning, the middle, and the end.

You each have different comfort levels. Everyone has different goals and aspirations. But one thing I’ve observed, one thing I believe is true, one thing I’ve seen—life is unfair. And often, the truth is, real. He used to say, it’s a lucky man or woman gets up in the morning—and I mean this sincerely. It was one of his expressions.

It’s a lucky man or woman gets up in the morning, puts both feet on the floor, knows what they’re about to do, and thinks it still matters. I’ve been lucky. And my wish for all of you is that not only tomorrow, but 20 and 40 and 50 years from now, you’ve found that sweet spot where you can say: I woke up in the morning, put both feet on the floor, go out and pursue what you love, and think it still matters.

Because of you, you will go to Silicon Valley and make great contributions to empower individuals and societies and maybe even design
Don’t forget about what doesn’t come from this prestigious diploma—the heart to know what’s meaningful and what’s ephemeral; and the head to know the difference between knowledge and judgment. But even if you get these things right, I’ve observed that most people who are successful and happy remembered a third thing: Reality has a gift of humility.

I got elected in a very improbable year. Richard Nixon won my state overwhelming. George McGovern was on top of the ticket. I got elected as the second-youngest man in the history of the United States to be elected, the stuff that provides and ambitions. He was careful, it fuels a sense of inevitability that seeps in. But be careful. Things can change in a heartbeat. I know. And so do many of your parents.

Six weeks after my election, my whole world was altered forever. While I was in Washington helping staff, I got a phone call. My wife and three children were Christmas shopping, a tractor trailer broadsided them and killed my wife and killed my daughter. They weren’t sure that my sons would live.

Many people have gone through things like that. But because I had the incredible good fortune to find and be imbued with a sense of obligation imparted to each of us, I not only got help, but by focusing on my sons, I found my reality.

I can remember my mother—a sweet lady—looking at me, after we left the hospital, and saying, ‘‘Look at all the guys who went to the White House, Sam Cohen, and Andrew Heymann—will be commissioned in the United States Army, the Navy, the Air Force. You know that what happens to you, something good will come if you look hard enough for it. She was right.

The incredible bond I have with my children is that gift. I’m not sure I would have had, had I not been through what I went through. Who knows whether I would have been able to appreciate that moment in my life, the heady moment in my life, what my first obligation was.

So I began to commute—never intending to stay in Washington. And that’s the God’s truth. I was supposed to be sworn in with everyone else that year in ’73, but I wouldn’t go down. So Mansfield thought I’d change my mind and not come, and he sent up the secretary of the Senate to swear me in, in the hospital room with my children.

I began to commute—never intending to stay in Washington. And that’s the God’s truth. I was supposed to be sworn in with everyone else that year in ’73, but I wouldn’t go down. So Mansfield thought I’d change my mind and not come, and he sent up the secretary of the Senate to swear me in, in the hospital room with my children.

I began to commute—never intending to stay in Washington. And that’s the God’s truth. I was supposed to be sworn in with everyone else that year in ’73, but I wouldn’t go down. So Mansfield thought I’d change my mind and not come, and he sent up the secretary of the Senate to swear me in, in the hospital room with my children.

I began to commute—never intending to stay in Washington. And that’s the God’s truth. I was supposed to be sworn in with everyone else that year in ’73, but I wouldn’t go down. So Mansfield thought I’d change my mind and not come, and he sent up the secretary of the Senate to swear me in, in the hospital room with my children.
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But the truth is all of you will go through something like this. You’ll wrestle with these kinds of choices every day. But I’m here to tell you, you can find the balance between the two. Being true to yourself will make you really feel fulfilled. And along the way, it helps a great deal if you can resist the temptation to rationalize.

My dad was over with 25 years, one of the finest men I’ve ever known, even though he graduated from Penn, and subsequently became a senator from the state of Delaware, Senator Ted Kaufman, every new hire, that we’d hire, the last thing he’d tell them was, and never underestimate the ability of the human mind to rationalize—her birthday really doesn’t matter that much to her, and this business trip is an opportunity; this will be his last game, and besides, I’d have to take the redeye to get back. We can always take this family vacation another time. There’s plenty of time.

For your generation, there’s an incredible amount of pressure on all of you to succeed, particularly now that you have accomplished so much. You are generation X—under pressure. I see it in my grandchildren who are honors students at other Ivy universities right now. You race to do what others think is right. You race through the bloodsport of college admissions. You raced through Yale for the next big thing. And all along, some of you compare yourself to the best senators of your generation on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, Twitter.

Today, some of you may have found that you slipped into the self-referential bubble that validates certain, every new hire, that we’d hire, the last thing he’d tell them was, and never underestimate the ability of the human mind to rationalize—her birthday really doesn’t matter that much to her, and this business trip is an opportunity; this will be his last game, and besides, I’d have to take the redeye to get back. We can always take this family vacation another time. There’s plenty of time.

But resist that temptation to rationalize what others view is the right choice for you—instead of what you feel in your gut is the right choice—that’s your North Star.

Trust it. Follow it. You’re an incredible group of young women and men. And that’s not hyperbole. You’re an incredible group.

Let me conclude with this. I’m not going to mention whom much is expected. And the bubble expands once you leave this campus, the pressures and anxiousness, as well—take this job, make that much money, live in this place, be like this, do this, and be like this. The real risks and have no real impact, while getting paid for the false sense of both.
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Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise today to discuss two important issues—first, the Export-Import Bank.

There is a lot about this place that puzzles me, but one of the things that this year has puzzled me the most is the movement to somehow defund or end the Export-Import Bank. I just don’t get it. This is an agency of the Federal Government that has been extraordinarily effective. It creates jobs in the United States. It supports jobs. It supports American businesses. It supports small American businesses. It supports American banks. It supports American taxpayers. Being able to offer open payment terms for U.S.-made goods opens previously inaccessible markets for us. Our major manufacturers—including HP, Dell and Lenovo—have committed to making more systems domestically. Our “Made in USA” requirement for eligibility. This has a huge multiplier effect on US employment. Since 2004, Planson’s annual export sales have increased from $2.5 million to $35 million. Our staff has grown from 5 to 35, and our payroll has increased to almost $2 million. We use local suppliers for a broad range of goods and services.

She goes on to conclude: We achieve all this entirely through export sales. The U.S. Export-Import Bank is a key partner in our success.

Why would we want to let this very valuable program expire? I don’t know. I don’t get it. I don’t think there are any real theoretical reason that, frankly, I just find inexplicable. It makes money for the American taxpayers. It is projected to continue to make money. But my passion here is about its support for small businesses in Maine that otherwise would not make these sales into the international market.

As I mentioned, allowing the Export-Import Bank charter to expire is a kind of unilateral disarmament in an era of intense global competition. It makes no sense. Sixty other countries have similar kinds of programs, and if we take ours away, what we are doing is handcuffing our businesses while the rest of the world is moving forward with their programs to support exports.

I used to start speeches in Maine by saying, simply, “Five percent.” People would look at me and say: What is he talking about, 5 percent? Well, 5 percent is the percentage of the world’s population—compared with Ex-Im Bank approval. This means that if our businesses are going to ultimately be successful, we have to sell into the rest of the world. We have to be able to export, and the Export-Import Bank is a very valuable tool in order to facilitate the export of goods from the United States.

There is bipartisan support. I believe the votes are there in the House. Senator Cantwell and Senator Graham have worked hard to get a vote here in the Senate. I commend Senator Cantwell and Senator Graham for their work on behalf of this.

I hope we can bring this matter to a vote promptly and avoid the deadline. I do not know why we cannot do things around here before the night before. Let’s get this done and move on to more important topics. We should not even be having this debate. This ought to be automatic, as, indeed, it has effectively been for some 80 years.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this program. We should not be playing games with this important agency at a time of such intense global competition.

Madam President, I also wish to talk about the national defense authorization bill, which is also coming to the floor today and is on the floor today.

Sixty-five years ago this week a freshman Senator from Maine rose on the floor. In this speech, she made one of the most important speeches in American history. It certainly was one of the most important speeches of the 20th century. It was June 1, 1950. That freshman Senator was Margaret Chase Smith. Senator of Maine—Senator Margaret Chase Smith after she left the Senate, in the 1980s and 1990s in Maine, before we lost her in 1995.

She told me about that speech. The speech was about the dangers to the country and, particularly, to this institution of the practices of Joseph McCarthy, of the smear campaigns, of the innuendo, of the threats. Her speech took enormous courage. She told me two stories about the speech that I think are interesting that I want to note before I go on to the implications of that speech for what we are considering today.

One was that, as she had the speech in her hand and got on the little trolley to come from the Russell Building over here—at that time the Russell Building was the only Senate office building—who should be sitting in the trolley in the seat next to her but Joe McCarthy. Senator Smith sat down and turned to the other senator and said: What are you up to today, Margaret?

She told me that she responded: I am about to make a speech, Joe, and you are not going to like it.

She went on to the Senate floor. She had written that speech with her close aide Bill Lewis at her kitchen table in Skowhegan, ME, over Memorial Day weekend of 1950. She had the speech in her hand, and Bill Lewis was in the press gallery right up here. But she told him not to hand out a copy of the speech until she was well into giving it on the Senate floor because she was afraid that she would lose her nerve and not deliver the speech.
That speech took enormous courage. It took enormous courage because she was telling her colleagues an uncomfortable truth—an uncomfortable truth. I believe that today it is also important that we face uncomfortable truths.

I am a strong supporter of the National Defense Authorization Act that is on the floor. I am a strong supporter of the need and the importance and how crucial that bill is to the defense and the security of this country. The most solid responsibility we have in this place is set forth in the preamble to the Constitution itself: to “provide for the common defense” and “insure domestic Tranquility.” That is what governments are established to do. That is the basic fundamental responsibility—to “provide for the common defense” and “insure domestic Tranquility.”

That is national security. That is what this bill that is on the floor today is all about. I worked in subcommittee on it. I have been to numerous, repeated hearings, as the Presiding Officer has, all through the winter and early spring, where we learned about the strategic challenges facing this country. I worked closely with the chair of the committee for putting this in a strategic context. We talked about big issues with people such as Henry Kissinger and Brzezinski and Madeleine Albright before we started talking about the specifics that are in this bill. And then we had lengthy subcommittee meetings and subcommittee markups.

For me, one of the most satisfying parts of my legislative experience here has been the markup of this bill, where we met as a committee, where we argued and debated and voted and had a lot of amendments and tried to deal with it for 2 solid days and came to a conclusion, where, as I recall, the vote out of the committee was something like 22 to 4. It was a very powerful vote. I am in total support of this piece of legislation. However, my problem with the legislation is that it attempts to avoid the impact of the sequester through the use of the overseas contingency account money, which is not paid for.

We have had hearings. Every hearing we have had this year has been talking about the impact of the sequester on national security. Indeed, I have been working with a number of my colleagues to try to find a solution for the sequester, but the solution for the sequester is not simply to borrow the money from our grandchildren. What bothers me about this legislation is that it is part of a pattern. When the chips are down around here, we borrow the money from our grandchildren. If 5-year-olds could vote and knew what we were doing to them, we would all be dead. We are passing this bill on to them. I think we should fully fund the Department of Defense and the request at the level that is in this bill. I just do not think we should borrow the money to do it.

Make no mistake, that is what we are doing. We are saying it is very important, these are important expenditures, and it is critical for national defense to “provide for the common defense” and “insure domestic Tranquility.” That is what the legislation is that it attempts to fix defense with this funny-money deal, but not critical enough to pay for them. That is the pattern.

Earlier this year we passed the so-called tax extenders. They ought to be called tax-cut extenders because that is what they are. Everybody said they were important to economic development and they were important for the country and important for certainty for businesses. All that was true, but it was not enough to pay for them. We borrowed the money.

Last year we passed a major rewrite of the Veterans’ Administration program, where everybody talked about how important this was, how important the Veterans Affairs Department was to our veterans, how much we owed them, and we really had to take care of this. But then we turned around and borrowed the money from our grandchildren in order to fund it. We did not fund it.

Recently, just in the last month or so, we fixed the so-called doc fix, which has been plaguing this place for a dozen years. But we did not really fix it. We fixed it as far as the docs are concerned, but we fixed it by borrowing the money. We did not pay for it.

Many of us talk a lot around here about the deficit and the danger to the country. I think they are right. I think the deficit is a serious danger to this country. But it seems that the deficit is only a problem when we think it is a problem, and then the next day, it is not a problem anymore because we are going to borrow $38 billion more to put into this bill.

I think we need to stand up and pay for things. I am no angel. I voted for all of these programs when I was in the House. But I think it is time to start saying: Wait a minute; we cannot do this. By the way, by fixing the sequester in the Department of Defense, of course, we are not fixing it anywhere else in the Federal Government. Some people say: Well, that is OK because defense is important, and we are not so worried about these other programs. Well, I am sorry, but some of those other programs are little items such as the FBI. There has never been a time in the history of this country when the FBI was more important.

We are facing serious, dangerous imminent threats. To not fund the FBI or the Border Patrol or the TSA and to have the sequester affect those agencies and kid ourselves that we are dealing with our national security responsibilities is just not responsible. It is just not right. And to borrow the money to fix some of these things is not responsible or fair to our grandchildren.

We are saying: We are just going to fix defense with this funny-money deal, a gimmick wrapped up in a trick, but we are not going to fix anything else. I talked about the FBI, the TSA, Border Patrol, and national security issues, but what about NIH and what about scientific research that can save lives? And we are having the sequester and OCO fixed instead. Is that OK? What about education? What about, yes, Head Start, which gives young people a chance to make a serious contribution to this country?

I think the OCO trick that is in this bill is wrong on two counts. It is wrong on three counts, actually. No. 1, it is not paid for. No. 2 it is not really what the Defense Department needs. They need base budget authority so they can plan, so they can look to the future, and so that they can make decisions on an ongoing basis that are necessary to commit to programs, plans, and projects that will defend this country. The short-term OCO solution does not do that. That is No. 3, by ignoring the needs of the rest of the Federal Government, by ignoring the needs of other parts of the national security apparatus, we are not serving the public we were sent here to look after.

I support this bill, but I think we really ought to be thinking about alternative ways to fund the needs we have identified. It is too easy to say this is an important national priority but not important enough to pay for it. We are continually—even today, after all of the talk about deficits and budget control and everything else—finding ways to shift the burden to our kids and to our grandchildren. I do not think that is right.

Senator REED of Rhode Island has an amendment to this bill that I think is an important one. All it simply says is that we are not going to spend that OCO money in defense until we solve the problem more generally throughout the rest of the Federal Government.

I realize it is not the responsibility of the Defense Department or of the Armed Services Committee to solve the overall budget problem within the Defense bill. But I think we have a responsibility to look at the larger problem, and we can contribute to its solution by saying to our colleagues throughout this body and in the House that there has to be a comprehensive solution before we say we are going to fix only defense and we are only going to fix defense with borrowed money.

There are three ways to solve this budget problem—three ways. One is by cuts, and there have already been substantial cuts. From the projected budgets back in 2010, there is something like three-quarters of a trillion dollars that has already been cut from defense and other areas of the Federal budget. We have to continue to look at that, and we have to look at all aspects of the Federal budget.

The second way is revenues. Nobody is supposed to talk about revenues around here, but the reality is that we are not paying our bills. To put ourselves on the back for tax cuts when in
reality we are passing the expenses on to our children is just not honest.

When we pass tax cuts here in a deficit situation and borrow the money to fill the hole, we are not cutting taxes. We are shifting the tax to our children. I do not think that is honest. I do not think that is fair. I do not think that is right. I do not think that is what we were sent here to do.

The third way, of course, to solve this budget problem is by economic growth. Some people say that the only way to grow the economy is to cut taxes. I have seen no economic study that says that works. Maybe it works if you are reducing taxes, as they did in 1960, from a 90-percent top marginal rate to now about 35 percent. OK, I think that is significant. But to reduce that marginal rate by two or three points and say that it will stimulate a huge amount of economic activity—there is no economic justification for that.

The two single biggest economic development projects in the recent history of the United States were the GI bill after World War II and the interstate highway system. Both of them were investments, both of them cost money, and, by the way, our predecessors paid for them. They didn't pass the bill on to us. They paid for them.

So, yes, we need to control taxes.

Yes, we need to think about strategic tax reductions in ways and areas that will actually help stimulate the economy. I don't understand how having some guy who is managing money in New York pay half the tax rate that his secretary makes is a stimulus to the economy. Yet that is what we are doing.

We have to look at this problem in a comprehensive way. We have to look at health care costs, we have to look at the effects of demographics on Federal expenditures over the next 20 to 30 years, and we have to look at investments that will help our economy grow.

The Presiding Officer and I work hard on this bill. I think it is an important bill for the future of this country. I think it is an important bill to protect the national security and to provide for the common defense, but I think we need to do it in an honest and open way and not try to fill a short-term budget gap with money our children and our grandchildren are going to have to repay. I believe we can do this. I believe we can face this responsibility because that is why we are here.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, someone already asked unanimous consent that U.S. Army MAJ Justin Gerkowski, who is a fellow in my Senate office, be granted floor privileges for this debate.

I just wanted to explain how pleased and lucky we have been to have the major with us to help with these issues. He is a graduate of West Point. He currently serves as an information operations officer. He served as an adviser to the Iraq Army during the surge in 2006 and 2007 and returned from Afghanistan in January of last year, where he had been responsible for psychiatric warfare and military deception for Kandahar Province. He has been a great addition to our office during this debate, and in my view this debate is the most important debate we have.

One priority for the Federal Government is to defend the country. We can spend all the time we want talking about all the other priorities and all the things we should be doing and whether there is some sudden mystical balance between all of those priorities and defending the country, but in most of our States, and certainly in the State of Missouri, the one thing you can get the least argument on as to what the Federal Government should do to help our country is to defend the country. That is why for 54 years straight the Senate has passed a defense authorizing bill every year. There are very few things that get authorized every year, very few things we get debated every year, very few things that get looked at every year, but our national defense is one of those, and it is one of those for a reason.

We hear all kinds of reasons not to move forward with this bill, and then you hear: But I am for the bill. Well, that is because people understand that this is one of the things the Federal Government is supposed to do and in my view the top thing we can't in any way do for ourselves. Local government can't do this, State governments can't do this, individually we cannot do this, and that is why this debate is always so important and why the Armed Services Committee voted this out 22 to 4 after all kinds of discussions, such that we could not vote for this for the reasons we just heard. But at the end of the day, the vote was 22 to 4 out of the committee. Chairman McCAIN and Ranking Member Reaper have done a good job of bringing this bill to the floor with bipartisan support and looking for ways to reform defense so we really focus our energy and only with that kind of service and with technical skills that are not easily replaced. This bill recognizes that and looks for ways to encourage them to continue to serve.

Our State, the State of Missouri, has a huge commitment to the military. More than 17,000 Active-Duty service members serve in Missouri. We have important bases in our State. We have 8,000 civilian Department of Defense employees and more than 20,000 members of the Reserve and the National Guard.

This bill authorizes funding to build a Consolidated Stealth Operations and Nuclear Alert Facility at Whiteman Air Force Base. It preserves and prevents the retirement of the A-10 plane which has wide support in the Congress, but more importantly the A-10 has wide support from the ground forces it supports from the air. When you talk to people who serve on the ground, General Odierno and others will say that is where they are in the fight. They say that does what this plane does. Of course, those who fly it and support it are very important. Whiteman Air Force Base, again, has the 442nd Fighter Wing. It is an A-10 fighter wing which just returned from a deployment.

This bill also authorizes upgrades in our cargo aircraft, such as the C-130 aircraft, which will help the main force as well as the National Guard and Reserves.

In fact, Rosecrans Air National Guard Base in St. Joseph is a great training facility not only for our forces, but that base also serves as a training facility for our allies. At least 16 of our allies trained at this facility last year so they could figure out how to get supplies, how to get troops, and how to move things with those cargo planes in ways that they would not otherwise be able to do.

This bill also takes an important step in moving forward with the new bomber. There is money here that would continue to fund the new plan
for the idea out there for a long-range bomber. We have to have that. We have to have a precision bombing capability that is better than anybody else’s. The planes we are using now have been the best planes in the world for a long time, but they will not be the best planes in the world forever, and it is time to begin to move forward, as we have been, toward that new plane. Those are all important projects. There are key initiatives here, such as promoting readiness and promoting the standards we need to have for performance in the military and how we reward those standards.

This bill continues to provide critical assistance to our allies, particularly our ally Israel. We have significant common research efforts. As we have all seen in recent years, the David’s Sling and Iron Dome weapon systems are critical not only for Israel’s security, but they have been a critical provision of the kind of resources that were once looked at as some kind of unachievable “Star Wars” capacity. Both David’s Sling and the Iron Dome have proved that capacity is, in fact, truly achievable, and we continue to move forward with that kind of defense system in this bill.

This also goes a long way toward combating threats of cyber space and cyber security by evaluating what those vulnerabilities are and dealing with those vulnerabilities.

I want to mention a few amendments I filed and intend to offer before we move on with this bill. I believe my amendments will strengthen the bill. First, I believe the military’s mental health screening process can be improved. We learned a lot about mental health and behavioral health over the past 15 years. I believe we can continue to adapt and, frankly, last year’s Defense Authorization bill had important steps in this direction. I was able to get on the bill when I was a member of the committee last year—not just the defense appropriating committee I serve on now but the defense authorizing committee I served on then.

The amendments I will offer will improve the predeployment health assessment and postdeployment health reassessment by requiring that all service members screened and those who don’t have to meet some criteria that every member of the service may not meet. While people are serving, it is important to establish the things that have happened to them, so if they need help later, perhaps, and back and ask for assistance in what truly was a post-traumatic event which was caused by their service but didn’t show up for a number of years, having the incidents and things that might have affected their mental health is important.

The National Institutes of Health says that one in four adult Americans has a diagnosable and almost always treatable behavioral health issue. I asked the Surgeon Generals of the Armed Forces if that number applies to the Armed Forces, and without hesitation they said yes. They said: We receive calls from the general population and there is no reason that number wouldn’t apply to people serving us in uniform.

The key is diagnosable and treatable—diagnosable and treatable in a way that people can hold back by their behavior health issues any more than they are held back by their physical health issues. They just need to be dealt with.

We will look at mild traumatic stress injury potential, post-traumatic stress injury potential, and look at the things that might affect somebody as they move forward from their time in the service. What happens in the service and what can happen years after really matters.

I think those amendments on mental health meet the evolving needs of servicemembers and hopefully the evolving needs of how we understand behavioral health as it relates to all other health. I had an amendment that would not allow the Army to go below the currently authorized end strength level of 475,000 soldiers. There are threats around the world, and we need to increase our national security.

We heard from General Odierno, Chief of Staff of the Army, testify earlier this year before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee about the risk associated with going below 490,000 soldiers. This amendment would say you can’t go below the 475,000 soldiers until the Secretary of Defense tells the Congress how he plans to reduce excess headquarters elements and excess administrative overhead.

Just this morning, I read an article from military.com discussing Navy Secretary Ray Mabus’s recent comments about excessive bloat—his term—in the DOD headquarters functions.

The article states:

Secretary Mabus said Pentagon and Congressional budget cutters should look at eliminating extra bureaucracy before slashing funds for sailors and ships. Mabus said 20 percent of the Pentagon budget is spent on what he called “pure overhead”—items not directly linked to readiness or ongoing operations. He [Mabus] referred to this “overhead” as the fourth estate, specifying entities such as the office of the Secretary of Defense, defense agencies and organizations funded by the Under Secretaries of Defense.

Here is a direct quote from Secretary Mabus:

There are other places to look rather than taking tools from the warfighter. To the extent you can, protect the stuff that actually gets to the warfighter.

I think my amendment would ensure that the Secretary of Defense has to take that quote to heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has an order for a vote at this hour.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. I wish to make one other comment on one other amendment I have that I will speak more later in this debate. It involves a concern I have for Iran’s growing influence in Iraq and the failure we have had in maintaining the commitment we made to those Camp Liberty residents whom we promised to protect. One hundred and 100 veterans have been killed at Camp Liberty.

I recognize the State Department’s ongoing efforts, but they are not good enough. I believe the Secretary of Defense needs to certify to the defense committees that the central government of Iraq is taking appropriate and sufficient steps to ensure the safety and security of Iranian dissidents housed in Camp Liberty in Iraq.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SIAHANE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on the pending amendment No. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SIAHANE. Madam President, the Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional to deny Federal benefits to legally married same-sex couples and their children. Yet due to unrelated provisions of the Federal Code, State legislatures have the ability to indirectly deny Federal benefits to certain disabled veterans and their families merely because they are in a same-sex marriage. This is unjust and, according to the Supreme Court, it is unconstitutional.

This amendment we are about to vote on would end the current prohibition on benefits for legally married same-sex veterans and their families living in States that do not recognize same-sex marriage.

I wish to quote from testimony we heard from the VFW at a Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee hearing last month. The VFW said this, and I hope all of my colleagues will keep this in mind as we vote. “Simply put, if a veteran is legally married in a State that recognizes same-sex marriage, we—the VFW—believe the VA should provide benefits to his or her surviving spouse the same way it does for every other legally married veteran.”

Many of us speak all the time about the need to honor the service of our veterans and to make sure they have access to the care they deserve. This amendment will right a wrong that so many of our veterans who have fought and volunteered deserve to have.

I hope our colleagues will support this amendment so we can ensure that those veterans are treated equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on
agreed to amendment No. 1494, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Voting Table]

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42.

I say to the chairman and Senator REED. I have the privilege of representing America’s Global Response Force, the XVIII ABN Corps and the 82nd ABN Division.

As Senator REED knows from his long service in the division, the 82nd is the most decorated combat unit in the Armed Forces—it is America’s Guard of Honor.

GEN Colin Powell famously said, “There’s nowhere a better test of attention quicker than knowing the 82nd ABN is flying straight for your nose.”

But to put it bluntly, the Air Force wants to take the “air” out of “airborne.”

In 2012 the Air Force decided to deactivate the Reserve Air Wing at Pope Army Airfield at Fort Bragg and eliminate onsite daily support for training for XVIII ABN Corps, 82nd ABN and USASOC.

The wing consists of 8–12 C-130Hs. Last year this committee required the Air Force to produce a report on the C-130 fleet during which time the Air Force was required to maintain its wings at Pope and Little Rock for 1 year—the report came out in April, the committee expected it last December. The Congress was to be given time to respond.

Unfortunately, the Air Force began dismantling the Wing at Pope long before the report was produced and in direct opposition to this committee’s instructions. When asked about this, the Air Force said nothing about us taking away pilots and maintainers, we are leaving the Aircraft.”

The chairman’s mark is full of behavors like this: including Air Force refusal to heed the recommendations of the National Commission on the Air Force and the SECAC’s refusal to cut the size of AF headquarters.

In my brief time in this body I have repeatedly asked the Air Force for documentation as to the impact on Airborne and Special Operations training the departure of dedicated Air Force Wings will have. I have been rebuffed by Pentagon leadership.

The Deputy Commander of the USAF Reserve said that planes at Pope were a “luxury”. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force said that the Air Force needed to maintain C-130s at Minneapolis, Youngstown, and Pittsburgh for important missions. With all due respect is there any mission at Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and Minneapolis that is as important as supporting Airborne and Special Operations units.

In the last 3 months, the commanders of the XVIII ABN Corps and 82nd ABN have taken the extraordinary step of delivering public speeches noting that Airborne and Special Operations leadership were not consulted about the Air Force decision and that the loss of onsite planes will severely hamper their ability to train and meet requirements of emergency contingencies.

The Pope planes provide between 25 to 40 percent of all Airborne and SOF daily training missions. Last year they dropped 50 percent of the 82nd ABN’s chutes; 440 AW provides 100 percent of 18 ASOG, Air Force, training—Air Force Special Operations Group.

Even as a cost savings device, the transfer of 8–12 of these planes out of Pope makes no sense, as planes will have to be flown in—often on a voluntarily basis if they are Reserve units—from around the country and those units will have to go on TDY orders, which this money does not provide for the moving to the left effects of weather grounding planes that would have to fly into Pope from the rest of the country. As the XVIII ABN Corps Commander said, the downstream effects will be problematic.

This amendment is simple and it supports the C-130 Avionic Modernization Program that the Air Land Subcommittee validated yesterday by accepting the chairman’s $75 million mark and the Manchin amendment.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall, by September 30, 2017, station aircraft previously modified by the C-130 Avionics Modernization Program, AMP, in direct support of the daily training and contingency requirements of the Army Airborne and Special Operations units. The Secretary shall provide such personnel as required to maintain and operate such aircraft.

There are roughly 260 C-130Hs left—I believe the AF will try and retire up to 100, and it will hopefully replace 50 more with C-130J models—this leaves 100 C-130Hs that need AMP.

The AP spent $2.3 billion on C-130H AMP, the program was on schedule and cost when the AF cancelled it, the design was validated by the JROC, Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and the program had begun Low Rate Initial Production, LRIP.

We currently have five C-130H AMP aircraft at Little Rock that will be flown to the bone yard at a loss of approx $300 million, as well as four AMP aircraft that can barely be tied into any C-130H, those simulators and all software that will be thrown away.

We can have nine AMP C-130Hs plus simulators and software for $75 million—this also adheres to the law Congress passed last year and was validated by the Manchin amendment yesterday.

The bottom line is, if the AF does not take this course, it will send the five C-130H AMP aircraft to the boneyard, waste $2.3 billion to mention the simulators and software. Total amount spent for AMP was $2.3 billion. Program was approved by JROC and was on schedule and cost when AF tried to cancel it. There are roughly 260 C-130Hs left—AF will try and retire up to 100, and it will hopefully replace 50 more with C-130J models—this leaves 100 C-130Hs that need AMP. Total cost to get nine aircraft, all simulators and software running again is approximately $75M which was funded this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.
Mr. REED. Mr. President, very quickly, the Senator from North Carolina worked very hard to get legislative language in the bill which has a study of the sufficiency of the airlift requirements for the units stationed at Fort Bragg, NC. This legislation would take several aircraft that are at Little Rock and move them up to North Carolina. It would not effectively help the mobility of our forces. It would micromanage the use of military aircraft. As such, I would ask that there be a 'no' vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted 'yea.'

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. BOXER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—48
Ayotte Flakes Paul
Barrasso Gardner Perdue
Blumenthal Grassley Portman
Brown Harkin Quitz
Cassidy Hoeven Roberts
Coats Inhofe Rounds
Cochran Issa Issa
Collins Johnson Scott
Corker Kirk Sessions
Coryn Lemieux Shelby
Crapo Lee Sullivan
Cruz McCain Thune
Daines McCaskill Tillis
Emi McConnell Toomey
Ernest Menendez Vitter
Fischer Murkowski Wicker

NAYS—44
Baldwin Franken Nelson
Bennet Gillibrand Peters
Blumenthal Heinrich Reed
Booker Harkin Reid
Boozman Hirono Schatz
Brown Kaine Schumer
Cantwell King Schumer
Capito Klobuchar Shaheen
Cardin Leahy Stabenow
Casper Manchin Tester
Casey Mark Pryor Udall
Cochran Merkley Warner
Cotton Moran Warren
Donnelly Murphy Whitehouse
Feinstein Murray Wyden

Mr. REED. Mr. President, very quickly, the Senator from North Carolina worked very hard to get legislative language in the bill which has a study of the sufficiency of the airlift requirements for the units stationed at Fort Bragg, NC. This legislation would take several aircraft that are at Little Rock and move them up to North Carolina. It would not effectively help the mobility of our forces. It would micromanage the use of military aircraft. As such, I would ask that there be a 'no' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

CHANGE OF VOTE
Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 204 I voted yes. It was my intention to vote no. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 204, I voted yes. It was my intention to vote no. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION
• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for vote No. 204 on Tillis amendment No. 1506. Had I been in the Chamber I would have opposed this amendment. Section 136 of the underlying bill requires the Secretary of the Air Force in consultation with the Secretary of the Army to examine the daily training and contingency requirements of the C-130 fleet on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENTS Nos. 1168, 1359, 1501, 1571, 1484, and 1511. Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up, reported by number, and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 1618; McCain, Blumenthal, and Flake No. 1539; Shaheen No. 1551; Warner No. 1571; Hoeven No. 1484; and Heller No. 1511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENTS Nos. 1168, 1359, 1501, 1571, 1484, and 1511. Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up, reported by number, and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 1618; McCain, Blumenthal, and Flake No. 1539; Shaheen No. 1551; Warner No. 1571; Hoeven No. 1484; and Heller No. 1511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), for others, proposes en bloc amendments numbered 1618, 1539, 1551, 1571, 1484, and 1511 to amendment No. 1463.

The amendments en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1168
In the appropriate place please insert the following:

SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—
(1) the accidental transfer of live Bacillus anthracis, also known as anthrax, from an Army laboratory to more than 28 laboratories located in at least 12 states and three countries discovered in May 2015 represents a serious safety lapse;
(2) the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should continue to investigate the cause of this lapse and determine if protective protocols should be strengthened;
(3) the Department of Defense should reassess standards on a regular basis to ensure they are current and effective to prevent a reoccurrence; and
(4) the Department of Defense should keep Congress apprised of the investigation, any potential public health or safety risk, remedial actions taken and plans to regularly reassess standards.

AMENDMENT No. 1359
(Purpose: To prohibit the Department of Defense from entering into contracts to facilitate payments for honoring members of the Armed Forces at sporting events)

Insert after section 342 the following:

SEC. 342A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS TO FACILITATE PAYMENTS FOR HONORING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT SPORTING EVENTS.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—
(1) the Army National Guard has paid professional sports organizations to honor members of the Armed Forces;
(2) any organization wishing to honor members of the Armed Forces should do so on a voluntary basis, and the Department of Defense should take action to ensure that no payments be made for such activities in the future; and
(3) professional organization, including the National Football League, that has accepted taxpayer funds to honor members of the Armed Forces should consider directing an equivalent amount of funding in the form of a donation to a charitable organization that supports members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2241a the following new section:

"2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces."

(2) PROHIBITION.—The Department of Defense may not enter into any contract or other agreement under which payments are to be made in exchange for activities by the contractor intended to honor, or giving the appearance of honoring, members of the armed forces (whether members of the regular components or the reserve components) at any form of sporting event.

"(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Department from taking actions to facilitate activities intended to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events that are provided on a pro bono basis or otherwise funded with non-Federal funds and activities are provided and received in accordance with applicable rules and regulations regarding the acceptance of gifts by the military departments, the armed forces, and members of the armed forces."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2241a the following new item:

"2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces.".

AMENDMENT No. 1511
(Purpose: To require a study and report on the changes to the Travel Regulations related to flat rate per diem for long term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. STUDY AND REPORT ON POLICY CHANGES TO THE JOINT TRAVEL REGULATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on
the impact of the policy changes to the Joint Travel Regulations for the Uniformed Service Members and Department of Defense Civilian Employees related to flat rate per diem for long-term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014. The study shall assess the following:

(1) The impact of such changes on shipyard workers who travel on long-term temporary duty assignments.

(2) Whether such changes have discouraged employees of the Department of Defense, including military personnel, from volunteering for important temporary duty travel assignments.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the study required by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1571
(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on diversity among members of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States military includes individuals from a variety of national, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds that have roots all over the world.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the effect of the changes in subsection (a) on diversity among members of the Armed Forces.

(c) REPORT.—Within 60 days of the date of a final report required pursuant to section 1140 of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of the changes in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 1542 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1623
(Purpose: To require a report on diversity among members of the Armed Forces)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator PAUL, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of amendment No. 1463 to amendment No. 1483 be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mr. PAUL, proposes an amendment numbered 1542 to amendment No. 1623.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a report on diversity among members of the Armed Forces)

The amendment shall include the following:

(1) The impact of such changes on diversity among members of the Armed Forces; and

(2) Honor those from diverse backgrounds and religious traditions who have lost their lives or been injured defending the national security of the United States.

SEC. 1621. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RQ-4 GLOBE NK MISSION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of using the Air National Guard in association with the active duty Air Force to operate and maintain the RQ-4 Global Hawk.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by (a) shall include the following:

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-related Activities

SEC. 1622. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RQ-4 GLOBE NK MISSION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of using the Air National Guard in association with the active duty Air Force to operate and maintain the RQ-4 Global Hawk.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission involving members of the Air Force serving on duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(2) The capacity of the Air National Guard to support an association described in paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 1511
(Purpose: To require additional elements in the report on the privatization of the defense commissary system)

On page 283, strike line 15 and insert the following:

result of the implementation of the plan;

(C) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the current savings to patrons of the defense commissary system;

(D) an assessment of the impact that privatization of the defense commissary system under the plan would have on all eligible beneficiaries;

(E) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the strength in the commissary that makes the United States a great Nation.

(b) SENATE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) promote and encourage diversity in the Armed Forces; and

(2) Honor those from diverse backgrounds and religious traditions who have lost their lives or been injured defending the national security of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 1484
(Purpose: To require a report on Air National Guard contributions to the RQ-4 Global Hawk mission)

In title XVI, after subtitle A, insert the following:

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-related Activities

SEC. 1621. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RQ-4 GLOBE NK MISSION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of using the Air National Guard in association with the active duty Air Force to operate and maintain the RQ-4 Global Hawk.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission involving members of the Air Force serving on duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(2) The capacity of the Air National Guard to support an association described in paragraph (1).

(3) The unity of the Armed Forces reflects the strength in this Nation that makes the United States a great Nation.

SEC. 1116. COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by section 1105(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission involving members of the Air Force serving on duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by section 1105(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission involving members of the Air Force serving on duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by section 1105(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission involving members of the Air Force serving on duty and members of the Air National Guard.
"§4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers"

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term "agency" includes—

(1) the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(b).

(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subsection if the officer—

(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

(2) is the head of an agency; or

(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

"4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564 TO AMENDMENT No. 1463

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and on behalf of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, I call up amendment No. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island. [Mr. REED], for Mr. BLUMENTHAL, proposes an amendment numbered 1564 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and on behalf of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, I call up amendment No. 1564.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and on behalf of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, I call up amendment No. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.)

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) In general.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value in excess of 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency or agencies for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the equity interests constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

(B) after the acquisition, either—

(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership; or

(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, after the acquisition, the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States; and

(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percentages in any of the regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

(C) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any
Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient and effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency shall provide a written waiver under paragraph (1) shall not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

(2) Task and Delivery Orders.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

(e) Definitions and Special Rules.—

(1) Definitions.—In this section, the terms expanded affiliated group, foreign corporation, person, expanded affiliated group, and foreign have the meaning given those terms in section 833(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

(2) In Applying to Section (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described in section 2338(a)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)) shall apply.

(f) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2337 the following new item:

"2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations."

(b) Regulations Regarding Management and Control.—

(1) In General.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall, for purposes of paragraph (1) of section 1116 of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), prescribe regulations for purposes of the definition of an expanded affiliated group to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) Executive Officers and Senior Management.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations shall provide that all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendment, No. 1543, be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT No. 1543, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendment, No. 1543, be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEC. 1116. Cost Savings Enhancements.

(a) In General.—Section 4522 of chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority" after "mismangement";

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting "or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority" after "disclosure"; and

(C) at the end of the section—

(i) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee;

(d) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

(2) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury, and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to rescind the deficit (as defined in section 1301(b) of title 31, United States Code).

(b) Table of Sections for Chapter 45 of Title 5, United States Code.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following:

"§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

(a) Definitions.—In this section, the term 'agency'—

(1) has the meaning given that term under section 5511; and

(2) includes an entity described in section 4501.

(b) Prohibition.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this section if the officer—

(1) serves in a position at level 1 of the Executive Schedule;

(2) is the head of an agency; or

(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.

(c) Technical and Conforming Amendment.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section, is amended by inserting the following:

"4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers."
MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

CLEAN WATER ACT RULE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to share my concerns regarding the administration’s recently finalized Clean Water Act rule issued by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to define waters of the United States.

The Clean Water Act clearly states it is the “policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution.” Despite this partnership and the limits to Federal authority, the President and his administration, along with some lawmakers, have sought to redefine and expand the scope of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act in a manner that would expand the Federal Government’s ability to regulate waters of the United States—in short, a Federal power grab. Changing the scope of the law, including the Clean Water Act, is solely the responsibility of Congress. Yet, the President’s administration has again elected to bypass the legislative process by finalizing this rule.

When I am in Louisiana, I consistently hear from my constituents about the impacts this rule could have on private property development, timberland, farmland, and other bodies of water that would be subject to Federal control. They tell me this rule will create more uncertainty and impact infrastructure projects and jobs despite the EPA and the Corps’ assurances to the contrary.

Louisiana is experiencing significant economic growth—growth that is bringing jobs to those Americans who have had the hardest time finding jobs with this recent poorly performing economy. This progress will be negatively affected as a result of this rule.

In addition to the increased costs and regulatory burdens it imposes on business, and it can significantly restrict the ability of landowners to make decisions about their property and make it harder for State and local governments to plan for their own development.

Let me note that this is not the only rule the EPA has been working on that will negatively impact the economy and the job growth in my State. Their proposed rule to lower the standard for ground-level ozone will hurt job development in Louisiana, carrying with it health impacts to workers and families that are not fully considered by the EPA. It is clearly established that the higher the standard of living, the healthier the family. These rules will lower the standard of living for those who lose their jobs.

In Calcasieu Parish, more than $60 billion in various manufacturing projects are underway and are in the process of being approved—that is $60 billion with an “B.” These will require construction workers—again creating the kinds of jobs our economy needs more of. These projects can be severely impacted as a consequence of this rule. We see in display navigable waters prior to the release of the rule this past week in Calcasieu Parish. Now we will see the bodies that will fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government under the finalized rule. Again, this is under current law. And that is what it will be. This will impact the ability of local government to plan their development.

Instead of people in Louisiana deciding how best to use their property, the Federal Government will be able to dictate land use decisions, which have always been local. Again, this rule is a major takeaway effort by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers.

The administration has stated that this rule is narrowly defined. However, under the new definitions for tributaries, adjacent waters, and waters that are neighboring a traditional navigable water, virtually any water body could fall under the Agency’s regulatory authority. And if certain bodies of water don’t fall under these definitions, the Agency can make a case-by-case determination of significant nexus.

Assistant Secretary Jo-Ellen Darcy from the Army Corps said last week that this rule is a huge win for public health and the economy and reflects that clean water matters to the American people.

First, let me point back to this map that community leaders in Calcasieu Parish provided for me, highlighting that this is not a win for the economy and could significantly impact economic and private land development moving forward.

Secondly, as a physician—I am a doctor—I understand the importance of human health, and I also understand the impacts on human health as a consequence of overregulation by the Federal Government. If people are poor, their health suffers. There is a strong statistical relationship when because of regulatory uncertainty, jobs are lost overseas. Again, I believe this revised rule is a power grab by the administration and not based upon any congressional action.

We took a vote on this issue back in March, during the budget debate, to limit the expansion of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, which I supported. Last fall, we took a similar vote while I was in the House of Representatives to repeal this harmful regulation. My colleague from Wyo- ming, JOHN BARRASSO, has a bill, the Federal Water Quality Protection Act. It is a good bill that provides clarity for how EPA should and should not define the waters of the United States. I know the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma, intends to move this bill through his committee soon, and I wish to offer my support for that legislation, and we have some time and again that this administration will attempt to overreach the limits of what the executive branch should do. When it comes to the EPA’s overreach, the waters of the United States rule isn’t the exception; it is the norm.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the bill that is before us and reauthorizing funding priorities for the Department of Defense.

I wish first to congratulate Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member JACk REED for working together on a very important bill. There are a lot of important issues and a lot of important priorities in this legislation for our home State in Michigan.

The fact that we are supporting the A-10s so our troops have the close air support they need is very important. It is important that we are continuing to invest in research and development and new kinds of technologies. We are very proud in Michigan that there are a lot of companies that are on the frontlines providing research and development for the Army. If the Army drives it, we design it, fix it, and build it in Warren, MI, and in the surrounding area of Macomb County that we call the Defense Corridor, and we are very proud of that. We have vital military equipment manufactured here in the United States, and in Michigan, specifically, that is supported in this legislation.

It provides very important pay in-creases and support for our troops that are actually critical.

My concern is not with the contents of what we are doing in this particular bill in terms of supporting the defense of our country and supporting our troops. It is the fact that we have budget gimmicks being used to fund the Department of Defense.

Our troops deserve more than budget gimmicks. Those on the frontlines deserve more than basically funding essential services or pay raises or essential equipment through funds that we know are sort of made-up funds—an-other name for deficit spending. This has been done over the years, as we
went to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, when there was a fund set up—the overseas contingency account—not including any money in it, but it was a way to mask the fact that we were not funding the wars and we were in fact abusing how we spend the budget.

So to continue with that the critical items in this bill is a mistake and, frankly, not worthy of the men and women who are on the frontlines, putting their lives—putting themselves—harm way every single day. So it is critical that we do better in terms of this budget and the structure of this budget.

Our families also deserve better, because we need to fully fund the full defense of our country—both here at home and overseas—without budget gimmicks, without adding to the deficit. All those things that create a strong country and security for our families need to be done in a way that does not include budget gimmicks. And that, frankly, is not what is being proposed.

That is why I am very proud to be a cosponsor of Senator Reed's amendment, which would cap the spending on what has been called this overseas contingency account. Others of us at various points have called it the fake money account because there is no money in it. It is a fancy way of covering up the fact that we are spending and adding to the deficit. Senator Reed would basically say that we would be doing something that would be capped. We would try to begin to rein that in, to cap that amount. We would also say very clearly that we are going to address the issues that affect the United States terms in our strength, the defense, broadly, of our country—whether it is in the Department of Defense or whether it is in other parts of our overall budget as a Nation—by basically lifting the caps—for those watching, we talk about the budget CWayrol Cottage, but there are caps—in a way so we can fully fund both the Department of Defense but also the other things that need to be done to create security and to fully make sure our families are safe, our economy is safe, and that we are aggressively moving forward as an economy.

That is what Senator Reed's amendment would do. It brings some balance. It begins to rein in what is a policy that I think is not making sense in terms of using budget gimmicks. As I said before, our troops certainly deserve better than that, and our families deserve better than that.

Using gimmicks is a convenient way to avoid dealing with what the real problem is. There is this thing called sequestration. People wonder: What in the world is that? We put in a policy a number of years ago to limit spending. The good news is that we have brought the annual budget deficit down by two thirds. That is the reality of what has happened. Two thirds of the annual deficit is gone. But now, as we go forward and look at what is going to grow the economy and what is going to keep us safe, we look at the threats around the world that are coming at us—not just through the Department of Defense but through every area of the budget. When we look at what we need in terms of the economy and the economy and on, we know that there is policy and that policy and stop the gimmicks. Don't use gimmicks going forward to pretend that we are still meeting sequestration but to look honestly at the needs of our country today and move forward.

Frankly, on the security front alone, security is more than just what happens at the Department of Defense, as important as that is. It is all of the programs that we rely on day in and day out to keep our country safe. Certainly, we care about border security.

To continue that with the critical funding under the budget that is gone. But now, as we go forward and look at what is going to grow the economy, it is about the huge debts they are incurring to do the right thing. People coming out of college are now in a situation where they can't qualify even to buy that first home. They are telling me: Do something about college loan debt. We can't help young people coming out of college to buy a house. They don't qualify because of the amount of debt, and the amount of debt they have will equal a house. That is a security issue for us—education, the ability to have a college education, job training.

Investing in cures for diseases—how exciting it is for us to hear about all the opportunities now through the National Institutes of Health. We have so many promising opportunities and treatments and cures, such as on Alzheimer's—which, by the way, takes one out of every five Medicare dollars—and in other areas, such as cancers, Parkinson's disease, mental health disorders. That is part of our strength and being secure and strong and robust for the future.

To be strong abroad we need to be strong at home, as well, and in so many other areas, as we know. If we want to talk about competing around the globe, if we want to talk about what we need to be doing to be secure, to have a robust economy, to outcompete the competition, we have also to talk about educating our young people—which, by the way, is cut in the overall scheme of things in this budget. We have to talk about lowering the costs of college. If there is one thing we are hearing every day and over from people from us going back to job training programs who lost their job in the economy, going back to get new skills to get a new job, it is about the huge debts they are incurring to do the right thing. People coming out of college are now in a situation where they can't qualify even to buy that first home. They are telling me: Do something about college loan debt. We can't help young people coming out of college to buy a house. They don't qualify because of the amount of debt, and the amount of debt they have will equal a house. That is a security issue for us—education, the ability to have a college education, job training.

As I conclude, let me say that all of this leads to the fact that we need to not back vote Senator Reed's amendment because that is what it is all about: real safety, real security, growing the economy of our country. Our people deserve better than budget gimmicks that are in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

OBAMACARE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, it has been 5 years since Americans were forced into a broken and unhappy relationship with ObamaCare. Ever since
the implementation of this failed law. Americans have received one broken promise after another. For Montana families, reflecting on the consequences of this law is not a happy trip down memory lane. Too many Montanans have seen their work hours cut. Too many have been forced off the insurance they liked, and they were told they could not see the doctors whom they trusted.

The reviews have been in for quite some time. ObamaCare is not anything close to what Montanans were promised. Five years later, insurance companies are still unable to find stable rates that do not force more uncertainty and hardship upon Montanans. It has been widely reported across the country that rates for millions of Americans are set to skyrocket again. Look no further than Montana, where it is evident that health care premiums are not as affordable as President Obama promised they would be. Policies under ObamaCare are climbing, and those rate increases are not just one-time increases. In fact, in Montana, according to filings with the Montana Commissioner of Securities and Insurance, insurers across the board are asking for double-digit increases for 2016 policies on top of more increases that occurred just last year.

Blue Cross Blue Shield, which is Montana’s largest insurer that boasts 255,000 consumers in the State, is asking for an average increase of 23 percent for Montanans enrolled in individual plans. That is the start.

PacificSource filed papers with the commissioner requesting an average of a 31-percent increase for individual plans. And Montanans who were insured under Time Insurance are facing a staggering 47-percent increase in 2016.

Insurance rate hikes make it harder for Montanans to have access to affordable health care. It is money that no longer is in the pockets of Montanans, and those rate increases are not just in Montana. Across the Nation, Americans are seeing massive and debilitating rate increases. These hikes are a far cry from what Montanans—from what the American people were promised.

In 2007, President Obama said himself that by the end of his first term, ObamaCare would “cover every American and cut the cost of a typical family’s premium by up to $2,500 a year.”

Montanans have not seen their premiums decreased by $2,500 a year. It is not even close. Unfortunately, this is the predictable result of forcing a partisan piece of legislation through Congress without transparent consideration or bipartisan input. We need to ensure health care is affordable, and it needs to be accessible for all Montanans. This is why I was so concerned when ObamaCare, repealing its costly mandates, repealing its burdensome taxes, and repealing the senseless regulations.

ObamaCare is not working and it is not popular. This law is a bureaucratic nightmare that hurts small businesses. I just came out of a meeting with some homebuilders and small business owners from Montana. I showed them this chart before I came down to the floor. One of the builders said: This likely means I no longer will be able to provide health care insurance for my employees.

Growing up in Montana, I grew up hunting, camping, backpacking, fishing. In fact, I was fly fishing in Montana before Brad Pitt made it cool in the movie “A River Runs Through It.” I know that when your fishing line gets tangled up, you have two options. I have been there many times on one of the banks of Montana’s rivers. Sometimes you take a minute, sometimes you take several minutes, and you work to untangle the line. But other times the line gets so badly knotted up that the best option, instead of spending a long time untangling the line, is to simply cut the line.

After 5 failed years, the American people know ObamaCare is too badly tangled to fix. It is time to cut the line and tie on a new fly.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DONELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. DONELLY. Mr. President, I wish to begin my comments on this year’s National Defense Authorization Act, S. 1376, by thanking all of the members of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. I would especially like to thank the subcommittee’s chairman, Senator Sessions, for the close working relationship we share.

I want my colleagues to note that Senator Sessions and his staff worked closely with me and my staff in developing the elements of the bill pertaining to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. I would especially like to thank PacificSource filed papers with the commissioner requesting an average of a 31-percent increase for individual plans. And Montanans who were insured under Time Insurance are facing a staggering 47-percent increase in 2016.

In 2007, President Obama said himself that by the end of his first term, ObamaCare would “cover every American and cut the cost of a typical family’s premium by up to $2,500 a year.”

Montanans have not seen their premiums decreased by $2,500 a year. It is not even close. Unfortunately, this is the predictable result of forcing a partisan piece of legislation through Congress without transparent consideration or bipartisan input. We need to ensure health care is affordable, and it needs to be accessible for all Montanans. This is why I was so concerned when ObamaCare, repealing its costly mandates, repealing its burdensome taxes, and repealing the senseless regulations.

The Annual National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress passes every year, and this year will mark what I hope will be the passing of a defense authorization act for the 54th year in a row.

I would like to give my colleagues a brief overview of the provisions in what we call the NDAA, which we are considering today, as they relate to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.
of the ground-based interceptors. The bill also contains the GAO’s annual review of MDA’s acquisition programs.

Moving on to space programs, the bill addresses several key aspects of space system acquisition. It includes important provisions aimed at maintaining fair competition among space launch providers through fiscal year 2017. It does not, however, solve a potential 2- to 3-year gap after that, as launch providers work to develop and certify a new American-made rocket engine to replace the Russian RD–180. I hope that gap does not occur, but if it does, I am sure this committee will revisit and correct the issue so we can maintain a competitive and healthy launch industrial base that both ensures DOD’s access to space and saves taxpayer dollars. The bill also makes important contributions to ensuring that we adddress the threats we may face in space by requiring an interagency policy and a principal DOD position to address these threats.

We have authorized the President’s requested level of funding for the nuclear modernization programs at the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA. We also create a program that enables the scientists and engineers at the NNSA to work on new concepts and methods that shorten the time and the cost for future life extensions of our warheads.

Let me close noting that we fully fund the President’s request for nonproliferation at both the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Defense. At the NNSA, these programs collect loose nuclear material around the world, which could be used as terrorist devices against us. The NNSA also maintains a network of radiation detectors at borders across the world to detect the illegal transfer of nuclear material before it can cross our borders here in America.

Finally, the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program at the Department of Defense will continue to secure weapons of mass destruction around the world, as it did with Syria’s chemical weapons and dangerous pathogens at Ebola clinics in West Africa. The relatively small sum of money in this program has made a noticeable difference in reducing dangerous threats to our country.

I take particular pride in this program as the enduring legacy of my fellow Hoosier, Senator Richard Lugar, who has done our Nation and the world a great service as a champion for nuclear nonproliferation. He and Senator Sam Nunn were extraordinary leaders, and we are proud to try to follow in their tradition.

I again thank Senator Sessions for the productive and bipartisan relationship we have had on the subcommittee and for the majority leaders on the committee for taking part in our hearings and in crafting the provisions under this subcommittee’s jurisdiction.

I look forward to working with our colleagues to pass this important legislation.

I yield back any remaining time that has been allotted.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have had a number of our colleagues come to the floor to talk about the importance of the Export-Import Bank, and I want to see if I can put in context the exceptionally important work done by our colleagues Senator CANTWELL and Senator HEITKAMP on this issue.

We have been talking in this body for weeks now about the importance of trade and particularly tapping global markets, given the fact that there are going to be 1 billion middle-class people in the world in 2025. This is an exceptional opportunity for us to be able to sell the products we make here, whether they are computers or wine or helicopters or planes, you name it.

We had a big debate about trade promotion authority. What I want to spend just a few minutes talking about is whether a Senator was for trade promotion authority or not, they ought to support the Export-Import Bank because the Export-Import Bank provides key financing tools to promote products that are made in my home State, in the States of our colleagues, and all across the land. It has supported tens of thousands of American jobs—even hundreds of thousands—for decades. It costs less than 1 cent of its revenue comes from overseas. They got off the ground with help from Ex-Im Bank, and it has customers in France, Germany, and Asia, and it is looking to expand further.

These kinds of success stories are ones you see in every single State because these startups got help when it was essential to have that added boost to be able to seize the opportunities ahead and the world and create high-skilled, high-wage jobs.

To me, when we debate the future of the Export-Import Bank, colleagues, this is about red, white, and blue jobs. Keeping the Export-Import Bank up and running with the important financing tools it offers is part of getting trade done right.

I commend our colleagues Senators CANTWELL, HEITKAMP, MURRAY, and GRAM, who have come together in a bipartisan way to work to extend the Bank as quickly as possible, and they have my support.

NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I asked for an extra few minutes. I want to spend another few minutes just talking about another part of our economy that I think can grow in the days ahead, and I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to bring a basket of Oregon products onto the floor at this time.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have had a number of our colleagues come to the floor to talk about the importance of the Export-Import Bank, and I want to see if I can put in context the exceptionally important work done by our colleagues Senator CANTWELL and Senator HEITKAMP on this issue.

We have been talking in this body for weeks now about the importance of trade and particularly tapping global markets, given the fact that there are going to be 1 billion middle-class people in the world in 2025. This is an exceptional opportunity for us to be able to sell the products we make here, whether they are computers or wine or helicopters or planes, you name it.

We had a big debate about trade promotion authority. What I want to spend just a few minutes talking about is whether a Senator was for trade promotion authority or not, they ought to support the Export-Import Bank because the Export-Import Bank provides key financing tools to promote products that are made in my home State, in the States of our colleagues, and all across the land. It has supported tens of thousands of American jobs—even hundreds of thousands—for decades. It costs less than 1 cent of its revenue comes from overseas. They got off the ground with help from Ex-Im Bank, and it has customers in France, Germany, and Asia, and it is looking to expand further.

These kinds of success stories are ones you see in every single State because these startups got help when it was essential to have that added boost to be able to seize the opportunities ahead and the world and create high-skilled, high-wage jobs.

To me, when we debate the future of the Export-Import Bank, colleagues, this is about red, white, and blue jobs. Keeping the Export-Import Bank up and running with the important financing tools it offers is part of getting trade done right.

I commend our colleagues Senators CANTWELL, HEITKAMP, MURRAY, and GRAM, who have come together in a bipartisan way to work to extend the Bank as quickly as possible, and they have my support.

NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I asked for an extra few minutes. I want to spend another few minutes just talking about another part of our economy that I think can grow in the days ahead, and I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to bring a basket of Oregon products onto the floor at this time.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this week is National Hemp History Week, and to help celebrate I thought I would show a few Oregon-made hemp products. And if you don't mind, I encourage the many other opportunities for industrial hemp in my State and across the country.

In the basket I brought, I have food, soap, clothes, and even deck sealant, all made in Oregon, bought and sold in American stores and used by Americans. Oregon companies such as Bob's Red Mill, Fiddlebumps, and Hemp Shield contribute to our economy in unique ways. Industrial hemp supports a $620 million industry in America, and our companies have found innovative ways of incorporating it into everyday products.

However, the full growth potential of this industry is being cut down before it can fully bloom because a single ingredient—a small portion of all of these products—the hemp itself—cannot be grown in America. The unfortunate reality is that current Federal rules prohibit our farmers from growing industrial hemp on American soil. This means 100 percent of the hemp used in these products is imported from other nations. The Federal ban on hemp amounts, in my view, to a restriction on free enterprise, and it doesn't accomplish anything but stifles job creation and economic growth.

We are the world's largest consumers of hemp products, but we are the only major industrialized nation to ban hemp farming. This hasn't always been the case, and it doesn't have to continue to be the case. It was once a booming crop in America and it can and should be again.

American farmers were growing this product as early as the 1600s, before our Nation was even founded. The Declaration of Independence, colleagues, was written on paper made from hemp. In the 1800s and early 1900s, it was used to make rope, heating oil, and textiles. During World War II we used it as part of the Hemp for Victory Program to support our soldiers. But everything got changed when hemp got wrapped up with marijuana in Federal regulations, and it has been banned ever since.

Are they related? Maybe industrial hemp and marijuana are related species, but there are big differences between them, such as their chemical makeup.

Because they are not the same plant, they should not be treated with the same regulation and prohibitions. In my view, keeping the ban on growing hemp makes about as much sense as instituting a ban on Portobello mushrooms. There is no reason to outlaw a product that is perfectly safe because of what it is related to.

That is why the majority leader Senator McConnell and I came together, with our colleague from Kentucky Rand Paul and my colleague from Oregon Jeff Merkley, to introduce the Industrial Hemp Farming Act. Our bill would make sure hemp does not get lumped into the definition of marijuana in the Controlled Substances Act.

Our bill is all about stopping the unfair punishment of entrepreneurs and farmers who want to be part of a growing ag industry here in America. Companies in our Nation that are importing hemp to use in food, cosmetics, soap, clothing, and auto parts, they ought to be buying that hemp from American farmers and contributing to our agricultural sector.

I will close by way of saying there are also big environmental benefits to growing hemp. It takes less water to grow hemp than it does to grow cotton, and hemp generally requires fewer pesticides than other crops. I will put it this way, colleagues: If you can buy it at Costco when my wife was pregnant with our third child—if you can buy it at your local supermarket, American farmers ought to be able to grow it.

I urge my colleagues to join me, the distinguished majority leader Senator McConnell, the Senator from Indiana, my colleague Senator Rand Paul, and my colleague Senator Merkley in our legislation to address this gap in American law and today join me in celebrating National Hemp History Week by learning more about this safe and versatile crop and the potential it holds to bolster American agriculture and the domestic economy.

These products are products that are sold all across America. We ought to have a chance for our farmers—farmers in Nebraska, in Kansas, farmers in Indiana—to be able to grow this product and reap the benefits of the private economy associated with it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is "The Waste of the Week" time again, and the waste of the Federal Government's spending just keeps piling up. Today, I am taking a look at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. We all have a stake in this. I am a veteran, but even those of us who are not veterans have a stake in making sure our veterans are getting the use of taxpayer dollars for their benefit for the sacrifices they made.

Over the past year, we have been hearing the VA continues to continue to have a story of mismanagement that is plaguing the VA. Many of these news articles tell the story of our Nation's heroes not receiving the care or the resources they have earned and that they deserve. Last month—just last month—I read yet another frightening headline, frustrating. "Veterans Affairs improperly spent $6 Billion annually, senior VA official says"—improperly spent $6 billion annually.

In my memo written by the VA's senior official for procurement, the VA has been wasting taxpayer money by violating Federal contracting rules to pay for medical care and expenses. Under law, VA purchases require competitive and proper contracts, but testimony from Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Logistics Jan Frye, before Congress last month revealed that just the opposite is occurring.

So the medical care and supplies our veterans need for their medical needs are being compromised at a cost of $6 billion a year. Mr. Frye wrote:

Over the past five years, some senior VA acquisition and finance officials have willfully violated the public trust, Federal procurement and financial laws were debased. Their overt actions and dereliction of duties combined have resulted in billions of taxpayer dollars being issued in disregard to Federal laws and regulations, making a mockery of Federal statutes.

An example of this violation is found with VA purchase cards. Typically, VA uses these cards for smaller purchases up to $5,000, according to the rules and regulations. But they were inappropriately used to buy billions of dollars' worth of medical supplies without contracts or oversight. Mr. Frye continued:

In addition, doors are flung wide open for fraud, waste, and abuse when contracts are not executed. For example, by law, prices paid for goods or services subject to contract can only be determined to be fair and reasonable by duly appointed contracting officers. I can state without reservation that VA has not been able by duly appointed contracting officers. I can state without reservation that VA has not been able to properly spend $6 billion annually.

According to reports, the VA has failed to engage in a competitive bidding or signing contract process ensuring a good deal for the services they are unable to provide in house, such as specialized tests and surgeries and other procedures. In fact, the VA has paid at least $5 billion in such fees in violation of Federal rules.

This is yet but another example of what the White House has recognized—as and I quote—"corrosive culture" at the Veterans' Administration. I think we all agree our 8.7 million American veterans and our more than 130 million taxpayers deserve a lot better. Given the scale and magnitude by the VA, proper procurement procedures ensure the best products for veterans and the best value for taxpayers.

Aside from higher prices, a lack of contracts can result in a lack of oversight. The VA, just like Congress, is accountable and must be accountable for what it spends. Now, I understand the incredible pressure the VA has been under with the recent influx of new
veterans. I appreciate the good work of many people who work at the VA. Still, no matter the growth in need, it is never in order to violate Federal law. This kind of reckless spending cannot and must not be tolerated.

Each year Congress sends billions of dollars to the VA to care for our veterans. With those funds, comes an obligation to use every dollar of those funds properly. By simply requiring the VA to comply with Federal law, we can save $6 billion. This is a simple fix with large impacts and we should take it.

Today, I am adding an additional $6 billion to our ever-increasing gauge of taxpayer money that comes to Washington and is spent for improper and unnecessary purposes. We are now two-thirds of the way to our goal of $100 billion. We are going to be doing this every week as long as the Senate is in session this year. I hope we have to add an additional attachment to this gauge because, folks, there is no end to discovering how our government is wasting taxpayers’ money for unnecessary programs, violating the law, violating regulations, mismanaging the spending at the Federal level. We are going to continue to point out these issues week after week. Hopefully, we can get the attention of our colleagues and the American people, and they will demand that we do something about this.

While we have not been able—no thanks to the administration—to come up with a sensible, long-term fix to our deficit spending and continuing plunge into debt, we can at least look at these programs that have been identified by the inspector generals, by the Government Accountability Office, and by the Office of Management and Budget as wasting taxpayer dollars.

So there is much we can do while we are trying to get to the point where we have an administration that allows us to address the larger issue; that is, a government out of control, spending taxpayer money for unnecessary purposes, and wasting it, which we will point out every week. Tune in again next week for the next “Waste of the Week.”

I thank my colleague from Nebraska for generously yielding me the time to do this. I have a somewhat of a schedule hitch. She was gracious enough to do this. I have somewhat of a schedule which we will point out every week. Hopefully, we can get the attention of our colleagues and the American people, and they will demand that we do something about this.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Therefore, it is my understanding that we are now in a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the National Defense Authorization Act or NDAA. The brave men and women who serve in our Armed Forces have protected our Nation for generations. Because of their selflessness, we are able to enjoy many freedoms here at home, but it is important to remember that these liberties are not free.

The sacrifices made by our service members are extraordinary, and we must ensure that they have the resources necessary and needed to defend the United States. That is why the NDAA has been passed each of the last 53 years. I was proud to continue this tradition by working with my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee to pass the fiscal year 2016 NDAA only a few weeks ago.

While this bill is not perfect, it is the result of a bipartisan compromise to perform the most important function of the Federal Government, providing for the national defense. This bill’s importance cannot be overstated, but the details are not often given enough attention.

For this reason, I would like to take a moment to discuss some of the key provisions that play such a critical role in preserving the security of our Nation and the effectiveness of our military. Included in this bill are several commonsense proposals to cut inefficiencies and use the savings that are generated to better meet the needs of our workforce.

For example, the Air Force’s next-generation bomber and new tanker program have both suffered delays and they cannot spend the full amount requested when the budget was submitted. This bill will reduce funding for these programs accordingly and moves about $660 million in savings to meet unfunded requirements of our military.

Across a large number of budget categories, unnecessary increases were reduced, troubled programs were cut, and again the difference was used to meet high-priority requirements of our men and women in uniform.

The bill also combats the continued growth in headquarters staff at the Pentagon and major commands, an issue I discussed with Secretary Carter at his confirmation hearing. Two years ago, the Department announced its intention to reduce 20 percent of its headquarters staff by 2019. However, it has yet to provide the Armed Services Committee with a plan to accomplish these reductions.

This legislation takes action. It reduces funding for headquarters and management staff by 7.5 percent. This goes beyond even the Department’s stated goal. It results in $1.7 billion in savings that are reprioritized to support more important needs. In all, the bill moves about $10 billion from unnecessary spending to increase the capability of our forces. One such area is the development of the advanced technologies.

This bill sets aside $400 million for the offset initiative announced by the Department in November of last year. The technological superiority of our forces has come under increasing threat in recent years. This is an issue that the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, which I chair, has followed closely.

The money devoted to this initiative is targeted toward the development of the next-generation technology, such as lasers and railguns that will enable our military’s continued advantage on the battlefield of the future.

I am also pleased that this bill will fully support the modernization of our nuclear forces, and it includes additional funding required by the Department to address critical needs in our nuclear forces identified in reviews last year.

The bill reauthorizes key assistance and training programs, and it also provides the Secretary of Defense new authority to partner with nations in the Middle East, the South Pacific, and Eastern Europe to support U.S. interests in these key regions. It also codifies the Department of Defense’s role in defending the Nation in cyber space, and it requires the Department to regularly conduct training exercises with other governmental agencies to meet this responsibility.

This kind of reckless spending cannot continue to expand its reach. Russia continues to expand its reach, Russia has seized Crimea and pours fighters into eastern Ukraine, and China is intimidating its neighbors and building islands in the South China Sea, we must fund our national defense. To not do so would be unacceptable. We cannot hold our military hostage to a political controversy.

Despite disagreements, the committee has again produced a compromise product—as it has year after year—that supports our national defense and the needs of our men and women in uniform. I am inspired by their service, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to protect our great Nation as the full Senate considers the NDAA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I understood you could call up an amendment to the Defense bill. I will come back and get this amendment pending at the appropriate time on the floor.
CITIZENS UNITED DECISION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I wish to take a few moments now to speak about my amendment No. 1693, which responds to the very unfortunate Citizens United decision. January 2015 was that decision's fifth anniversary, and it has had a pretty nefarious effect on our democracy.

The premise of the decision was that unlimited corporate expenditures would not corrupt or exert improper influence in our American democratic process, because there would be a regime of quote-disclosure—effective disclosure that would permit shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters.

Well, here we are. Everybody in this room knows that there has been no effective disclosure whatsoever. We live in a world of dark money in which special interests spend tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars in elections to buy influence and to try to make sure that people get their way. There is neither public knowledge nor accountability about that dark money spending.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, in an editorial in June 2012, described the problem very well:

Money. Buckets of it. Tidal waves that one pundit has dubbed the "tsunami of slime." Well, we are in this political world have experienced firsthand that tsunami of slime that the Citizens United decision unleashed. In the 2014 midterm elections, the Washington Post has reported that at least 31 percent of all independent spending in those elections was spent by groups that don't disclose who their donors are. You don't know who is behind their money.

You don't know the candidates know who is behind the money. For sure they are going to be told, but the public doesn't know who is behind that money.

And that 31 percent doesn't even count what are called issue ads, where somebody says the Presiding Officer, for instance, has a terrible position on this issue and you need to call her and tell her that her position is terrible, anti-American, wicked, no good, and that she is awful—and on and on and they go. That is an issue ad, and so it doesn't even count. So that whole extra bit—also dark—is not even part of the 31 percent.

And the big, obvious thing that the Citizens United decision completely overlooked is that if you give big corporations huge, wealthy special interests the ability to spend on elections, guess what else you give them. You give them the ability to threaten to spend or to promise to spend, and you know that those threats and promises are most going to be in any regime effective disclosure. That is the ultimate private exercise of political influence. We have no idea how big the effect is of those silent threats and promises—silent, at least, to the public.

The American people are pretty fed up. The New York Times this week reported on a poll, and I will just quote a little bit from the story:

The findings reveal deep support among Republicans and Democrats for new measures to restrict the influence of wealthy givers, including limiting the amount of money that can be spent by "super PACs" and forcing more public disclosure on organizations now permitted to intervene in elections without disclosing the names of their donors.

And the story continues:

And by a significant margin, they reject the argument that underpins close to four decades of Supreme Court jurisprudence on campaign finance: that political money is a form of speech protected by the First Amendment.

Clearly, money facilitates speech, but it also facilitates bribery. It also facilitates blindly egomaniacal political actors and political parties with pressure.

Now, the results here:

More than four in five Americans (more than 80 percent of Americans) say money plays too great a role in political campaigns . . . while two-thirds say that the wealthy have more of an influence in the election process than other Americans.

That is not healthy when 80 percent of Americans think that money plays too great a part and two-thirds of Americans think that they don't have an equal shot in elections compared to the wealthy.

And it is not only Democrats and independents who feel this way. I will continue to read:

Those concerns—and the divide between Washington elites and the rest of the country—extend to Republicans. Three-quarters of self-identified Republicans support requiring more disclosure by outside spending organizations... Republicans in the poll were almost Democrats to favor further restrictions on campaign donations.

So if three-quarters of self-identified Republicans support requiring more disclosure by outside spending organizations, I would hope that I could get support for this amendment which would require some disclosure. It would require any company that contracts with the Department of Defense—and they get big contracts with billions, hundreds of billions of dollars—to disclose all of its campaign spending over $10,000. It is a requirement that would apply to all the corporate officers, the board members, and to anyone who owns 5 percent or more of the company.

When there is that much money sloshing around in the defense budget, and when political actors are making the decisions about where that goes, we ought to be able to connect the dots between those corporations and whom they are giving big money to.

So this is a very simple disclosure provision. Again, 75 percent of Republicans support increased disclosure, and, in fact, a considerable number of Republicans in the Senate used to support disclosure. Over and over, you see Members who are still here, including the majority leader, who were ardent supporters of disclosure—ardent supporters of disclosure, that is, until it turned out that after Citizens United, the big, dark money tended to come in on their watch—guess what—Republicans.

So the disclosure principle evaporated, but I think it has to come back. The public is sick of it. It is time we cleaned up the political process from all this dark money. It is totally consistent with the premise of the Citizens United decision.

So when the time comes for me to call up this amendment and get it pending, I will do so with the hope that we can find some Republican support for the American people being allowed to know who is spending big bucks to influence elections. We are entitled to know that.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, one other thing I wish to speak in favor of is the amendment of Senator REED, my senior Senator—Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island—to cut the so-called OCO budget gimmick from the Defense bill.

I am on the Budget Committee, and I have heard very passionate protestations from my colleagues on the Budget Committee about the importance of reducing the deficit, not dealing with the national debt, reducing borrowing, deficit spending, and all of that. Well, when it comes to this particular bill, suddenly all of those concerns have gone completely out the window. They are funding a significant portion of this Defense authorization with imaginary money, with an account that is not intended to support ongoing, continuing, baseline defense expenditures, and that is reserved for overseas contingencies and that, therefore, to be paid for. So it would be a clear increase to the debt and the deficit to go down this road, and we would very much prefer that instead of using the so-called OCO gimmick to fund this authorization with deficit spending, we sit down and have a mature and consequential discussion between the White House and the Senate and the House on where our spending is going to go and with what accounts we are going to be able to do it. Before we start going account by account through the appropriations process, we have a plan in mind so that we don't find that certain favored accounts get dealt with first and then the rug gets pulled out from under the other.

I think that is a reasonable way, and I support Senator REED's amendment and his notion that we should have a bipartisan plan to replace the arbitrary sequester cuts with a balanced deficit-reduction strategy that includes, among other things, closing some wasteful tax loopholes.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL EXPORTS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, when we talk about national security issues and the vulnerabilities we have as a nation, I can think of no other area where we face such challenges and yet such opportunities when it comes to our energy assets and how we can utilize our energy policies at their intersection points with our national security policies.

The inability of the United States to export oil is a vulnerability to our nation. At a time when we have risen to be the world’s top producer of oil, our outdated 1970s-era ban on oil exports is causing us to miss out on a significant economic and security-related benefit.

The good news is we can change this. It is within our power to change this, and that is why I have come to the floor this afternoon.

Here is a fact: The United States is the only country that imposes prohibitive crude oil exports. We are the only one. Countries such as Australia, Denmark, Norway, the United Kingdom, Canada, and even New Zealand all allow for both imports and exports, just like the normal trade in any other commodity. It is distinctly weird that we would prohibit our own exports.

We are also in a position where our friends and our trading partners are openly asking us for assistance. They are coming to us and saying: Hey, can you help? We are your friends. We are your allies. You have the resources.

The world has changed dramatically. We have new alliances. We have new threats. We have new hopes. We have new fears. It is my own hope that while the world may have changed, our Nation’s role as a global leader has not eroded. This is an area where we have an opportunity to prove it has not eroded.

Our energy renaissance is a new thing, and sometimes it takes time to understand the implications of new things, of changes, but here is where we have been. We have already held about half a dozen hearings on the topic of oil exports in the House and in the Senate since last January. I introduced this subject last January 2014, and I said at that time that 2014 was going to be the year of the report, where we would seek out the experts, we would ask the think tanks to weigh in on this issue, and so they did. The reports that were received were numerous, they were considered, they were thoughtful, and they were all very helpful. Reports came out of the Brookings Institution, Columbia University, the Center for a New American Security—too many to even list here. The individual experts who are in favor of allowing oil exports are also quite impressive. These are people whom we look to for leadership in a host of different areas.

There was a piece in the Wall Street Journal that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, penned by Leon Panetta and Stephen Hadley, the Defense Secretary in the Obama administration and National Security Advisor in the Bush administration. They wrote a piece that was entitled “The Oil-Export Ban Harms National Security.” It is well-founded, well-written, and to the point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal (Opinion) May 19, 2015]

THE OIL-EXPORT BAN HARM NATIONAL SECURITY

The U.S. is willfully denying itself a tool that could prove vital in dealing with threats from Russia, Iran and others (By Leon E. Panetta and Stephen J. Hadley)

The United States faces a startling array of global security threats, demanding national resolve and the resolve of our closest allies in Europe and Asia. Iran’s moves to become a regional hegemon, Russia’s aggression in Ukraine, and conflicts driven by Islamic terrorism throughout the Middle East and North Africa are a few of the challenges calling for steadfast commitment to American democratic principles and military readiness. The pathway to achieving U.S. goals also can be economic—as simple as ensuring that allies and friends have access to secure supplies of energy.

Blocking access to these supplies is the ban on exporting U.S. crude oil that was enacted, along with domestic price controls, after the 1973 Arab oil embargo. The price controls ended in 1981 but the export ban lives on, though America is awash in oil.

The U.S. has cut its dependence on energy from unstable sources. Only 27% of the petroleum consumed here last year was imported, the lowest level in 30 years. Nearly half of the remaining imports came from Canada and Mexico. But our friends and allies, particularly in Europe, do not enjoy the same degree of independence. The moment has come for the U.S. to deploy its oil and gas in support of its security interests around the world.

Consider Iran. Multilateral sanctions, including a cap on its oil exports, brought Tehran to the negotiating table. Those sanctions would have proved hollow without the surge in domestic U.S. crude oil production that displaced much of that foreign oil in turn found a home in European countries, which then reduced their imports of Iranian oil to zero.

The prospect of a nuclear agreement with Iran does not permit the U.S. to stand still. Once world economic growth increases the demand for oil, Iran is poised to ramp up its exports rapidly to nations whose reduced Iranian imports were critical to the sanctions’ success, including Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Turkey and China. U.S. exports would help those countries diversify their sources and avoid returning to their former level of dependence on Iran.

More critical, if the negotiations fall, or if Tehran fails to comply with its commitments, the sanctions should snap back into place, with an even tighter embargo on Iranian oil exports. It will be much harder to insist that other countries limit Iranian imports if the U.S. refuses to sell them its oil. The U.S. would lose other trading partners, as global oil suppliers that the U.S. cannot afford to ignore. Libya is racked by civil war and attacks by the Islamic State. Venezuela’s mismanaged economies.

Most ominous is Russia’s energy stranglehold on Europe. Fourteen NATO countries buy 15% or more of their oil from Russia, several countries in Central Europe exceeding 50%. Russia is the sole or predominant source of natural gas for several European countries including Finland, Slovakia, Bulgaria and several states Europe as a whole relies on Russia for more than a quarter of its natural gas.

This situation leaves Europe vulnerable to Kremlin coercion. In January 2009, Russia cut off natural gas to Ukraine, and several European countries completely lost their gas supply. A recent EU “stress test” showed that a prolonged Russian supply disruption would result in several countries losing 60% of their gas supplies.

Further, revenue from sales to Europe provides Russia with critical financial resources to fund its aggression in Ukraine. That conflict could conceivably spread through Central Europe toward the Baltic states. So far, the trans-Atlantic alliance has held firm, but the trajectory of this conflict is unpredictable. The U.S. can provide friends and allies with a stable alternative to threats of supply disruption. This is a strategic imperative as well as a matter of economic self-interest.

The domestic shale energy boom has supported an estimated 2.1 million U.S. jobs, according to a 2013 IHS study, but the recent downturn in oil prices has led to massive cuts in capital spending for exploration and production. Layoffs will have spread outward, notably to the steel industry. Lifting the export ban would put some of these workers back on the job and boost the U.S. economy.

Why, then, does the ban endure? Habit and myth have something to do with it. U.S. energy policy remains rooted in the scarcity mindset that took hold in the 1970s. Even now, public perception has yet to catch up to the reality that America has surpassed both Saudi Arabia and Russia as the largest producer of liquid petroleum (exceeding 11 million barrels a day). The U.S. became the largest natural gas producer in 2010, and the federal government will now license exports of liquefied natural gas.

The fear that exporting U.S. oil would cause domestic gasoline prices to rise is misplaced. The U.S. already exports refined petroleum, including 875,000 barrels a day of gasoline in December 2014. The result is that U.S. gasoline prices approximate the world price. Several recent studies, including by the Brookings Institution, Resources for the Future and Rice University’s Center for Energy Studies, demonstrate that crude oil exports would actually reduce pressure on U.S. gasoline prices, as more oil supply hits the global market and lowers global prices.

Often foreign-policy debates in America focus on issues such as how much military power should be deployed to the Middle East, whether the U.S. should provide arms to the Ukrainians, or whether economic sanctions should be imposed on Iran. Ignored is a powerful, nonlethal tool: America’s abundance of oil and natural gas. The U.S. requires the great army. It should also be the great arsenal of energy.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. It said directly: We keep this ban in place, in this decades-
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old ban. It hurts us as a nation. It harms us from a national security perspective, not to mention the benefits that oil exports will provide when it comes to increased production and increased jobs benefits to our economy.

The Department of Energy to assess the impact that lift of the ban on oil exports: ‘The merits are as clear as the merits with respect to any significant public policy issue that I have ever encountered.’ This is a guy many people looked to for leadership in a host of different areas. The merits are as clear as the merits with respect to any significant public policy issue he has encountered.

Tom Donilon, formerly the National Security Advisor to President Obama, has said that allowing exports “will increase diversity of supply, increase competition, reduce volatility and lower prices in global markets.”

The questions we needed to ask about oil exports have been asked, and answered favorably. Independent experts have studied what would happen if we lift the ban, and universally encouraged us to move forward to lift this outdated, outmoded policy.

This is not a partisan issue. My colleagues from North Dakota is on the floor today. We have introduced bipartisan proposals to remove this ban. This is something which is simply in the best interest of the United States, both in terms of our economic strength and in terms of our national security.

I am here today to tell our colleagues, to repeat and remind our colleagues that the time to legislate on oil exports is now. I think the bill we have in front of us, the National Defense Authorization Act being led by my friend and colleague from Arizona, is the vehicle on which to advance this. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to call up and make pending my amendment No. 1594, related to crude oil exports.

Mr. President, I withhold the request to make this amendment pending at this point in time, but if I may proceed to speak to three quick components to the amendment.

The first requires the Department of Energy to assess the impact that lifting the ban would have on global oil markets. We would likely see higher Iranian oil exports, even as American producers are prohibited from accessing global markets. So our friends in Japan, India, South Korea, and elsewhere would continue importing from Iran. In part because they cannot get the crude oil from us. They cannot import from us. That situation is simply unacceptable. We would be lifting sanctions on Iranian oil while maintaining them on American oil.

I have made this point and I have repeated it before: Leaving in place the oil export ban on U.S. producers while at the same time sanctions are relieved on Iranian producers effectively sanctions U.S. oil production.

There was an article in Reuters this week that revealed that India is now importing record volumes of oil directly from Iran. Another from May showed record volumes of oil going from Iran to global markets. Yet another shows the highest volumes of oil exports from Saudi Arabia in 10 years. So the fact is that we are simply not competing.

The second component of my amendment says that after completion of this report, all U.S. crude oil may be exported on the same basis as the regulations and law currently allow for exports of petroleum products. Today, we can export gasoline, we can export diesel, we can export jet fuel—really, any refined product we can export without a license—but we cannot export crude oil. It does not make sense, and it is high time we resolve that inconsistency.

The third component of my amendment preserves the authorities of the President to block exports during emergencies, during a national security crisis, and so forth.

So what we have done is we have borrowed language on these authorities directly from 20 years ago that authorized oil exports from Alaska’s North Slope, which was a measure that passed the Senate on a bipartisan vote, 74 to 25, and was signed into law by President Clinton. What we did was we took this overwhelmingly favorable vote well before this American energy renaissance began.

I find the whole idea that oil exports would still be prohibited a little mind-boggling. The Commerce Department keeps a list of commodities that are in short supply. They call this the short supply controls. Historically, these controls were generally not blanket prohibitions; they were on items such as aircraft parts, copper, iron and steel scrap, diamond bort and powder, nickel, selenium, and the polio vaccine—not blanket prohibitions, just bits of them. Only three items remain on the short supply controls list. One of them—you guessed it—is crude oil, the second is western red cedar, and the third is horse for slaughter. There is also a small caveat here that prohibits exports from the Naval Petroleum Reserves, but, really, the list is pretty short. There are three things: crude oil, western cedar trees, and horse for slaughter. Clearly our policy needs to be modernized.

We see many parts of the world in a state of unrest. Many parts of the world are seemingly on fire. America and American energy need to be ready to render vital assistance to our friends who are counting on us to demonstrate that global leadership. This is our chance, and I look forward to further discussion on the floor as we move this NDAA measure forward.

I encourage colleagues to look at this amendment, look at the merits of the reports that have gone down in the past year, and look to updating this very outdated policy that is holding us back as a nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for her remarks. Please count me in. It is very timely and extremely important.

71ST ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this Saturday will be the 71st anniversary of one of the greatest days in history—D-Day, June 6, 1944. The day that led to Allied victory in Europe in World War II, the preservation of Western democracy, no less, and freedom for generations to come.

Few days in history belong to individuals, but this day, D-Day, belongs to Dwight David Eisenhower. Ike came to this day, which forever established his place in history as a soldier, as a German, and most of all as an American.

Ike came to the United States, as a marine, and as Ike’s fellow Kansan. Most of all, I come to share Ike with my fellow Americans and my colleagues in the Senate.

There are days in history that change nations and the course of history itself. D-Day, June 6, 1944, was one of those days. The events growing out of that day changed the course of millions of lives, preserved Western civilization, and led to victory over a ruthless tyranny totally dedicated to destroying democracy.

The sacrifices and human losses were immense. Several weeks ago, on May 8, the whole of Europe—from Amsterdam to Moscow—was not only celebrating European victory in World War II but also remembering the special sacrifices of the brave young Americans who made victory possible when it seemed impossible, especially in June of 1944, when the whole of Europe and much of Russia was under the Nazi boot. These cataclysmic events were set in motion on D-Day by the heroic decisionmaking of one man, a Kansan, a Kansan from West Point, the President of the United States, who, at the direction of the President of the United States, carried individually and in concert with our military forces in Europe in World War II.

The decision to launch the invasion was his alone, and the risk of failure was enormous, with huge human losses and casualties for America and all of its allies. Ike’s decision, however, proved correct and was followed by the greatest demonstration of military coalition leadership ever seen in history—before or since D-Day. This brilliant leadership by General Eisenhower led to victory in Europe in 1945, followed by the defeat of Japan.

Ike never let his gigantic role in history push his ego ahead of modesty, common sense, and humility. As he famously said in 1945: ‘‘One must always be the portion of any man who receives acclaim earned in blood of his followers and sacrifices of his friends.’’
Ike’s transcending humanity won not only his fellow citizens’ respect but also their affection. Indeed, he won the respect and affection of much of the world, and he is celebrated internationally to this very day.

I am privileged to serve as the chairman of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Two giants of the United States Senate brought me to this role: Congressional Medal of Honor winner Danny Inouye and U.S. Army Flying Tiger pilot Ted Stevens, both combat-decorated World War II veterans who decided Ike, both as general and as President, should be nationally memorialized. They decided and convinced the Congress that the general and President Eisenhower should be nationally celebrated. And the day it all began was D-day.

Senator Inouye from Hawaii and Senator Stevens from Alaska knew that Ike represented more than Kansas, more than America, but the entire world as well. That is what he spoke to the world. His identity was simple, basic, and convincing. In paying homage in 1945 to the British fathers and mothers of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen who had died under his command, he also said, “I am not a native of this land. I come from the very heart of America.”

It is a paradox of unfortunate irony that those members of the “greatest generation” who come on Honor Flights from all across our great Nation to the World War II Memorial cannot visit, reflect, and pay homage to a memorial to the general who led them to victory.

Today, in the midst of a much different war and during a time when our Nation is searching for resolve, commitment, and leadership, I suggest and recommend that all of my colleagues reflect upon the unique leadership of America’s greatest general when the future of Western democracy was in grave peril. Time is of the essence, and now is the time to complete a lasting memorial and tribute to America’s greatest wartime general and President of the United States whose legacy was 8 years of peace and prosperity. The veterans of World War II and their families know this, and their counterparts all over the world know this as well. With the completion of the Eisenhower memorial, their children and grandchildren and generations to come will understand the tremendous commitment undertaken in defense of freedom, then and now.

Now is the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

OIL EXPORTS

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before I begin what has turned into my weekly discussion about the sacrifices of 196 Dakotans who lost their lives in Vietnam, I wish to briefly mention and associate myself with the remarks of my great friend and tremendous colleague, Lisa Murkowski from Alaska, as she talks about oil exports.

I will tell you this: There are very few issues we confront in the Senate where there is absolutely nothing on the negative equation. What do I mean by that? Changing this policy has hundreds of good ideas for good reasons, and there is absolutely no reason not to do it. As we continue to pursue fairness for the oil-and-gas-producing industry, allowing them to seek their market as we continue to pursue an opportunity for our consumers to experience lower oil and gas prices, as we kind of move forward with oil and gas policy, I think it is critically important that we understand and appreciate that in this arena, the effort is bipartisan, the effort is essential for energy security in our country, energy independence in our country, and energy security across the world.

I applaud Senator Murkowski for taking on this issue. I believe that as she has pointed out, it must get done. I look forward to our continuing efforts, our bipartisan efforts to move this along.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA’S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before I begin to talk about the 196 North Dakotans who died while serving our country in Vietnam, I want to first mention and publicly thank a great Vietnam veteran, Jim Schothorst of Grand Forks. He is a Vietnam veteran. He enlisted in the Army and served in Vietnam from December 1966 to March 1969 as a construction engineer with the 169th Engineer Battalion.

He was raised in McVille. He now lives in Grand Forks. He received his degree from the University of North Dakota and worked with the Grand Forks Health Department for 25 years.

Jim has been extraordinarily helpful to the North Dakota congressional delegation whenever we have needed to gather input or hear from Grand Forks area veterans.

Thank you, Jim, for your service to our country.

I want to again extend my comments and talk about 14 men who did not make it home from Vietnam.

WESLEY CRAIG BRENN

The first soldier whom I will talk about is Wesley Craig Brenno. Craig was from Larson. He was born February 18, 1945. He served in the Marine Corps Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 1st Marines. Craig died on March 28, 1967. He was 22 years old.

He attended school in Columbus and was a star athlete. He was voted most valuable player, and he lettered in baseball, basketball, and football from eighth grade through his senior year of high school.

In 1963, he began his college career at the University of North Dakota on a baseball scholarship and became an active member and officer of the Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity. After finishing his junior year of college, Craig enlisted in the Marine Corps. The Acting Secretary of the Navy wrote the following in Craig’s citation for the Silver Star Medal:

He unhesitatingly assumed the hazardous point position and while fearlessly advancing at the front of his team, he was severely wounded by an enemy mine. Despite intense pain, he valiantly continued to direct his men, urging them forward to complete their mission.

About a week after sustaining that injury, Craig died from his wounds. Nearly 600 people attended Craig’s funeral.

In addition to receiving many medals honoring his sacrifice and service, Craig was also inducted into the North Dakota American Legion Baseball Hall of Fame, and his fraternity named their library after him.

His family cherishes an essay entitled, My Philosophy of Life. Craig wrote in the eighth grade, where he stated:

I believe in a free country. People must have courage and be willing to fight for our freedom.

CHRISTOPHER DAVIS

Christopher Davis was from Belcourt and was born June 1, 1942. He served in the Army’s 17th Field Hospital as a medic. Chris was 24 years old when he died on March 18, 1967.

He was one of seven children. Also, his nephew, Gerald, was raised by Chris’s parents and the two were as close as brothers. Gerald remembers Chris’s fun personality and the little jokes and tricks he played on people, like dressing up and impersonating others. Chris loved to sing and play the guitar, and once won second place in a contest singing Ricky Nelson’s “Poor Little Fool.”

While serving in Vietnam, Chris mailed his parents a letter describing seeing more blood in 1 day in the hospital in Vietnam than he had seen in his whole lifetime before that.

After Chris died, Gerald served in the Army in Vietnam. Gerald went to visit the hospital where Chris worked but left almost as soon as he entered because of the awful cries and screams that he heard. Chris’s family says that Chris’s son Marcus has similar looks and mannerisms to Chris. Marcus was just a baby when Chris died.

DEWAYNE SELBY

DeWayne Selby was from Bismarck. He was born July 6, 1948. He served in the Marine Corps’ India Company, 3rd Battalion, 3rd Marines. DeWayne died on May 26, 1968. He was 19 years old.

DeWayne was one of four children. His brother, Richard, also served our country in the Navy. DeWayne’s sister, Phyllis, and his wife, Evan, remember what a soft heart DeWayne had. When he was 15 years old, he moved in with his grandparents to help take care of his aging grandfather. After high school, DeWayne worked as a mechanic, often fixing cars for free for
people who did not have any money. DeWeay taught Phyllis how to play football and baseball with the boys, but if they got too rough, DeWayne protected his little sister.

DeWayne was shot and killed about a month into his tour of duty in Vietnam.

**LARRY WARBOIS**

Larry Warbis was from Haynes. He was born October 15, 1948. He served in the Army’s 9th Infantry Division. He died on October 6, 1968. He was 19 years old.

Larry was one of five children and attended Haynes High School, where he played basketball. He then worked at the Haynes elevator, where his brother managed the elevator.

Larry’s sister, Vicki, says that she and Larry spent their free time together hunting, catching snakes, and shooting pheasants year-round. Their mother scolded them for shooting pheasants out of season but then cooked the birds for the family to eat anyway.

Vicki remembers Larry as a kind, soft person. Their cousin, Sharon Campbell, remembers having fun babysitting Larry and what a nice young man he grew up to be.

Larry was killed about 2 months into his tour of duty in Vietnam. Larry’s body was returned to his family on his 20th birthday.

**DENNIS “BUDDY” WOSICK**

Dennis “Buddy” Wosick was from Grand Forks and was born September 26, 1947. He served in the Army’s 11th Infantry Brigade. Buddy died on June 9, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Although Dennis was his name, he was known to all of his family and friends as Buddy. First, he was his dad’s little buddy, and as he grew up, he became a buddy to all who knew him.

He had dreams about becoming an astronaut, and he could fix anything, including HAM radios, TVs, and cars. To this day, Buddy’s family still hears from people who knew him and people who have beautiful stories about his character, like when he gave up his lunch at school for another boy who had been bullied and whose sandwich was thrown on the ground.

Buddy died saving the men in his barracks from an explosion that could have killed them if he had not bravely jumped into the ammunition truck to drive it from the targeted barracks as it was being attacked. His sister, Kathy, whom I had the privilege to meet last Sunday in Fargo, believes that Buddy knew he was giving his life by driving that truck away, but that was the kind of guy Buddy was.

**ERNST “ERNE” BARTOLONA, JR.**

Ernest “Ernie” Bartolona, Jr., was a Bismarck native. He was born December 29, 1942. He served as a captain in the Marine Corps flying helicopters. Ernie was 20 years old when he died on February 7, 1969.

He played the French horn in the band while attending Bismarck High School. He later attended Bismarck Junior College and the University of North Dakota where he received a degree in accounting.

Ernie’s sister, Jan, says that he liked to have fun and had a good sense of humor. He and his dad enjoyed hunting and fishing together as often as they could.

Ernie was killed when the helicopter he was flying on an emergency medical evacuation mission was shot down and crashed. The only survivor of the crash spoke with Jan and explained that Ernie’s calm and collected manner was the reason that survivor was able to live and that Ernie was highly respected by his fellow Marines.

**PAUL CHARNETZKI**

Paul Charnetzki was from Valley City and was born May 25, 1936. He served in the Army’s Military Assistance Command—Vietnam Advisers. Paul was 31 years old when he died on February 7, 1968.

Paul left behind his wife and five sons. One son, also named Paul, said that his father loved this country and the Army. He was a professional soldier, and he respected and cared for his fellow soldiers.

He spent much time as he could with his sons, settling their fights and pretending to be tackled in their backyard football games.

Paul was killed when the Vietnamese unit he was advising was ambushed. He was shot while assisting his unit members into the evacuation helicopter.

Paul was awarded the Silver Star Medal for his gallantry in action, and his son Paul believes that he would have been proud of that award, but even more proud of what his friends told Paul’s family; that he was the ultimate warrior.

**JOSEPH “BILL” CRARY**

Joseph “Bill” Crary was from Fargo and was born April 18, 1945. He served in the Army’s 196th Infantry Brigade. He was 25 years old when he died on May 27, 1970.

Bill was one of seven children. There were three sets of twins in his family.

Bill and his twin sister, Kathy, were the oldest twins in the family. Bill’s brother, Mike, also served in Vietnam.

The Crary family honors Mike as a hero for his service and selflessness as well. Mike told Bill that instead of being drafted, Bill should enlist and Mike would offer to sign up for a second tour of duty so Bill would not have to serve in Vietnam, but Bill did not agree.

Bill had earned a degree from St. Louis University and was attending the University of North Dakota Law School when he was drafted.

His siblings believe Bill was special and excelled at everything. They believe he could have held office at the highest level. Bill’s cousin, Jim Crary, says Bill always saw the bright side of life and that Ernie was highly respected by his fellow Marines.

Bill was shot while assisting his unit members into the evacuation helicopter. Paul was awarded the Silver Star Medal for his gallantry in action, and his son Paul believes that he would have been proud of that award, but even more proud of what his friends told Paul’s family; that he was the ultimate warrior.

**ROBERT “BOB” HIMLER**

Robert “Bob” Himler was from Williston and was born October 21, 1942. He served as a captain in the Marine Corps. Robert was 25 years old when he died on October 7, 1964.

He was attending the University of North Dakota with plans to become a doctor, but he paused his studies to enlist in the Marines.
In Vietnam, Robert was killed when the helicopter he was flying was struck by hostile fire, crashed, and burned.

In addition to his parents and siblings, he left behind his wife, Doris.

Robert’s family says that everyone loved him and that to this day, whenever they see his name, Patty, they still talk about him.

Robert’s mother’s husband, Duane, has a diary that Robert kept while he served in Vietnam. Duane notes the interesting fact that Robert stopped writing in the diary about 5 months before he died.

**BYRON KULLAND**

Byron Kulland was from New Town and was born on November 9, 1947. He served in the Army’s 196th Infantry Brigade. Byron was 24 years old when he went missing on April 2, 1972.

His brother, Lee, says that Byron was always smiling and enjoyed life. He loved to hunt rabbits to improve the accuracy of his shot.

Today he is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

**DAVID “DAVIE” DEPRIEST**

David “Davie” DePriest was from Rugby and was born September 17, 1946. He served in the Army’s 101st Airborne Division Artillery. John was 22 years old when he died on November 27, 1968.

John’s family says that he loved being on the move and flying. John chose to serve so that none of his three brothers would ever have to.

The last letter John mailed to his parents from Vietnam describes, with a positive outlook, living and working in less-than-ideal conditions. In his letter, he wrote that he expected to be promoted and receive a better aircraft in about 1 month. But almost 2 weeks after writing the letter, John’s aircraft was shot down and John was killed.

Byron’s remains were uncovered, and today he is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

**REMEMBERING ELDER L. TOM PERRY**

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to honor the memory of Elder L. Tom Perry, an exemplary leader whose kindness, compassion, and love were as boundless as his optimism. Elder Perry quietly passed away on May 30 after a brief battle with thyroid cancer. Serving as an apostle in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for more than 40 years, Elder Perry traveled the world, strengthening congregations visiting the poor, and ministering to those in conflict. Throughout his ecclesiastical service, his words and actions inspired countless Latter-day Saints and many more outside the church. As millions across the globe mourn his passing, we find comfort in his teachings and take solace in the memory of a man who consecrated his life to the service of others.

From humble beginnings, Elder Perry developed a strong sense of discipline that would later define his church service. Born to Leslie Thomas and Nora Sonne Perry in 1922, his father was a lawyer and his mother was a teacher by profession. Together, they taught Tom the principles of honest work and self-reliance. Elder Perry was no stranger to hard labor, and some of his earliest memories included long days working the fields, milking the family cow, and cutting hay by hand with an old scythe. From the early age, Elder Perry learned that nothing would be handed to him and that he had to work for everything he received. And work he did.

After finishing his first year of college, Elder Perry worked as a volunteer missionary, he developed a powerful testimony of Jesus Christ—a testimony that inspired a life of love and selfless service. After serving his church, Elder Perry desired to serve his country. He enlisted in the United States Marine Corps only a month after returning from his church mission.

Elder Perry’s mechanized battalion was deployed to Nagasaki shortly after the Japanese surrender. Observing the devastation and suffering of the Japanese people only softened Elder Perry’s already tender heart. In his off-duty hours, he rallied a group of fellow marines to help him rebuild a Protestant chapel. On the same tour, he also helped repair a Catholic orphanage and build another chapel on the island of Saipan. While in Japan, Elder Perry grew especially close to a Protestant congregation. When transferred to another city, a group of nearly 200 members of this congregation gathered to bid him farewell. As his train crawled out of the station, each member of the congregation lined up along the track as Elder Perry reached out to touch their hands one by one. He loved these people, and they loved him back, making the goodbye all the more difficult. Last Saturday, thousands of us tasted that same bittersweet emotion as Elder Perry departed this mortal life for the next. In the Japanese congregation, we were all moved by his kindness, energized by his enthusiasm, and humbled by his service.
After his honorable release from the Marine Corps, Elder Perry returned to Utah State University, where he earned a degree in finance and married his wife, Virginia Lee. Together, they were the parents of three children: Barbara, Linda Gay, and Lee. Family was always the highest priority for Elder Perry. When Elder Perry's successful business career demanded much of his attention, he always made special sacrifices to spend time with his wife and children.

Elder Perry was also committed to balancing his busy work schedule with his church service. As his family moved across the country—from Idaho and California, to New York and Boston—Elder Perry served in various leadership positions for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, including two bishoprics, a high council, and two stake presidencies. In April 1974, he accepted a calling to serve in the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. Sadly, after serving as apostle for just 8 months, Elder Perry's beloved wife, Virginia Lee, died of cancer. Nine years later, cancer would also take his daughter, Barbara. Although Elder Perry's life was marked by tragedy, it was not defined by it. His faith in God was unshakable, as was his optimism. In response to heartbreak, Elder Perry said, “[The Lord] is very kind. Even though some experiences are hard, he floods your mind with memories and gives you other opportunities. Life doesn't end just because you have a tragedy—there's a new mountain to climb.”

Elder Perry never stopped climbing those mountains, and he served valiantly as an Apostle of Jesus Christ. In 1976, he married Barbara Dayton—his loving helpmeet and able partner who helped him bear the heavy responsibility of his apostolic calling. I will always remember Elder Perry for the zeal and energy he brought to every facet of his apostolic calling. Nothing could temper his enthusiasm, and nothing could deter him from doing what was right.

Elder Perry never tired of his calling. He so loved meeting with church members and leaders throughout the world that he once said, “My association with great men has been not only an education, but an inspiration.” I can easily say the same of my own association with Elder Perry; it has been both an education and an inspiration, and I will always be grateful for his example.

I will never forget Elder Perry, his life of dedicated service, and his unwavering optimism. I consider myself lucky to have known him and even luckier to call him a friend. I will miss Elder Perry dearly, as will all those who knew him. I send my deepest condolences to his wife, Barbara, and their beautiful family. May God comfort them in this time of grief, and may his love be with them always.

OPENING OF THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL OFFICE IN DENVER, COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to welcome a great new diplomatic development in my home State of Colorado. Last week, Denver was proud to officially welcome the opening of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office, TECO, the de facto consulate of Taiwan in the United States. The TECO office in Denver will serve Colorado, as well as the States of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

I thank Taiwan’s leadership for this wise decision, particularly Dr. Lyushun Shen, the Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States, TECO in Washington, DC, as well as Mr. Jack J.C. Yang, the Director General of the new TECO Office in Denver.

As Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee’s Subcommittee on East Asia, the Western Hemisphere, and Cybersecurity Cooperation, I am committed to ensuring that the U.S.-Taiwan partnership continues to grow and prosper. Our nations must continue to work together to ensure regional stability and security, including through landmark initiatives such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP.

Our friendship has never been stronger. Taiwan is now the tenth largest trading partner for the U.S., while the U.S. is Taiwan’s largest foreign investor. Our people-to-people relations are flourishing, with over 20,000 Taiwanese students studying in the U.S. each year. Over 73 U.S. cities have established sister city relationships with their Taiwanese counterparts, including Colorado Springs, CO, which has been a sister city to Kaohsiung since 1983.

I know our nation’s bonds with Taiwan will only grow stronger, and I am proud that Denver will now be front and center in ensuring the continued friendship between our nations and peoples. I am confident that our Taiwanese friends will not find more hospitable and welcoming hosts for their diplomats and visitors than the people of the great State of Colorado.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SONNY SMITH

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the service and sacrifice of Johnson County Auxiliary Sheriff Deputy Sonny Smith who gave his life while in the line of duty on May 15, 2015.

Deputy Smith led a life of service. He was a true hero, not only because of the uniform he wore, but also because of his final acts. By taking the lead when he responded to a residential burglary call and exercising his professional training, he saved the lives of his fellow officers.

I humbly offer my appreciation and gratitude for his selfless service to Arkansas.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I spoke on the floor about two of the outstanding Federal workers at the National Institutes of Health and I indicated at the time that I would be speaking periodically about other Federal workers who are doing extraordinary things on behalf of the American taxpayer and our ideals abroad. Who does the government work for? Government Works for America.

The Partnership for Public Service announced the finalists for the 2015 Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals, also known as the “Sammies,” last month during Public Service Recognition Week. As the Partnership notes, “Federal employees are responsible for many noble tasks and inspiring accomplishments that are seldom recognized or celebrated.”

The Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals
highlight excellence in our Federal workforce and inspire other talented and dedicated individuals to go into public service."

Also last month, on May 5, the Washington Post, citing an Office of Personnel Management—OPM—survey of senior government managers who have retired or moved to other, nonfederal jobs, reported that the single biggest factor for leaving is the "political environment", which was blamed for "a great extent" or "to a very great extent" by 42 percent of the individuals surveyed. The article, by Post columnist Joe Davidson, quoted Brian M. Kent, a retired senior-level Federal scientist, who said, "Expect to be overworked, undercompensated and mistreated by both parties on the Hill, who do not appreciate the value of our expertise, our dedication and our talents."

Congress and the American people need to realize that the Federal workforce is a crucial asset. There are some people who dislike government so much that they want to demonize and demoralize the workforce and deter young people from considering a career in public service. That is counterproductive. Find and remove the bad apples—yes, but acknowledge that they are few and far between. Overwhelmingly, Federal workers are hard-working and patriotic Americans. Rather than demonize and demoralize them with respect in acknowledging their service to our Nation.

One way to acknowledge that service is through the Sammies. I am proud that so many of the finalists this year work and/or live in Maryland, spread across several agencies and several of the award categories. I would like to mention a few today.

Dr. Gretchen K. Campbell and Dr. Ronald Ross

The mission of the National Institute of Standards & Technology, NIST, which is headquartered in Gaithersburg, MD, is to "promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life". NIST's weights and measures services, a job assigned to the Federal Government in the Constitution, provide the basis for the fairness and reliability of trade. These services underpin the efficiency of about one-half of the U.S. economy, or about $7 trillion of the U.S. gross domestic product—GDP. Eighty percent of global merchandise trade is influenced by testing and other measurement-related regulations and standards. U.S. companies increasingly depend on NIST to help ensure access to standards. U.S. companies increasingly depend on NIST to help ensure access to standards.

Dr. Campbell, who is just 35, is a pioneer and intellectual leader in this new and theoretical field of physics known as atomtronics, and has conducted a series of seminal experiments that show its potential. Her team have worked with the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security to test and validate the risk framework unveiled earlier this year that will be used by cloud computing service providers, allowing them to host some of the Federal Government's most sensitive information. And as the principal architect of a new national testing program and infrastructure, Dr. Ross also has been collaborating with the National Security Agency to develop the first-ever network of commercial testing laboratories capable of evaluating the security of information technology—IT—products.

Robert Bunge, Michael Gerber, Mark Paese, and Gregory Zwicker

The National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—is headquartered in Silver Spring, MD. NOAA's mission is "Science, Service, and Stewardship". The agency attempts "to understand and predict changes in climate, weather, oceans, and coasts; to disseminate that knowledge and information; and to conserve and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and resources". NOAA's research, services, and products—ranging from daily weather forecasts, severe storm warnings and climate monitoring to fisheries management, coastal restoration and supporting marine commerce—affect more than one-third of America's GDP.

Robert Bunge, Michael Gerber, Mark Paese, and Gregory Zwicker of the National Weather Service's Wireless Emergency Alerts Team at NOAA are also finalists for the 2015 Homeland Security & Law Enforcement Medal. They have developed a fast and geographically targeted cell phone alert system and launched the 2015 for severe weather emergencies such as tornadoes, flash floods, and hurricanes that reaches millions of people, saving lives and preventing injuries. So far, the system has transmitted more than 13,000 warnings for the most dangerous types of severe weather to the cell phones of millions of people potentially in harm's way across the United States.

While other weather alert systems have been in use for years, this new method of using mobile devices and targeting new people in new areas is a significant improvement. It took many years of coordination with the Federal Communications Commission,
DHS, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the major wireless telecommunications providers.

Previously, weather emergency alerts from one of the 122 weather service offices around the country were emailed to their cell phone customers in the affected county, but the system was slow and too broadly targeted. The new weather alert system structures the information into concise messages—90 or fewer characters—and uses geo-targeted data to broadcast the messages rapidly over cell phones only in the affected areas.

The team worked with six of the largest cell phone companies to build the sophisticated technology needed to make the system work. They developed the infrastructure and protocol for the alerts, facilitated the decision-making for the weather alerts to be transmitted, and conducted extensive public awareness and educational programs. Mr. Gerber is responsible for technical oversight of the software development, the data specialists, the coding, the host servers and other information technology needs, and helped create a system that targets the cell phone alerts to specific geographic locations. Mr. Gerber is a meteorologist and a specialist in how the weather service information is disseminated, and he played a critical role in making sure the right kind of weather alerts would be available and properly transmitted. He also is credited with convincing the wireless carriers to participate and make the needed investments. Mr. Paese handled many of the complicated management issues while Mr. Zwicker was involved in training some 2000 weather service employees in more than 122 offices around the country to use the system in coordination with Federal emergency management officials.

Here’s an example of how effective the system can be. On July 3, 2013, a tornado obliterated a dome in East Windsor, CT, where 29 children had been playing soccer. Seconds before the tornado struck, a cell phone alert prompted the camp manager to rush the children out of the dome and into an adjacent building, preventing injuries and quite possibly fatalities.

DR. HYUN LILLEHOJ

The Agricultural Research Service—ARS—is the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s USDA chief scientific in-house research agency, with headquarters collocated here in Washington, DC and in Beltsville, MD. The agency’s job is “to find solutions to agricultural problems that affect Americans every day from field to table”. ARS conducts research to develop and transfer solutions to agricultural problems of high national priority and provide information access and dissemination to: ensure high-quality, safe food, and other agricultural products; assess the nutritional needs of Americans; sustain a competitive agricultural economy; enhance the natural resource base and the environment; and provide economic opportunities for rural citizens, communities, and society as a whole. Dr. Hyun Lillehoj, a senior research molecular biologist at ARS in Beltsville, is a finalist for the 2015 Career Achievement Medal. This medal recognizes a Federal employee for significant accomplishments throughout a lifetime of achievement in public service. Dr. Lillehoj has pioneered industry-leading research to improve the health of commercial poultry without the use of antibiotics, protecting consumers and making the U.S. poultry industry more competitive by saving it billions of dollars.

There is growing concern over the widespread use of antibiotics in poultry and other food industries, which health experts say contributes to the development of drug-resistant bacteria. These so-called “superbugs” infect hundreds of thousands and kill tens of thousands of Americans each year, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

During three decades as a molecular biologist at ARS, Dr. Lillehoj has helped mitigate the use of antibiotics in poultry, finding that certain food supplements, probiotics, and nutrients can improve health and be an effective means of enhancing the immune system and fighting common parasitic diseases and bacterial infections. The USDA estimates that the poultry diseases Dr. Lillehoj is working to combat cause more than $600 million in losses in the United States and $3.2 billion worldwide.

Dr. Lillehoj has developed novel diagnostic and therapeutic products and discovered DNA markers for the genetic selection of disease-resistant chickens, paving the way for breeding healthier chickens that will benefit both consumers and the Nation’s $45 billion poultry industry. She has done this by creating one of the first gene libraries from commercial chickens and depositing more than 55,000 individual gene sequences from this database into the public domain, providing other researchers with information that could lead to breeding poultry with superior resistance to parasites. She also has identified molecular molecules that have anti-cancer properties and kill infectious parasites; discovered a second-generation parasite vaccine with an improved protection profile over current vaccines; developed therapeutic antibodies that boost immunity for poultry; formulated health-promoting probiotics for veterinary use; and discovered organic, plant-derived herbal extracts and essential oils that fight infectious diseases affecting animals and humans. She is recognized by the National Institutes of Health as an expert understanding host-pathogen interactions of an avian parasite closely related to human malaria that is a major cause of disease affecting poultry and livestock. She has also done original research on a bacterium that is one of the most common causes of food-borne illness in the U.S. Her scientific breakthroughs are documented in 10 U.S. and international patents, more than 350 peer-reviewed scientific papers, 14 book chapters, and 230 worldwide collaborations with academia, foreign governments and private industry. She has mentored more than 120 young scientists.

Dr. Lillehoj embodies the American Dream. She is from South Korea. She came to the United States in 1969 after her father died, when she was just out of high school, and with just $200 in her pocket. At first, she wanted to be a cancer researcher, but her focus soon turned to immunology and she received a government scholarship. After she received her Ph.D., she went to work at the National Institutes of Health. She then moved to USDA in 1984, and has been at ARS ever since. The government’s investment in her has paid enormous dividends.

These are just a few of the Nation’s talented, creative, dedicated, and hardworking Federal employees who have inspired me in congratulating them on their successes and thanking them for their public service. We are a strong and prosperous Nation, in part, because of our Federal workforce. We cannot take it for granted.

REMEMBERING BILL GALLAGHER

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, William “Bill” Gallagher Jr., was an incredible father, teacher, farmer, husband, and public servant who was called home on May 22 at the age of 55. I am also honored to have also called him a friend.

Bill earned his bachelor’s degree from Western Montana College, which led him to Plains, MT as the high school’s new history teacher. He later moved to Polson, where he worked in the insurance business. He then led him to Helena, where he learned how to farm before going on to earn his law degree from the University of Montana Law School.

Bill was an accomplished attorney in Helena, but his heart for our State eventually led him to public service. As the former chairman of the Montana Public Service Commission, Bill worked tirelessly for the people of Montana. Because of his efforts, he helped Montana reacquire hydroelectric dams to bring good-paying jobs back to our State.

He has left an incredible mark on our State and will be truly missed by all who knew him. His wife Jennifer, and children David and Catrina, as well as his five grandchildren, are in my thoughts and prayers.

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT COLONEL KEVIN KNUF

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Lt. Col. Kevin
Knuf on his retirement after nearly 32 years of service to the Nevada Air National Guard. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of dedication to protecting the United States of America and Nevada.

Lt. Col. Knuf enlisted on July 11, 1983, and was commissioned from the Academy of Military Science in Knoxville, TN. He most recently earned a degree from the School of Aerospace Medicine as a bioenvironmental engineer. He has been a great asset to the Nevada Air National Guard throughout his years, serving as deputy base civil engineer, base civil engineer, civil engineering squadron commander, and most recently as the officer in charge of the Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight and as the base environmental manager in the 152nd Medical Group of the Nevada Air National Guard. Throughout his service, Lieutenant Colonel Knuf deployed to Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and to Saudi Arabia in support of Operation Southern Watch. His selfless contribution to this country is invaluable.

Lieutenant Colonel Knuf’s service to the United States of America earns him a place among the heroes who have so valiantly defended our Nation. I offer my greatest appreciation to Lieutenant Colonel Knuf for his courageous contributions to defending our freedom. Words could never fully express my deep appreciation for his sacrifice or for the sacrifices of all veterans and active military members across the country.

As a member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the United States. Lieutenant Colonel Knuf’s sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Lieutenant Colonel Knuf has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Nevada Air National Guard. I am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan, and today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lt. Col. Kevin Knuf for his years of service. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JUNE AND ROBERT SEBO

- Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize June and Robert Sebo for their generous contribution to Honor Flight Nevada, honoring their best friend, Ray Parks. Mr. Parks was a World War II veteran who served in the Navy for four years. He passed away only a few years ago. June and Robert Sebo’s contribution to this amazing organization is not only a grand gesture in memory of Mr. Park’s service to our country, but also a great gift to Nevada’s heroes. The $37,000 will send more than 30 veterans to visit our Nation’s capital, giving them an opportunity to visit their memorials.

I would also like to recognize both Mayor Gino Martini and the City of Sparks for accommodating the Third Annual Honor Flight Pancake Breakfast, a great event that helps make Honor Flight Nevada possible. The annual pancake breakfast provides Nevadans with an opportunity to support their local veterans and help Honor Flight Nevada succeed. The generous donation of Mayor Martini and his wife, Ruth Martini, as well as their commitment to helping Honor Flight Nevada, are shining examples of the strength of our Nevada community. This breakfast could also not take place without the hard work of Teri Bath, who coordinates the entire event. I have had the privilege of attending this pancake breakfast, and I can say first hand her work with this organization is invaluable.

Honor Flight Nevada is a nonprofit organization committed to honoring the brave men and women who so valiantly defended our freedom. The organization sets up trips from Nevada to honor the lives of heroes across the State. As a member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the United States. Lieutenant Colonel Knuf’s sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

As a member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the United States. Lieutenant Colonel Knuf’s sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Lieutenant Colonel Knuf has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Nevada Air National Guard. I am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan, and today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lt. Col. Kevin Knuf for his years of service. I wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO TELLIS JEROME CHAPMAN

- Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Rev. Dr. Tellis Jerome Chapman of Galilee Missionary Baptist Church in Detroit, MI as the congregation and the broader community celebrate his 30th pastoral anniversary.

Born and raised in the State of Mississippi, Reverend Chapman is a graduate of Jackson State University and received his degrees from Natchez College and Dallas Baptist College. Reverend Chapman has served as pastor in churches across the South. On March 31, 1985, Reverend Chapman was called to the pastorate of Galilee Missionary Baptist Church in Detroit, where he has been devoted to serving for the past 30 years. Through his charismatic and dynamic leadership he has left a permanent mark on the congregation and Greater Detroit community.

The congregation has steadily grown under Pastor Chapman’s leadership. His original vision of a church with classrooms, a daycare, and a senior citizen building came to fruition in 1997. The purchase of the property located on Outer Drive for $150,000 and a building that provided seating capacity for 1,000, with facilities to accommodate all of the church’s ministries. The new edifice was inaugurated on Sunday May 31, 1998. Seven years later the church purchased an adjacent property and a new building with a new edifice.

Reverend Chapman has been called many times to serve in a leadership capacity among his ministerial peers and also with various Christian associations. He was an advisor on the Faith-Based Advisory Board of Governor Jennifer Granholm, and currently works as a president of the Baptist Missionary and Educational State Convention of Michigan. He has served as vice moderator and vice president of the Michigan District Baptist Association and Congress of Michigan. Respected for his knowledge, he is well versed in parliamentary procedure and served as parliamentarian for the Baptist Missionary and Educational Convention of the State of Michigan.

Reverend Chapman has been involved in Detroit’s recent growth and the development of mass transit through his work as a board member on the city of Detroit Department of Transportation Commission for several years. Reverend Chapman’s community service is not without energetic and influential involvement. He is the founder and president of the Chapel Vision Community Development Corporation, serving greater southeast Detroit. He is also Founder and President of the Mid-West Community Development Corporation, serving greater southeastern Michigan.

Reverend Chapman’s efforts, both at the pulpit and beyond, have been strengthened by the love and support of his wife Eunic, and their four children, Cecil, Brandie, Candace, and Brannon.

It is an honor to recognize the profound impact that Rev. Dr. Tellis Jerome Chapman has made on the congregation of Galilee Missionary Baptist Church for the last 30 years and the
larger impact he has made on the Greater Detroit community. I wish Reverend Chapman, his family, and the congregants of Galilee many more rewarding years of spiritual fellowship. •

RECOGNIZING PAINTING WITH A TWIST

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, Louisiana has a rich culture and history known for fostering artistic and musical creativity. After the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, two Louisiana entrepreneurs opened a small business to provide their friends and neighbors with a safe and fun distraction during the recovery and rebuilding process. This week’s “Throwback Thursday” honorary Small Business of the Week is Painting with a Twist of Mandeville, LA.

In 2007, longtime friends Cathy Deano and Renee Maloney became business partners to a need in the greater New Orleans area for a distraction and relief after Hurricane Katrina. The pair opened a small painting studio, Painting with a Twist, formerly known as Corks N Canvas, where folks could learn to paint and enjoy a glass of wine at the same time. Today, Painting with a Twist has expanded to over 210 franchise locations across the country, with Deano and Maloney retaining ownership of four locations while also maintaining the franchise headquarters in Mandeville. Painting with a Twist owns copyrights to over 3,500 pieces of art and is also the country’s largest employer of aspiring artists.

When they first started their small business, Deano and Maloney set aside one day’s salary each week per month to donate to local charities, in order to support the recovery and restoration efforts in southeast Louisiana. Today, that tradition continues with their campaign, “Painting with a Purpose.” Held monthly at all Painting with a Twist locations, this event raises funds for charities and nonprofits in each franchise’s area.

Congratulations again to Painting with a Twist for being selected as this week’s “Throwback Thursday” honorary Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to advancing the arts in Louisiana and for your continued dedication to giving back to your community. •

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ‘THE GOONIES’

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this Sunday marks the 30th anniversary of the release of the beloved film, “The Goonies.” With enduring and relatable themes of adventure, adolescence, and friendship, “The Goonies” has withstood the test of time and firmly established its place in American culture as a cult classic. A large part of what makes this film unique and impactful is its iconic setting along the stunning Oregon coastline. Indeed, so significant is the film’s location that thousands of fans from around the world are gathering this week for a four-day festival in Astoria, Oregon—or, “The Goon Docks”—to celebrate the magic that is “The Goonies.” In fact, Astoria has held a Goonies-themed festival every year since the film’s release in 1985.

“The Goonies’” 30th anniversary celebration will include a variety of events around Astoria, as well as Cannon Beach, OR—another Oregon coastal town that served as an idyllic backdrop for the film. Notably, Cannon Beach’s impressive Haystack Rock is featured prominently in the film’s opening scene. Fans will be able to relive their favorite Goonies memories by participating in festivities such as tours of the filming locations, treasure hunts, and a group “truffle shuffle.” Astoria’s Oregon Film Museum also invites festival attendees to visit its Goonies gallery, take a mug shot with friends, and even make their own feature film. Needless to say, it is sure to be a weekend full of fun, nostalgia, and, in typical Goonie fashion, adventure.

Just as the original Goonies fans and stars have grown and matured since the film’s release in 1985, so has Oregon’s film industry. With its magnificent and diverse natural beauty, Oregon has become a much sought after location for film production. As the backdrop for major television shows and box-office hits alike, film production in Oregon brings with it good-paying jobs and tourism that in turn support local businesses and economic development across the State. Certainly all film producers in Oregon and across the country should aspire to achieve the remarkable success of “The Goonies.” •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(Messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES REFERRED

The following measure, having been referred from the Committee on Indian Affairs, was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, pursuant to the order of May 27, 1988, for a period not to exceed 60 days:

S. 710. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ann Donnelly, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

A. D. Zred, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

LaShann Montique DeArcy Hall, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Lawrence Joseph Vilaro, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Eileen Maura Decker, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years.

John W. Huber, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years.

(Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1502. A bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. Reed, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. COONS, Ms. WINTERHOLM, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1503. A bill to provide for enhanced Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a
S. 1504. A bill to prohibit employers from requiring low-wage employees to enter into covenant not to compete, to require employers to notify potential employees of any requirement to enter into a covenant not to compete, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUTZ:
S. 1505. A bill to amend part D of title V of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. KIRK):
S. 1506. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HINCHI, Mr. COONS, and Mr. GRASSLEY:
S. 1507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:
S. 1508. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):
S. 1509. A bill to promote the recycling of vessels in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. HARRINGTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WILKINSON, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAYES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):
S. Res. 192. A resolution requiring that legislation considered by the Senate be confined to a single issue; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BURSTEIN (for himself and Ms. COBB):
S. Res. 193. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the historic Grieswold v. Connecticut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and expressing the sense of the Senate that the case was an important step forward in the fight to ensure that all people of the United States are able to use contraceptives to plan pregnancies and have healthier babies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ROUNDS):
S. 1510. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ROUNDS):
S. 1511. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women’s health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ROUNDS):
S. 1512. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. NELSON):
S. 1513. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the application of Medicare secondary payer rules to certain workers’ compensation settlement agreements, to qualified Medicare set-aside provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:
S. 1514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the tax treatment for certain build America bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):
S. 1515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SCHAFFER, and Mr. UDALL):
S. 1516. A bill to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):
S. 1517. A bill to amend the Labor Relations Management Act of 1947 to address slowdowns, strikes, and lock-outs occurring at ports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCAR (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):
S. 1518. A bill to protect victims of stalking from violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:
S. 1519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase access for the uninsured to high quality physician care; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI:
S. Res. 192. A resolution requiring that legislation considered by the Senate be confined to a single issue; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WILKINSON, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAYES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):
S. Res. 193. A resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the historic Grieswold v. Connecticut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and expressing the sense of the Senate that the case was an important step forward in the fight to ensure that all people of the United States are able to use contraceptives to plan pregnancies and have healthier babies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 202. At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans’ individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 626, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by pediatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, and to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas...
(Mr. Boozman) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. Stabenow, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive health care program for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 982

At the request of Mr. Barrasso, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cruz) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law.

S. 1110

At the request of Mr. Enzi, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to publish in the Federal Register a strategy to significantly increase the role of volunteers and partners in National Forest System trail maintenance, and for other purposes.

S. 1117

At the request of Mr. Johnson, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Ayotte) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct to include removal of certain other employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. Reed, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. Barrasso, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cruz) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term “waters of the United States”, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Brown) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mrs. Ernst, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blunt) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1218

At the request of Mrs. Murkowski, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 1229

At the request of Mrs. Murkowski, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Alexander) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1229, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. Gardner, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Alexander) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1363

At the request of Mr. Crago, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1363, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a report assessing the capability of the Department of Energy to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and fission reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at sites owned by the Department of Energy.

S. 1382

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1390

At the request of Mr. Udall, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1390, a bill to authorize exportation of consumer communications devices to Cuba and the provision of telecommunications services to Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. Res. 180

At the request of Mr. Gardner, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Perdue) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 180, a resolution urging additional sanctions against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1468

At the request of Mr. Cardin, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. Mikulski) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1468 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1485

At the request of Mr. Hoeven, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1485 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1494

At the request of Mrs. Shaheen, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Frank) and the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1494 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1498

At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1498 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1522

At the request of Mr. Portman, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr.
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1526 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1538 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRapo) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1540 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TiLLis) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as co-sponsors of amendment No. 1549 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Shaheen, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Ayotte) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1551 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Franken) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1557 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) were added as co-sponsors of amendment No. 1522 proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Shaheen, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. Hirono) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1550 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1562 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Carper) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1601 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCain), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Vitter), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Ayotte) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1607 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCain), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Vitter), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Ayotte) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1607 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1513. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I join with Senator PORTMAN to reintroduce the bipartisan Second Chance Reauthorization Act. This legislation builds on the success of the original law and takes important new steps to ensure that individuals released from prison are given a fair chance to turn their lives around. When inmates are released from prison, they face many
challenges, including finding housing and employment, combating substance abuse, and accessing physical and mental healthcare. This legislation aims to improve their ability to reenter society, become productive members of their communities, and reduce the likelihood that they will reoffend. Investing in reentry services has been proven to reduce recidivism and bring down prison costs. It is also the right thing to do.

The legislation is urgently needed. While the United States is home to less than 5 percent of the world’s population, we have nearly 25 percent of the world’s prison population. With more than two million people behind bars, and 650,000 ex-offenders released each year, we need to reauthorize these critical programs that reduce crime and increase public safety.

Budgets at the State and Federal level face heavy challenges of mass incarceration, and we all suffer as a result. The truth is that when so much money goes to locking people away, we have fewer resources for programs that actually prevent crime in the communities where we are investing in reentry programs that break the cycle of crime helps reduce prison costs and keeps us all safer. That is why law enforcement groups like the National Association of Police Organizations support this bill. They understand better than most that we cannot afford to stay on our current path.

My home State of Vermont was recently awarded a grant to implement a Statewide Recidivism Reduction Program through the Second Chance Act. The Commissioner of the Vermont Department of Corrections, Andrew Pallito, says that he sees the positive impact of Second Chance programming every day. In a Commission’s Pallito’s word’s “The Second Chance Act is not just about giving incarcerated individuals another opportunity to succeed, it is about significantly improving the outcomes we all want for children, families, and communities.”

We have seen that these programs are succeeding in States across the country. North Carolina, with the help of six Second Chance grants, has reduced its recidivism rate by 18.1 percent since 2007. It has focused on individualized case planning, use of evidence-based practices, and coordination of services through local reentry councils.

Georgia has reduced its recidivism rate by 13.5 percent since 2007 by directing greater resources to rehabilitation, community supervision, and programs addressing reentry needs. Thirteen Second Chance grants have helped support these successful efforts and the state’s incarceration rate has decreased by 4.8 percent.

These programs are working, and it would be irresponsible not to continue supporting these critical efforts that are improving public safety and bringing down prison costs.

I am introducing this bill so that it can be a part of our conversation in the Judiciary Committee and the full Senate about the urgent need for criminal justice reform. Recidivism rates at the State and local levels are unacceptably high. Nearly 2% of former inmates are rearrested within 3 years of release and about half of them end up back behind bars. Any serious effort to address recidivism must include efforts to support reentry. Nearly all prisoners will return to our communities at some point and it is wise policy to help make that transition smooth for all beneficiaries of our families, our neighborhoods, our economy—when people become productive, stable members of society. That is the goal of the Second Chance Act.

There is much that is supported by American Probation and Parole Association, the National Association of Counties, the American Bar Association, and the United Methodist Church, among many others.

Let me be specific. This bill will help former inmates overcome some of the obstacles they face in finding a job, a place to live, and accessing healthcare services. Meeting these basic needs has become more difficult because people coming out of jail are too often treated as second class citizens for the rest of their lives. As a former prosecutor, I believe in tough sentences for those who break out laws. However, once someone has paid their debt to society, they should not be burdened by past mistakes forever.

Chairman GRASSLEY convened a Judiciary Committee hearing last month that highlighted just this issue. The hearing took up the importance of the right to counsel for poor defendants convicted with misdemeanors. During that hearing, we heard testimony about Melinda, a single mother in Ohio who suffered a seizure while cleaning her house. When the police and paramedics arrived, they found unsecured cleaning supplies and Melinda ended up with a conviction for child endangerment. Years later, she was fired from her job when her employer learned of the conviction. This left her unable to pay her rent, buy food for her family, or lead a productive life. This is just not right, and it certainly does not make any of us safer.

Any criminal conviction, no matter how minor, can hinder a person’s chances of success for their entire lives. The Second Chance Act equips people to deal with this difficult issue by providing resources before inmates are even released. Grants under this program have enabled states to hire case managers who meet with inmates while they are in jail to plan for their release, and continue to be a resource once they return home. Case managers help former offenders identify where to continue substance abuse treatment, apply for jobs, and enroll in parenting classes. They also help them build conflict resolution skills and avoid certain people or places that threaten their recovery.

A key component to remaining crime-free is getting and keeping a job, and this reauthorization implements a new “Transitional Jobs Strategy” to help identify and address the root causes of chronic unemployment for ex-offenders. This new strategy will support those individuals committed to working hard and getting their lives back on track by bringing programs like vocational education, life skills training, or child care services. I am proud of this addition to the bill and believe it will improve lives and stimulate our economy.

We have learned from recent reports by the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General that our Nation’s aging prison population is costing the Federal Bureau of Prisons millions every year due to their increasing medical needs. Many of these older prisoners no longer represent a threat to public safety, so this bill increases the discretion of prison officials to deter
determine when inmates over 60 should be released to home detention. It simply doesn’t make sense to spend money incarcerating and caring for elderly inmates who are not dangerous.

Although the Second Chance reauthorization has passed with strong bipartisan support through the Judiciary Committee each of the last two Congresses, the act expired in 2010. We need to pass this legislation this Congress as part of comprehensive criminal justice reform.

I am hopeful that with partners like Senator PORTMAN and Representatives SENSENBERGER and Representative DAVIS for their hard work and cooperation. We have come together in a truly exceptional way in this bipartisan, bicameral effort. I look forward to joining with Democrats and Republicans to get this bill passed and signed into law.
the incentives more accessible an providing parity with other forms of renewable energy. The upfront costs of CHP and WHP can be expensive, and facilities seeking to lower their energy bills often lack access to the capital needed for purchasing the equipment. The POWER Act allows for tax credits, which can help decrease the capital costs. While technologies such as solar energy and fuel cells currently benefit from a 30 percent investment tax credit, it, the incentives for CHP are more limited. CHP systems are only eligible for a 10 percent ITC for the first 15 megawatts of projects that are smaller than 50 MW in capacity. Moreover, while WHP has the potential to produce 15 gigawatts of emissions-free electricity nationwide, it currently does not qualify for the ITC. The limits on the size and scope of the ITC have hampered companies from making important investments to increase their efficiency. The POWER Act would increase the ITC for CHP to 30 percent, allow WHP to qualify for the credit, remove the limit on project size, remove language that states projects are eligible, and extend the credit through December 2018 to allow time for equipment purchase, installation, and permitting. By making our industrial sector more efficient, we would be reducing costs for manufacturers and helping them to better compete in the global marketplace. CHP can also help us be a more resilient nation. Critical institutions that have combined heat and power, such as schools and hospitals, will allow more companies to reduce energy use and costs, build resilience, and reduce emissions.

Woodard & Curran, headquartered in Portland, Maine, noted in its support for the bill that the POWER Act...will megawatts of projects that are smaller than 50 MW in capacity. Moreover, while WHP has the potential to produce 15 gigawatts of emissions-free electricity nationwide, it currently does not qualify for the ITC. The limits on the size and scope of the ITC have hampered companies from making important investments to increase their efficiency. The POWER Act would increase the ITC for CHP to 30 percent, allow WHP to qualify for the credit, remove the limit on project size, remove language that states projects are eligible, and extend the credit through December 2018 to allow time for equipment purchase, installation, and permitting. By making our industrial sector more efficient, we would be reducing costs for manufacturers and helping them to better compete in the global marketplace. CHP can also help us be a more resilient nation. Critical institutions that have combined heat and power, such as schools and hospitals, will allow more companies to reduce energy use and costs, build resilience, and reduce emissions. CHP will megawatts of projects that are smaller than 50 MW in capacity. Moreover, while WHP has the potential to produce 15 gigawatts of emissions-free electricity nationwide, it currently does not qualify for the ITC. The limits on the size and scope of the ITC have hampered companies from making important investments to increase their efficiency. The POWER Act would increase the ITC for CHP to 30 percent, allow WHP to qualify for the credit, remove the limit on project size, remove language that states projects are eligible, and extend the credit through December 2018 to allow time for equipment purchase, installation, and permitting. By making our industrial sector more efficient, we would be reducing costs for manufacturers and helping them to better compete in the global marketplace. CHP can also help us be a more resilient nation. Critical institutions that have combined heat and power, such as schools and hospitals, will allow more companies to reduce energy use and costs, build resilience, and reduce emissions.
SA 1614. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMBY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROUND, and Mr. MARKET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1615. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1616. Mr. DONELLY (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1617. Mr. DONELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1618. Mr. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1619. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1620. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1621. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1622. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1623. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1624. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1625. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1626. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1627. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. EVIL, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. Daines, Mr. BURING, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1628. Ms. AYOTTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1629. Mr. COPPON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1630. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1631. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1632. Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1633. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1634. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1635. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1636. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1637. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1638. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1639. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1640. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1641. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1642. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1643. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1645. Mr. MARKETK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1646. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1647. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1648. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1649. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1650. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1651. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1652. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1653. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1654. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1655. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1656. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1657. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1658. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1659. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1660. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to
the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1661. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr.
KAIN) submitted an amendment in-
tended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1662. Mr. WARNER submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1663. Mr. WARNER submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1664. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1666. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DUR-
BIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN,
and Ms. WARNEN) submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1668. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1669. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr.
DONNELLY, and Mr. TOONEY) submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1670. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1671. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1672. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1673. Mr. WARNER submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1674. Mr. WARNER submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1675. Mr. UDALL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN
to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was or-
dered to lie on the table.
SA 1676. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr.
HEINRICH) submitted an amendment in-
tended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463

posed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1677. Mr. UDALL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1678. Mr. PAUL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1679. Mr. PAUL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1680. Mr. PAUL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1681. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1682. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1683. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs.
MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BLUNT)
submitted an amendment intended to be pro-
posed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr.
McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which
was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1684. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms.
BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PETERS)
submitted an amendment intended to be pro-
posed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr.
McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which
was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1685. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms.
COLLINS) submitted an amendment in-
tended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463
proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1686. Mr. MORA submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1688. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr.
DONNELLY) submitted an amendment in-
tended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463
proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1689. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1690. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1691. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1692. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1693. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself
Mr. MORAN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1694. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr.
FRANKEN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1695. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr.
CARPER) submitted an amendment intended
to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 pro-
posed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1696. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr.
WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended
to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 pro-
posed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1697. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr.
WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended
to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 pro-
posed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1698. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr.
INHOFE, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1699. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself
and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment
intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463
proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1700. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms.
HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended
to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 pro-
posed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1701. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1702. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amend-
ment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill
H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on
the table.
SA 1703. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed to amendment
SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735,
supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1710. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. Menendez) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1711. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1712. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1713. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. Toomey) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1714. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1715. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1716. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1717. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1718. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1719. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1720. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1721. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1722. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1723. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1724. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1725. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1726. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1727. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1728. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. Mikuls, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Hatch, Ms. Murkowski, Ms. Nelson, and Mr. Markley) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1729. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1730. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1731. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. Hirono) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1732. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1733. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. Perdue, and Mr. Cassidy) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1734. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. Grassley) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1735. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1736. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. Moran) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1737. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Booker) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1738. Mrs. McCaskill submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1739. Mr. McCaskill submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1740. Mrs. McCaskill submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1741. Mrs. McCaskill submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1742. Mr. McCaskill submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1743. Mrs. McCaskill submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1744. Mrs. Feinstein submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1745. Ms. Peters (for herself, Ms. Hirono, and Mr. Wyden) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1746. Mr. Peters (for himself, Ms. Hirono, and Mr. Wyden) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1747. Mr. Casey (for himself and Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Udall, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Murphy) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1748. Mrs. Shaheen submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1749. Mr. Warner submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1750. Mr. Booker (for himself and Mr. Menendez) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1751. Mr. Heinrich (for himself, Mr. Udall, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Graham, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Mark, Mr. Udall, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Udall) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1752. Mr. Rubio, Mr. Markey, Ms. Ayotte, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Menendez submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1753. Mrs. Ernst submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1754. Mr. Burr (for himself and Mr. Tillis) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1759. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1760. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1761. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1763. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1764. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1765. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1768. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1769. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1770. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1771. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1772. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. MANKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1774. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1775. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1776. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1777. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1778. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1779. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1780. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1781. Ms. HETFKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1782. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1783. Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1784. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1785. Ms. MUKROWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1786. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1787. Ms. SSESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1788. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1789. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1790. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1791. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1792. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1793. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1794. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1795. Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1796. Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1797. Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1049. REQUIREMENT THAT PASSENGER AIRCRAFT IN CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET HAVE SECONDARY COCKPIT BARRIERS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall require for any passenger aircraft participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet—

(1) the installation of a barrier, other than the cockpit door, that prevents access to the flight deck of the aircraft; and

(2) for any such aircraft—

(A) that is equipped with a cockpit door, that the barrier required under paragraph (1) remain locked while—

(i) the aircraft is in flight; and

(ii) the cockpit door separating the flight deck and the passenger area is open; and

(B) that is not equipped with a cockpit door, that the barrier required under paragraph (1) remain locked as determined appropriate by the pilot in command.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET.—The term "Civil Reserve Air Fleet" has the meaning given such term in section 9511 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) PASSENGER AIRCRAFT.—The term "passenger aircraft" means a passenger aircraft, as such term is defined in such section 9511, that—

(A) has 75 or more seats; and

(B) has a gross take-off weight of 75,000 pounds or more.

SA 1614. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year; and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:
SEC. 25E. STATE LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS OF MILITARY SPOUSE ARISING FROM TRANSFER OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES TO ANOTHER STATE.

(a) In General.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 22D the following new section:

SEC. 22E. STATE LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS OF MILITARY SPOUSE ARISING FROM TRANSFER OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES TO ANOTHER STATE.

"(a) In General.—In the case of an eligible individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter the qualified relicensing costs paid by such individual, which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(b) Maximum Credit.—The credit allowed by this subsection with respect to each change of duty station shall not exceed $500.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Eligible individual.—The term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual—

"(A) who is married to a member of the Armed Forces of the United States at the time that the member moves to another State, or

"(B) who moves to such other State with such member."

"(2) Qualified relicensing costs.—The term ‘qualified relicensing costs’ means costs—

"(A) which are for a license or certification required by the State referred to in paragraph (1) to engage in the profession that is qualified relicensing costs of such individual; such costs are paid or incurred during the period beginning on the date that the orders referred to in paragraph (1)(A) are issued and ending on the date which is 1 year after the reporting date specified in such orders.

"(d) Denial of Double Benefit.—The amount of any deduction or other credit allowable under this chapter for any expense taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of the credit under this section."

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by inserting at the end thereof, relating to section 22D the following new item:

"Sec. 22E. State licensure and certification costs of military spouse arising from transfer of member of Armed Forces to another State.".

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 1616. Mr. DONELLY (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 716 and insert the following:

SEC. 716. DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN NON-DEPARTMENT MILITARY HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS WITH KNOWLEDGE RELATING TO THE DUTY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) Mental Health Provider Readiness Designation.—

"(1) In General.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall develop a system by which any non-Department mental health care provider that meets the eligibility criteria established by the Secretary of Defense relating to the knowledge described in paragraph (2) receives a mental health provider readiness designation from the Department of Defense."

"(2) Knowledge Described.—The knowledge described in this paragraph is the following:

"(A) Knowledge and understanding with respect to the culture of members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and family members and caregivers of members of the Armed Forces and veterans;"

"(B) Knowledge with respect to evidence-based treatments that have been approved by the Department for the treatment of mental health issues among members of the Armed Forces and veterans;"

"(C) Knowledge of the Department of Veterans Affairs for mental health care providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs."

"(b) Provider List.—The Secretary concerned shall—

"(1) update all lists maintained by such Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for mental health care providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs;"

"(2) establish and update as necessary a list of mental health care providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs that are anticipated to be needed in such Secretary’s jurisdiction of such Secretary of the clinical care practices."

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Eligible Indiviudal.—The term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual—

"(A) who is married to a member of the Armed Forces of the United States at the time that the member moves to another State, or

"(B) who moves to such other State with such member."

"(2) Non-Department mental health care provider.—The term ‘non-Department mental health care provider’ means any non-Department mental health care provider that is qualified relicensing costs of such individual; such costs are paid or incurred during the period beginning on the date that the orders referred to in paragraph (1)(A) are issued and ending on the date which is 1 year after the reporting date specified in such orders.

"(d) Denial of Double Benefit.—The amount of any deduction or other credit allowable under this chapter for any expense taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of the credit under this section."

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by inserting at the end thereof relating to section 22D the following new item:

"Sec. 22E. State licensure and certification costs of military spouse arising from transfer of member of Armed Forces to another State.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SA 1617. Mr. DONELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 713 and insert the following:

SEC. 713. IMPROVEMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) Training on Recognition and Management of Risk of Suicide.—

"(1) Initial Training.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the mental health workforce of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and the long-term mental health care needs of members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their dependents for purposes of determining the long-term requirements of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for long-term mental health care providers.

"(2) Additional Training.—The Secretary concerned shall provide training to mental health care providers who receive or have already received, training described in paragraph (1) receive such additional training thereafter as may be required to train mental health care providers in evidence-based changes in health care practices.

(b) Assessment of Mental Health Workforce.—

"(1) In General.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the mental health workforce of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs as of the date of the submittal of the report, disaggregated by specialty, including psychologists, social workers, mental health counselors, and marriage and family therapists.

"(2) Elements.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the following:

"(A) The number of mental health care providers of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs as of the date of the submittal of the report, disaggregated by specialty, including psychologists, social workers, mental health counselors, and marriage and family therapists.

"(B) The number of mental health care providers that are anticipated to be needed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

"(C) The types of mental health care providers that are anticipated to be needed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

"(D) Locations in which mental health care providers are anticipated to be needed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) Plan for Development of Procedures to Measure Mental Health Data.—

"(1) In General.—The Secretary concerned shall—

"(A) develop a system by which any non-Department mental health care provider that is qualified relicensing costs of such individual; such costs are paid or incurred during the period beginning on the date that the orders referred to in paragraph (1)(A) are issued and ending on the date which is 1 year after the reporting date specified in such orders.

"(d) Denial of Double Benefit.—The amount of any deduction or other credit allowable under this chapter for any expense taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of the credit under this section."

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by inserting at the end thereof relating to section 22D the following new item:

"Sec. 22E. State licensure and certification costs of military spouse arising from transfer of member of Armed Forces to another State.”.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.
SEC. 1024. PROHIBITION ON RETIREMENT OF NUCLEAR POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIERS BEFORE FIRST REFUELING.

Section 5602 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) A nuclear powered aircraft carrier may not be retired before its first refueling.".

SA 1622. Mr. MORA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 706. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR READJUSTMENT COUNSELING FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO INCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall commence a three-year pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of furnishing counseling under Section 1712A(a) of title 38, United States Code, to any member of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces who has a behavioral health condition or psychological trauma.

(b) Comprehensive Individual Assessment.—Counseling furnished under the pilot program may include a comprehensive individual assessment under section 1712A(a)(1)(B)(I) of such title.

(c) Confidentiality.—The Secretary shall ensure that the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under this section is protected to the same extent as the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under section 1712A(a) of such title.

(d) Report.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the completion of the pilot program, the Secretarv of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to the following:

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

At the end of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 706. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR READJUSTMENT COUNSELING FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO INCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall commence a three-year pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of furnishing counseling under Section 1712A(a) of title 38, United States Code, to any member of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces who has a behavioral health condition or psychological trauma.

(b) Comprehensive Individual Assessment.—Counseling furnished under the pilot program may include a comprehensive individual assessment under section 1712A(a)(1)(B)(I) of such title.

(c) Confidentiality.—The Secretary shall ensure that the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under this section is protected to the same extent as the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under section 1712A(a) of such title.

(d) Report.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to the following:

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

At the end of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 706. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR READJUSTMENT COUNSELING FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO INCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall commence a three-year pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of furnishing counseling under Section 1712A(a) of title 38, United States Code, to any member of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces who has a behavioral health condition or psychological trauma.

(b) Comprehensive Individual Assessment.—Counseling furnished under the pilot program may include a comprehensive individual assessment under section 1712A(a)(1)(B)(I) of such title.

(c) Confidentiality.—The Secretary shall ensure that the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under this section is protected to the same extent as the confidentiality of individuals furnished counseling under section 1712A(a) of such title.

(d) Report.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to the following:

(2) Elements.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:
(A) A description of the individuals who benefitted from counseling under the pilot program.
(B) A description of any impediments to the Selection Reserve furnishing counseling under the pilot program.
(C) A description of any impediments encountered by individuals in receiving counseling under the pilot program.
(D) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of furnishing counseling under the pilot program to all members of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces who have behavioral health conditions or psychological trauma.
(E) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate with respect to the furnishing of counseling to such members.

(e) Letter to the Defense—In this section, the term ‘‘Vet Center’’ means a center for readjustment counseling and related mental health services for veterans under section 1712A of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1624. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 706. PROVISION OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES TO SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE BASED ON NEED.
(a) PROVISION AUTHORIZED.—Section 1074(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by redesigning paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and
(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

‘‘(2) The Secretary concerned may also provide to any member of the Selected Reserve not described in subsection (d)(1) or (f) care for behavioral health conditions if the Secretary determines, based on the most recent medical or psychological health assessment of such member, that the receipt of such care by such member will ensure that such member meets applicable standards of medical readiness.’’.

(b) FUNDING.—Subject to applicable provisions of appropriations Acts, amounts available to the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program shall be available to the provision of behavioral health services under section 1074(a) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)).

SEC. 1116. ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DISABLED VETERANS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by striking ‘‘§ 6329. Disabled veteran leave’’; and
(2) by inserting ‘‘§ 6329. Disabled veteran leave’’ before ‘‘mean’’.

(b) LEAVE CREDITED.—During the 12-month period beginning on the first day of any fiscal year, the terms ‘‘veteran’’ and ‘‘disabled veteran’’ shall be defined to mean—
(1) a veteran who has served on active duty in the armed forces; and
(2) a veteran who has served on active duty in the armed forces and has been determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to be a disabled veteran.

(c) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 1117. ADDITION TO VETERANS’ BENEFITS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter VIII of title 38, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by striking ‘‘(1) have the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38’’; and
(2) by inserting ‘‘(1) has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38’’ before ‘‘mean’’.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, by regulation, prescribe the manner in which a veteran’s disability rating is determined for purposes of this section.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1625. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 706. PROVISION OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES TO SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE BASED ON NEED.
(a) PROVISION AUTHORIZED.—Section 1074(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by redesigning paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and
(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

‘‘(2) The Secretary concerned may also provide to any member of the Selected Reserve not described in subsection (d)(1) or (f) care for behavioral health conditions if the Secretary determines, based on the most recent medical or psychological health assessment of such member, that the receipt of such care by such member will ensure that such member meets applicable standards of medical readiness.’’.

(b) FUNDING.—Subject to applicable provisions of appropriations Acts, amounts available to the Department of Defense for the Defense Health Program shall be available to the provision of behavioral health services under section 1074(a) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)).

SEC. 1116. ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DISABLED VETERANS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘§ 6329. Disabled veteran leave

‘‘(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
‘‘(1) notwithstanding section 6301, the term ‘employee’ has the meaning defined in section 6302 of this title; and
‘‘(2) the term ‘service-connected’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(16) of title 38; and
‘‘(3) the term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38.

(b) LEAVE CREDITED.—During the 12-month period beginning on the first day of the fiscal year for which the employee is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated as 30 percent or more disabled, the
employee is entitled to leave, without loss or reduction in pay, for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability for which sick leave could regularly be used."

(2) CARRY OVER.—Any leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) that is not used during the 12-month period described in such subsection may not be carried over and shall be forfeited.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—In order to verify that leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) is used for the purpose of being furnished treatment for the disability by a health care provider, the Secretary of the Air Force shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Office of Personnel Management, in such form and manner as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may prescribe, that the employee used the leave for purposes of being furnished treatment for the disability by a health care provider.

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

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

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels into and directed at the territory of Israel; and

(3) the Administration should develop anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels into and directed at the territory of Israel. Such authority includes the authority to develop, acquire, and use equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The activities described in paragraphs (1) and (3) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress the following:

(A) The Secretary of Defense shall coordinate with the Administrators of the Federal Air Force and the Air Force to ensure safety and compliance upgrades in lieu of the C-130 aircraft avionics modernization program of record to meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration by 2020.

(B) REPLACEMENT OF LIMITATION.—Section 134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3317) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection (b):

"(b) COORDINATION WITH FAA IN IMPLEMENTATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM.—If the Secretary of the Air Force implements an equivalent modernization program of record in accordance with subsection (a)(2) the alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program described in subsection (a)(1)(A) and (a)(2), the Secretary shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in the implementation of such program in order to achieve significant measurable safety and compliance airspace regulations."

SA 1628. Ms. AYotte (for herself, Mr. Peters, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Rubio) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. Rubio) submitted an amendment in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities referred to in amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

End of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3124. INSURING UNITED STATES CIVIL NUCLEAR COMPONENTS ARE NOT ILLICITLY DIVERTED TO NUCLEAR NAVAL PROPULSION PROGRAMS.

Section 57 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (42 U.S.C. 2177) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator may not make an authorization under subsection (b)(2) with respect to a foreign country with a nuclear naval propulsion program unless—

(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief of Naval Operations jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the risks of diversion, and the likely consequences of such diversion, of the technology and material covered by such authorization; and

(B) following the date on which such assessment is submitted, the Administrator recommends to the appropriate congressional committees, with respect to a nuclear naval propulsion program, that—

(i) there is sufficient diversion control as part of the authorization; and

(ii) the authorization presents a minimal risk of diversion of such technology and material to a military program that would degrade the technical advantage of the United States; and

(2) The limitation under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to France or the United Kingdom.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—In subsection (b)(2), the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the following:

"(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives."
“(A) The congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code).

(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.”.

SA 1630. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. REQUIREMENT TO CONTACT CERTAIN TRICARE PROVIDERS TO DETERMINE INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING IN CHOICE PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) SUBMITTAL OF LIST.—(1) In general.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a list of all health care providers who participate in the TRICARE program and who are not health care providers of the Department of Defense.

(b) UPDATE.—Not less frequently than twice each year after the submission of the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs an updated list under paragraph (1).

SA 1632. Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle —Border Security Effectiveness Metrics

SEC. 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

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

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(2) TOBACCO REMOVAL EFFECTIVENESS RATE.—The term “tobacco removal effectiveness rate” means the percentage that results from dividing—

(i) the number of apprehensions and turn backs; by

(ii) the number of apprehensions, turn backs, and got aways.

(3) TURNOVER EFFECTIVENESS RATE.—The term “turnover effectiveness rate” means the percentage that results from dividing—

(i) the amount of marijuana removed by the Department of Homeland Security’s maritime security components inside or outside a transit zone; by

(ii) the average weight of marijuana seized by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to such weight-to-frequency rate for the immediate preceding 5 fiscal years.

SEC. 2. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER BETWEEN PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) In general.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop metrics, in consultation with situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security between ports of entry. The metrics developed under this subsection shall include—

(1) an unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate, which is informed by situational awareness;

(2) a probability of detection, which compares the percentage of border crossings not detected by the Border Patrol to the unlawful border crossing effectiveness rate; and

(3) a weight-to-frequency rate, which compares the average weight of marijuana seized per seizure by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to such weight-to-frequency rate for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years.

(b) Metrics measurement.—The term “weight-to-frequency rate” means the average weight of marijuana seized per seizure by the Border Patrol in any fiscal year to such weight-to-frequency rate for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years.
6. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER
ON FEDERAL DOMAINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine shall consult with staff members of the Office of the Office of Air and Marine of the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) METRICS CONSULTATION.—In developing the metrics required under subsection (a), the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine shall consult with staff members of the Office of the Office of Air and Marine of the Department of Homeland Security.

5. AIR AND MARINE SECURITY METRICS
IN THE LAND DOMAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine shall consult with staff members of the Office of the Office of Air and Marine of the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

1. IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of Homeland Security shall develop metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security in the aviation environment.

2. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER AT PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Commander of the United States Coast Guard and the Assistant Commissioner for the Office of Air and Marine of the Department of Homeland Security shall jointly implement metrics, informed by situational awareness, to measure the effectiveness of security in the maritime environment.

3. METRICS FOR SECURING THE BORDER
AT PORTS OF ENTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner for Field Operations at the Department of Homeland Security shall consult with staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security and staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

4. METRICS FOR SECURING THE MARITIME BORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Assistant Commissioner for Air and Marine of the Department of Homeland Security shall consult with staff members of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security.

5. AIR AND MARINE SECURITY METRICS
IN THE LAND DOMAIN.
SA 1634. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of title V of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 796. INCLUSION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES NOT SUBJECTED OR EXPOSED TO OPERATIONAL RISK FACTORS IN REQUIRED MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.

Section 1074m(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code is amended by striking "determines that—" and all that follows through "providing such assessment" and inserting "determines that providing such assessment":

SA 1635. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 403. LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF END STRENGTH FOR ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Notwithstanding any provision of law, including any authorized strength specified in any annual national defense authorization Act enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, the authorized strength for active duty personnel of the Armed Forces for any fiscal year may not be reduced below the applicable number for fiscal year 2016 specified in any annual national defense authorization Act of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 706. ENHANCEMENT OF ANNUAL MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1074n(b) of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by inserting by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(3) include a thorough screening of the member for key indicators of post-traumatic stress and mild to severe traumatic brain injury; and

"(4) include the creation of a recorded, verified history of events, including non-combat related events, for each member to determine the cause and correlation of symptoms of mild traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress that may appear months or years after the causal incident.

"(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a plan for the implementation of paragraphs (3) through (5) of section 1074n(b) of such title, as added by subsection (a)(3) of this section.

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

(1) the annual mental health assessment for members of the Armed Forces provided under section 1074n of such title can be improved by providing members undergoing such assessment with an enhanced mechanism, including non-combat related events, to substantiate latent mental health issues that appear months or years after the causal incident;

(2) some members do not know how to ask for help with mental health concerns in connection with such assessment as conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act and not all health care providers adequately discuss mental health during such assessment;

(3) the majority of mild traumatic brain injury inducing incidents are not diagnosed during combat deployment, so when symptoms do appear, there is no mechanism for health care providers to link the injury back to the causal incident;

(4) the provision of such assessment as conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act does not recognize incidents described in paragraph (3) unless the member indicates such incidents on a survey or has a very proactive health care provider;

(5) when latent mental health symptoms appear after a member is discharged, the member is not eligible to receive treatment from the Department without a record of causal justification; and

(6) the Secretary of Defense has an obligation to localize as quickly and efficiently as possible without disrupting military readiness the mental health concerns that persist among members of the Armed Forces, unknown to those members and the health care providers of those members.

SEC. 456. AUTHORITY FOR UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY TO CHARGE TUITION FOR INSTRUCTION OF PERSONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL DETAINED AT THE INSTITUTE.

(a) INSTRUCTION IN PERSONS OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL.—Section 904(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(2) by redesigning subsection (b) as paragraph (4) of subsection (d), as so redesignated; and

(3) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

"(a) MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OTHER THAN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL.—(1) The Secretary of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Space Force, the District of Columbia National Guard, the United States Air Force Institute of Technology that is received by the members of the armed forces detailed for that instruction by the Secretary of the Army, the Navy, and Homeland Security, respectively.

"(2) Members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force may be detailed for instruction at the Institute on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned the cost of providing such instruction, and the Secretary of the Air Force considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(b) FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN AIR FORCE EMPLOYEES.—Section 904(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

"(2) by redesigning subsection (b) as paragraph (4) of subsection (d), as so redesignated; and

"(3) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

"(A) A member of the armed forces not detailed under section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

"(B) A member of the armed forces who is not a member of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Space Force, the District of Columbia National Guard, the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

"(C) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(2) Paragraph (1) applies to any of the following persons:

(A) A member of the armed forces not detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned.

"(3) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

"(4) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(b) FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN AIR FORCE EMPLOYEES.—(1) The Secretary of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Space Force, the District of Columbia National Guard, the United States Air Force Institute of Technology that is received by the members of the armed forces detailed for that instruction by the Secretary of the Army, the Navy, and Homeland Security, respectively.

"(2) Members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force may be detailed for instruction at the Institute on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned the cost of providing such instruction, and the Secretary of the Air Force considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(b) FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN AIR FORCE EMPLOYEES.—(1) The Secretary of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Space Force, the District of Columbia National Guard, the United States Air Force Institute of Technology that is received by the members of the armed forces detailed for that instruction by the Secretary of the Army, the Navy, and Homeland Security, respectively.

"(2) Members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force may be detailed for instruction at the Institute on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the Secretary concerned the cost of providing such instruction, and the Secretary of the Air Force considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(3) members of the armed forces detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned.

"(4) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(c) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(c) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(c) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(c) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.

"(c) NONDETAILED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may permit persons described in paragraph (2) to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology on a space-available basis. The Secretary of the Air Force shall charge the individuals concerned only for such costs and fees in connection with such instruction as the Secretary of the Air Force Institute of Technology considers appropriate. Amounts received by the Institute for such instruction shall be retained by the Institute to defray the cost of instruction.
“(B) A civilian employee of a military department, of another component of the Department of Defense, of another Federal agency, or of the National Guard of a State not detailed for that instruction by the Secretary concerned or head of the other Department of Defense component, other Federal agency, or the National Guard.

“(C) A United States citizen who is the recipient of a competitively selected Federal or Department of Defense sponsored scholarship or fellowship with a defense focus in areas typically offered to the academic disciplines offered by the Institute and which requires a service commitment to the Federal government in exchange for educational financial assistance.

“(3) If a scholarship or fellowship described in paragraph (2)(C) includes a stipend, the Institute may accept the stipend payment from the scholarship or fellowship sponsor and make a direct payment to the individual.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATED TO REDESIGNATION AND OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by transferring subsections (d) and (f) of section 9314, by striking “subsection (d)(1)’’ and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”;

(b) in paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(c) in paragraph (4), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), by striking “ELIGIBLE DEFENSE INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES.—’’;

(d) in subsection (f)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking “subsection (a)(1)” and inserting “subsection (d)(1)’’;

(e) in subsection (g)(1), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by striking “under section (a)(1)” and inserting “under subsections (c) and (d)”;

(f) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (b), “and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:’’;

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

(a) POLICY REQUIRED.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall establish a joint policy under which military installation level advisory committees on the use of military lands that are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities coordinate with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, local governments, and hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups the periods during which such lands shall be open and closed to the public. To the maximum extent practical, such coordination shall be undertaken sufficiently in advance of the commencement of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons in order for State fish and wildlife managers to plan for the opening and closing dates of seasons and the conditions under which fish and wildlife can be taken during the season.

(b) INSTALLATION LEVEL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The policy established under subsection (a) may authorize the creation of installation level advisory committees on the use of military lands for hunting, fishing, and recreational uses. Any such advisory committee shall not be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SA 1640. Ms. MURkowski submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2822. LAND ACQUISITION, FORT GREELY SCHOOL, DELTA JUNCTION, ALASKA.

(a) LAND ACQUISITION AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire, without consideration, from the Delta/Greely School District (in this section referred to as the “District”), all right, title, and interest of the District in and to a parcel of property, including improvements thereon, consisting of the Fort Greely School, Delta Junction, Alaska.

(b) TERMINATION OF GROUND LEASE.—Upon the acquisition authorized under subsection (a), the ground lease between Delta/Greely School District and the Army will be terminated and the District shall be relieved from all liability for the deed or title to the ground or for build- ing or remediation of the site except for environmental contamination that was the result of sole willful misconduct of the District during the period that the District owned the Fort Greely School.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the acquisition under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SA 1643. Mr. Mccain submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. GUARANTEED TRANSPORTATION FOR NEXT OF KIN TO ATTEND TRANSFER CEREMONY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

Section 481f(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) The discretionary to authorize transportation under paragraph (1) shall not apply, and the Secretary of the military department concerned is required to provide such transportation, whenever the death of the member overseas occurs in the line of duty in a combat or humanitarian relief operation or in combat zone designated by the Secretary of Defense.”

SA 1644. Mr. Mccain submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Title 591 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 9314 and 9314a and inserting the following new items:


§ 9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: reimbursement and tuition; instruction of persons other than Air Force personnel.”

(2) SECTION HEADINGS.—(A) The heading of chapter 901 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by transferring subsections (d) and (f) of section 9314 to the end of section 9314b and redesignating such subsections as sections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) in subsection 9314, by striking subsection (e).

(e) clerical amendments.—

(1) no change in wording.—(A) the heading of section 9314 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 9314. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: degree-granting authority.”

(B) the heading of section 9314a of such title is amended to read as follows:

“§ 9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: reimbursement and tuition; instruction of persons other than Air Force personnel.”

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 901 of such title includes appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.
At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. APPROVAL OF EXPORT LICENSES AND LETTERS OF REQUEST TO ASSIST THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall provide the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all export license applications, including requests for marketing licenses, for the sale of defense articles and defense services to Ukraine. The list shall include the date when the application or request was first submitted, the current status of each application or request, and the estimated timeline for action on applications or requests. The Secretary should give priority to processing these applications and requests.

(2) LETTERS OF REQUEST.—The Secretary of State shall also provide the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all pending Letters of Request for Foreign Military Sales to Ukraine, including the date when the letter was first submitted, the current status, and the estimated timeline for adjudication of such letters.

(b) LIMITATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report outlining the status of the applications, requests for marketing licenses and Letters of Request described under subsection (a). The report shall terminate upon certification by the President that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Government of Ukraine has been restored or 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs first.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘specified congressional committees’ means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

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

SA 1645. Mr. MARKEY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NON-FEDERALIZED NATIONAL GUARD TO SUPPORT PRIORITIES IN PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO NON-CATASTROPHIC DOMESTIC DISASTERS. (a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Section 10504 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ‘‘REPORT,’’ and insert ‘‘REPORT ON STATE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD,’’

(2) by striking subparagraph ‘‘To determine the annual personnel, training, and equipment requirements of the National Guard Bureau, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the officials specified in paragraph (1) a report setting forth the personnel, training, and equipment required by the National Guard during the next fiscal year to carry out its mission, while not Federalized, to provide protection, prevention, mitigation, response, and recovery activities in support of civilian authorities in connection with non-catastrophic natural and man-made disasters.’’; and

(3) by striking ‘‘annual report of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau’’ and inserting ‘‘annual report required by paragraph (1)’’;

and

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of title V of the Act is amended—

(1) in section 530, by striking ‘‘annual report of the’’ and inserting ‘‘annual reports.’’

SA 1647. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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


SA 1648. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 560. ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMY FOR TUITION ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EFFECTIVE UPON COMPLETION OF INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING IN THE ARMY.

Notwithstanding Army policy ALARACT 317/2013 or any amendment of that policy, any individual who is enlisted, inducted, or appointed as a member of the Army, including the Army National Guard of the United States and the Army Reserve, after the enactment of this Act, shall be eligible for tuition assistance through the Department of Defense for members of the Armed Forces upon completion of initial entry training, rather than upon completion of one year of service after completion of initial entry training, to the same extent such members would have been eligible for such tuition assistance before the issuance of ALARACT 317/2013.

SA 1649. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1264. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE COMMISSION TO CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—
(1) the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region is right for the United States, and the United States Army is essential to this effort given the importance of land armies in the region; (2) the Asian-Pacific region is one of the most important regional partners and allies of the United States; (3) the spending limits in the Budget Control Act of 2011 impose hard choices on the Department of Defense that could force the Army to make strategically unwise cuts to its end strength; (4) it is the responsibility of Congress to remove defense and non-defense spending limits to give Federal agencies the certainty they need to make sound budgetary decisions; and (5) despite fiscal pressure, the Army should strengthen its posture in the Asia-Pacific region and make future force structure decisions in line with the commitment of the United States to rebalance to the region.

SA 1650. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REVIEW OF DISCHARGE CHARACTERIZATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DISCHARGED UNDER THE DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL POLICY.

(a) In General.—In accordance with this section, the appropriate discharge boards—

(1) shall review the discharge characterization of covered members at the request of the covered member; and

(2) an individual discharge is not characterized as honorable under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that such changes are carried out consistently and uniformly for across the military departments using the following criteria:

(1) The original discharge must be based on Don't Ask Don't Tell (in this section referred to as DADT) and similar policy in place prior to the enactment of DADT.

(2) Such discharge characterization shall be so changed if, with respect to the original discharge, there were no aggravating circumstances, such as misconduct, that would have independently led to a discharge characterization that was any characterization except honorable. For purposes of this paragraph, such aggravating circumstances may not include—

(A) an offense under section 925 of title 10, United States Code (article 125 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), committed by a covered member against a person of the same sex with the consent of such person; or

(B) consensual sexual conduct, or consensual acts relating to sexual orientation or identity, or the disclosure of such statements, conduct, or acts, that were prohibited at the time of discharge but after the date of such discharge became permitted.

(3) When requesting a review, a covered member, or the member's representative, shall be required to provide either—

(A) documents consisting of—

(i) a copy of the DD-214 form of the member;

(ii) a personal affidavit of the circumstances surrounding the discharge; and

(iii) any relevant records pertaining to the discharge record;

(B) an affidavit certifying that the member, or the member's representative, does not have the documents specified in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph within the records of the Department of Defense; and

(C) the absence of such documents may not be considered a reason to deny a change of the discharge characterization under subsection (a)(2).

(b) Request for Review.—The appropriate discharge board shall make every effort to locate the documents specified in paragraph (a) of such paragraph within the records of the Department of Defense; and

(c) Request for Review.—The appropriate discharge board shall ensure the mechanism by which a covered member, or the member's representative, may request to have the discharge characterization of the covered member reviewed under this section is simple and straightforward.

(d) Review.—

(1) In General.—After a request has been made under subsection (c), the appropriate discharge board shall review all relevant laws, records of oral testimony previously taken, service records, or any other relevant information regarding the discharge characterization of the member.

(2) Additional Materials.—If additional materials are necessary for the review, the appropriate discharge board—

(A) may request additional information from the covered member or the member's representative, in writing, and specifically detailing what is being requested, and

(B) shall be responsible for obtaining a copy of the necessary files of the covered member from the member, or when applicable, from the member's representative.

(e) Change of Characterization.—The appropriate discharge board shall change the discharge characterization of a covered member whose discharge characterization is determined to be appropriate after a review is conducted under subsection (d) pursuant to the criteria under subsection (b). A covered member, or the member's representative, may appeal a decision by the appropriate discharge board to not change the discharge characterization by using the regular appeals process provided by the Army.

(f) Change of Records.—For each covered member whose discharge characterization is changed under subsection (e), the appropriate discharge board shall change the original discharge record to similarly reflect a universal change to the covered member's DD-214 form referred to paragraph (1) shall be changed to similarly reflect a universal authority with codes, authorities, and language applicable at the time of discharge.

(g) Status.—

(1) In General.—Each covered member whose discharge characterization is changed under subsection (e) shall be treated without regard to the original discharge characterization of the member, including for purposes of—

(A) recognition of the Federal Government to an individual by reason of service in the Armed Forces; and

(B) all recognitions and honors that the Secretary of Defense provides to members of the Armed Forces.

(2) Reinstatement.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall reinstate all recognitions and honors of a covered member whose discharge characterization is changed under subsection (e) that the Secretary withheld because of the original discharge characterization of the member.

(h) Reports.—

(1) Review.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the consistency and uniformity of the reviews conducted under subsection (a).

(2) Reports.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the reviews under paragraph (1). Such reports shall include any comments or recommendations for future reviews.

(i) Historical Review.—The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that oral historians of the department—

(1) review the facts and circumstances surrounding the estimated 100,000 members of the Armed Forces discharged from the Armed Forces Between World War II and September 11, 2001 because of the perceived or received sexual orientation of the individual so that such testimony may serve as an official record of these discriminatory policies and their impact on American lives.

(j) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) The term ‘appropriate discharge board’ means the original discharge board, the discharge review board under section 502 of title 10, United States Code, or the discharge review boards under section 5133 of such title, as the case may be.

(2) The term ‘covered member’ means any former member of the Armed Forces who was discharged from the Armed Forces because of the sexual orientation of the member.

(3) The term ‘discharge characterization’ means the characterization under which a member of the Armed Forces is discharged or released, including ‘dishonorable’, ‘general’, ‘other than honorable’, and ‘ honorable’.

(4) The term ‘Don’t Ask Don’t Tell’ means section 654 of title 10, United States Code, as in effect before such section was repealed pursuant to the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–321).

SA 1651. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year,
and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1253. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCOUNTABLE MEASURES RELATED TO THE SALE AND TRANSFER OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLES MRRAPs TO STRATEGIC PARTNERS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interest of the United States to build relationships with strategic partners through security assistance programs, including the Foreign Military Sales, Excess Defense Articles, and Foreign Military Financing of Direct Commercial Contracts programs; and

(2) these security assistance programs incentivize partners to meet the requirements of United States law in order to purchase United States military equipment, secure special access privileges for the United States military, and reassure allies of United States security commitments;

(3) as the United States deploys security forces in key regions, it remains vital that it strike a balance between an attractive security partner and establishing robust oversight over all security assistance programs;

(4) absent robust oversight, sales and transfers of sensitive weapon systems to foreign countries and military units with human rights violations carry the risk of harming legitimate domestic civil unrest and peaceful protests; and

(5) Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles are a highly sensitive weapon system that have the potential to be used for revenge killings, including to suppress legitimate domestic civil unrest and peaceful protests; and

(6) the Defense Security Cooperation Agency and the United States should submit the sale and transfer of MRAP vehicles to foreign countries to the Enhanced End-Use Monitoring process in order to ensure an added layer of compliance and accountability with United States assistance and to deter the misuse of this weapon system.

SA 1652. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Improvement of Health Care for Women Members of the Armed Forces

SEC. 741. CONTRACEPTION COVERAGE PARITY UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) In general.—Subtitle F of title II of title X of United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “FOR MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS” after “serving on active duty”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) CARE RELATED TO PREVENTION OF PREGNANCY.—Female covered beneficiaries shall be entitled to care related to the prevention of pregnancy described by subsection (d)(3).

“(c) PROHIBITION ON COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1074(g)(6) of this title or any other provision of law, cost-sharing may not be imposed or collected for care related to the prevention of pregnancy provided pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), including for any method of contraception provided, whether provided through a facility of the uniformed services, the TRICARE program, or the national mail-order pharmacy program:—

“(1) BRIEFING.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide in the regulations under section 1077(a)(13) of such title a briefing to all military treatment facilities of the TRICARE retail pharmacy program, or through a facility of the uniformed services, on the methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling (including information relating to efficacy) of each of the methods of contraception described in subsection (b).—

“(2) NATURE OF INFORMATION.—The information provided pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall be provided in language that is clear and concise, is readily comprehensible, and includes all material conditions and limitations regarding the provision of information in languages other than English) as the Secretary may provide in the regulations under this section.

“SA 1653. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 742. ACCESS TO BROAD RANGE OF METHODS OF CONTRACEPTION APPROVED BY TIES FOR WOMEN WHO ARE SEXUAL Assault Survivors.

Sec. 1074(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 1074d(b)” and inserting “section 1074(d)”.

SEC. 743. PREGNANCY PREVENTION ASSISTANCE AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide in statute, and to enhance, existing regulations that require health care providers at military treatment facilities to consult with survivors of sexual assault once clinically stable regarding options for emergency contraception and any necessary follow-up care, including the provision of the emergency contraception.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment whether the Department of Defense shall provide emergency contraception and any necessary follow-up care, including the provision of the emergency contraception.

(2) A description of efforts to disseminate information about all methods of emergency contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling (including information relating to efficacy) of each of the methods of contraception described in subsection (a).

(3) An assessment whether the Department of Defense shall provide emergency contraception and any necessary follow-up care, including the provision of the emergency contraception.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1072(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 1074(d)” and inserting “section 1074(d)”.

SEC. 745. BRIEFING ON CHANGING CLIMATE CONDITIONS AND MILITARY INSTALLATION READINESS.

(a) In general.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to interested Senators on the Department of Defense’s strategy and initiatives to address the impact of changing climate conditions on military installations, including expected increased water shortages and instances of wildfire due to increased drought and flooding due to sea level rise and coastal erosion from storm surges, and efforts to mitigate the associated national security risk and ensure optimal military readiness.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of how changing conditions are affecting operations and military readiness at military installations.

(2) A description of efforts to disseminate and implement best practices across military installations.

(3) An assessment whether the Department of Defense faces challenges in carrying out preparedness and resilience initiatives, and recommendations for legislation needed to increase security on military installations.

(4) A description of opportunities for effective public-private partnerships or contracts with industry to address and mitigate the effects of these changing conditions.
SEC. 1251. UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by title XV and available for overseas contingency operations as specified in the funding tables in division D, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide appropriate security assistance and intelligence support, including training and logistics support, supplies and services, to military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine to defend against further aggression.

(b) APPROPRIATE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT.—For purposes of subsection (a), appropriate security assistance and intelligence support includes the following:

(1) Real time or near real time actionable intelligence, including by lease of such capabilities from United States commercial companies.

(2) Lethal assistance such as anti-armor weapons systems, mortars, crew-served weapons and ammunition, and small arms and ammunition.

(3) Counter-artillery radars, including medium-range and long-range counter-artillery radars that can detect and locate long-range Russian artillery.

(4) Unmanned aerial surveillance systems.

(5) Cyber capabilities.

(6) Counter-electronic warfare capabilities such as secure communications equipment and other electronic protection systems.

(7) Other electronic warfare capabilities.

(8) Training required to maintain and employ systems and capabilities described in paragraphs (1) through (7).

(9) Training for critical combat operations such as planning, command, and control, small area maneuver, counter-armor, counter-artillery tactics, logistics, countering improvised explosive devices, battlefront field aid, and medical evacuation.

(10) Training for strategic and operational planning at and above the brigade level.

(c) FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND LIMITATION.—

(1) TRAINING.—Up to 20 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be used to support training pursuant to section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), relating to the Global Security Contingency Fund.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be obligated or expended until an amount equal to 20 percent of such amount has been obligated or expended for appropriate agencies, described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) for the Government of Ukraine.

(d) ALTERNATIVE USE OF FUNDS.—In the event funds available to support subsection (a) are not used by reason of the limitation in paragraph (2), such funds may be used at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide security assistance and intelligence support, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies and services to military and other national-level security forces of Partnership for Peace nations other than Ukraine that the Secretary of Defense determines are at risk of Russian military aggression and that the Secretary determines is appropriate to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(3) UNITED STATES INVENTORY AND OTHER SOURCES.—

(a) GENERAL.—In addition to any assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to make available —

(i) Funds for the purchase of Ukraine weapons and other defense articles, from the United States inventory and other sources, and defense services, in such quantities as the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate to achieve the purposes specified in subsection (a).

(b) REPLACEMENT.—Amounts for the replacement support are appropriated to the Department of Defense for overseas contingency operations for weapons procurement.

(c) CONSTRUCTION OF STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and other appropriate agencies, submit to Congress a report setting forth in detail the following:

(1) The current criteria governing the provision of security assistance and intelligence support to the Government of Ukraine.

(2) The plan, including timelines for delivery, types and quantities of security assistance, and costs, to ensure that such assistance and support is being provided in compliance with the authorized purposes specified in subsection (a).

(3) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Assistance not provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall be terminated in the event of the President’s determination that the purpose, conditions, or results of assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to exercise control over the disposition of funds in accordance with the provisions of this section.

SA 1656. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 355. UPGRADES TO LONG-RANGE RADAR AD- VERSELY IMPACTED IN A SIGNIFI- CANT MANNER BY THE DEVELOP-MENT OR CONSTRUCTION OF WIND ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Secretary of Defense shall upgrade any Long Range Air Route Surveillance Radar that is, or risks being, adversely impacted in a significant manner by the development or construction of wind energy infrastructure.

SA 1658. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1207, before the end of the sentence containing the words ‘‘(7) Report informing the processing time for applicants.’’, insert the following:—

‘‘(17) REPORT INFORMING THE PROCESSING TIME FOR APPLICANTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that includes—

(A) the number of applicants in the ‘‘ad- ministrative processing’’ phase of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa application process, broken down by month, during the most recent 12-month period;

(B) the shortest and longest period that an application described in subparagraph (A) has been in such phase; and

(C) a description of the steps that the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security are taking to reduce the length of the administrative processing phase, while maintaining adequate security review and screening of such applications.

SA 1657. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaskill to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1251 and insert the following:

SEC. 1251. UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by title XV and available for overseas contingency operations as specified in the funding tables in division D, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide appropriate security assistance and intelligence support, including training and logistics support, supplies and services, to military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine to defend against further aggression.

(b) APPROPRIATE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT.—For purposes of subsection (a), appropriate security assistance and intelligence support includes the following:

(1) Real time or near real time actionable intelligence, including by lease of such capabilities from United States commercial companies.

(2) Lethal assistance such as anti-armor weapons systems, mortars, crew-served weapons and ammunition, and small arms and ammunition.

(3) Counter-artillery radars, including medium-range and long-range counter-artillery radars that can detect and locate long-range Russian artillery.

(4) Unmanned aerial surveillance systems.

(5) Cyber capabilities.

(6) Counter-electronic warfare capabilities such as secure communications equipment and other electronic protection systems.

(7) Other electronic warfare capabilities.

(8) Training required to maintain and employ systems and capabilities described in paragraphs (1) through (7).

(9) Training for critical combat operations such as planning, command, and control, small area maneuver, counter-armor, counter-artillery tactics, logistics, countering improvised explosive devices, battlefront field aid, and medical evacuation.

(10) Training for strategic and operational planning at and above the brigade level.

(c) FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND LIMITATION.—

(1) TRAINING.—Up to 20 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be used to support training pursuant to section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), relating to the Global Security Contingency Fund.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the amount described in subsection (a) may be obligated or expended until an amount equal to 20 percent of such amount has been obligated or expended for appropriate agencies, described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) for the Government of Ukraine.

(d) ALTERNATIVE USE OF FUNDS.—In the event funds available to support subsection (a) are not used by reason of the limitation in paragraph (2), such funds may be used at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide security assistance and intelligence support, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies and services to military and other national-level security forces of Partnership for Peace nations other than Ukraine that the Secretary of Defense determines are at risk of Russian military aggression and that the Secretary determines is appropriate to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity.
(b) STRATEGIC UNIFORM FORMULARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly establish, from time to time update, a strategic, evidence-based, uniform formulary for the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs that includes all analgesics, pain relievers, anti-inflammatory, and anticonvulsant drugs that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly determine are critical to the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for the appropriate and effective provision of health care services to individuals described in such subsection.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the establishing and updating of the formulary required by paragraph (1).

(c) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from each maintaining their own formularies.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the establishment of the formulary under subsection (b).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriately committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1659. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 694.

SA 1660. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

The end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT OF FOREIGN FORCES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATIONS TO PREVENT AND END ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY BOKO HARAM.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States Government to—

(1) provide timely civilian and military assistance to the Government of Nigeria and regional partners for efforts to assist civilians harmed by Boko Haram;

(2) permit appropriate members and units of the Armed Forces to train, advise, and assist the Governments of regional partners, including Nigeria, as they conduct operations against Boko Haram and operations to reduce and eliminate the safe havens from which terrorist activity can be perpetrated;

(3) support the long-term capacity of the Government of Nigeria to provide security for schools to protect girls seeking an education, and to combat gender-based violence and gender inequality;

(4) coordinate United States Government and international interagency, intergovernmental, and non-governmental organizations to increase contributions for rescue and recovery efforts and better leverage those contributions to enhance the capacity of the law enforcement and military services of the Government of Nigeria; and

(5) strengthen the operational capacity of the civilian police and judicial system in Nigeria to enhance public safety and prevent crime and gender-based violence, while strengthening accountability measures to prevent or respond to the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General may provide logistic support, supplies, and services, communications, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets to foreign countries participating in operations to prevent or respond to the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from taking any other action, consistent with law, that the Secretary of Defense determines is critical to the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount authorized under this section for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for operation and maintenance, not more than $35,000,000 may be utilized in each such fiscal year to provide support under subsection (b) to any foreign country that otherwise prohibited by any provision of law.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may not use the authority in subsection (b) to provide support to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited by any provision of law.

(2) MILITARY SUPPORT.—Military support may be provided under the authority in subsection (b) only if—

(A) the type of support to be provided.

(B) The term "logistic support, supplies, and services" has the meaning given in section 2350(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may not use the authority in subsection (b) to provide support to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of support under any other provision of law.

(4) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the State, or the Attorney General may not use the authority in subsection (b) to provide any type of support to Nigerian forces unless the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines that the Government of Nigeria—

(A) undertaking significant efforts to promote the rule of law and hold its security forces accountable for any abuses or criminal activity;

(B) coordinating efforts to combat Boko Haram with neighboring countries;

(C) taking steps to counter extremist ideologies;

(D) prioritizing the protection of women and girls from gender-based violence.

(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "logistic support, supplies, and services" has the meaning given that term in section 2350(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term "foreign country" means—

(A) any country for which support may be provided under subsection (b); and

(B) the country for which any such support is provided under subsection (b).

(g) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON SUPPORT TO BE PROVIDED.—Not less than 15 days before the date on which funds are obligated to provide support under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice setting forth the following:

(1) The type of support to be provided.

(2) The national government to be supported.

(3) The objectives of such support.

(4) The estimated period of such support.

(5) The intended duration of such support.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "logistic support, supplies, and services" has the meaning given that term in section 2350(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term "foreign country" means—

(A) any country for which support may be provided under subsection (b); and

(B) the country for which any such support is provided under subsection (b).

(4) The term "eligibility for support under subsection (b)" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(5) The term "eligibility for support under that authority" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(i) E XPIRATION.—The authority provided under this section may not be exercised after September 30, 2017.

SA 1661. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEVELOPING SPACE TECHNOLOGY.

It is the sense of Congress that railgun and other developing weapons technologies are vital to the future of national security and should be provided the necessary infrastructure to support the development of such weapons systems, including all secure space (SCIFs) necessary to incorporate cyber security into weapons systems during development.

SA 1662. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO THE UNITED STATES OVERHEAD SATELLITE ARCHITECTURE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The current approach to the overhead satellite architecture of the United States is increasingly unsustainable in the long run
due to high and growing costs, long design time, over reliance on large, expensive vehicles that need heavy launch and represent potential single points of failure, an inability to leverage commercial- like acquisition practices, a lack of competition, inadequate commercialized systems, and the vulnerability to antisatellite attack without an adequate capability to replace and replenish lost or damaged space vehicles.

(2) The overhead satellite capabilities of the United States are in grave peril due to an over reliance on a big government, centralized planning, and an acquisition model based on a series of 10-year plans.

(3) In past years, the National Reconnaissance Office was the United States model for excellence in acquisition and program management. This was in no small part due to competition within the National Reconnaissance Office between Program A (the Air Force satellite reconnaissance element), Program B (the Central Intelligence Agency satellite reconnaissance element), and Programs C and D (commercial reconnaissance satellites), for the best, most innovative, and most cost-effective satellite and aircraft reconnaissance systems, which were delivered on time and under budget in Programs A, B, and C existed from 1962 to 1992.

(4) On September 23, 1971, National Security Action Memorandum 263 of President Nixon ordered the National Reconnaissance Office to be undertaken "under a re-alistic funding program, with a view toward achieving an operational capability in 1976." It took almost exactly 5 years to design and launch the first KH-11 satellite into orbit on December 6, 1976. The United States needed to get back to this kind of timeline in designing and launching United States overhead reconnaissance satellites.

(5) The United States cannot afford to wait a decade or more from design to launch of a satellite if the United States is to maintain its technological edge.

(6) The culture of innovation and competition must be fostered and reinforced in the requirements, planning, design, and research and development processes for the United States architecture, to take into account and prioritize—

(A) the intelligence requirements of United States warfighters and national policymakers;

(B) the need for resiliency and rapid reconstitution of the architecture in an increasingly contested space environment;

(C) the ability to leverage rapid development and innovation in commercial sector satellite, processing, and sensor technology.

(7) The United States no longer have an unchallenged environment, as it had been in the past. The United States must be open to innovative solutions such as distributed, disaggregated architectures that allow for redundancy against the space threat, and also for rapid reconstitution, constant replenishment, and frequent technological refresh.

(8) The current cost-constrained budget environment dictates that the United States can no longer ignore the costs of systems and potentially costly, expensive alternatives.

(9) In April 2009, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said that the United States needed to reform acquisition across the Department of Defense, that the costs of the "exquisite solution" were making defense unaffordable, and that "we need to shift away from the 99-percent-exquisite service-centric platform" and so construct systems that they take forever to build and only then in very limited quantities. With the pace of technological and geopolitical change and the range of possible contingencies, we must look more to the 80 percent multi-service solution that can be produced on time, on budget, and leverage commercial technologies, and serv-

(10) The National Space Policy of the United States of America issued on June 28, 2010, states "To promote a robust domestic capability of commercial space industry, departments and agencies shall:

- "Purchase and use commercial space capabilities and services to the maximum prac-tical extent;" and serv-

- "Develop commercial space capabilities and services to meet government requirements when existing commercial capabilities and services best meet these requirements and the potential modification represents a more cost-effective and timely acquisition approach for the government;"

- "Develop governmental space systems only when it is in the national interest and there is no suitable, cost-effective United States commercial or, as appropriate, foreign commercial service or system that is or will be available;"

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

(1) overhead satellite collection and processing known as commodity overhead satellite collection and processing should be undertaken "under a realistic funding program, with a view toward achieving an operational capability in 1976." It took almost exactly 5 years to design and launch the first KH-11 satellite into orbit on December 6, 1976. The United States needs to get back to this kind of timeline in designing and launching United States overhead reconnaissance satellites.

(2) the entire overhead satellite architecture of the United States, including programs funded by the Department of Defense or by an element of the intelligence community, commercial imagery providers, and foreign partner capabilities, should be viewed as a series of satellites systems of the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, or private entities.

(3) to require contractors to validate performance metrics for the hiring and training of veterans;

(4) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work.

(5) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work.

(6) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work.

(7) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work.

(8) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work.

(9) to encourage Federal agencies to modify or waive a skill required for the performance of an awarded contract when the contract supports cyber or cyber-related work.

(10) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

SEC. 1063. MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION TO ENCOURAGE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS TO HIRING VETERANS: MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION TO ENCOURAGE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS TO HIRING VETERANS: MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION TO ENCOURAGE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS TO HIRING VETERANS:

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall report to the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee of the Judiciary on the implementation of the Federal Acquisition Regulation—

(a) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(b) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(c) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(d) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(e) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(f) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(g) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(h) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(i) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(j) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(k) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(l) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(m) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(n) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(o) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(p) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(q) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(r) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(s) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(t) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(u) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(v) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(w) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(x) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(y) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(z) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.

(1) to require contractors to provide training to the veteran in order to meet the modified or waived requirement by not later than one year after the date of such award.
(A) the veterans hired by the contractors after the date of the enactment of this Act meet the minimum skill qualification requirements under the contract based on military training; and

(B) the contractors provide training to such veterans in order to meet the original qualification requirement of such contract within the year of such assignment.

(4) to modify such audit, oversight, and allowable cost requirements as may be applicable to Federal contracts to recognize and take into account the actions taken by a contractor under paragraph (3) as being in compliance with the terms and conditions of a contract.

SA 1664. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 811. IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE-BASED ACQUISITIONS.

(a) VALUE-BASED ACQUISITION PROCESS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of each of the military departments shall independently submit to the congressional defense committees a study that proposes methodologies for measuring and optimizing the targeted and returned value of each department’s acquisition portfolio, that is quantifiable and verifiable as a function of utility, monetary cost, and time-to-capability and for purposes of comprising the disparate capability options that might populate an optimal portfolio.

(2) SCOPE OF METHODOLOGY.—The value based acquisition portfolio management methodology proposed under this subsection shall—

(A) consider demonstrated commercial and government best practice for value-centric management, engineering, and procurement;

(B) address interagency and executive branch efforts and separate activities for the implementation of a portfolio management capability; and

(C) consider the intent of existing and emerging acquisition and related policies;

(D) address linkages and collaboration across Defense [PPBS, JCIDS, A&A, Engineering, Procurement, and Sustainment processes]; and

(E) provide mathematically robust, tailored, optimization algorithms suitable for support of value-based acquisition portfolio investment decisions, and management across the spectrum of Department of Defense programs.

SA 1665. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. USE OF ORGANIC INDUSTRIAL BASE FOR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN ITEMS.

(a) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency, shall issue feasible policy recommendations that could increase the efficiency and effectiveness within the existing capabilities of the organic industrial base.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing implementation of the guidance issued under subsection (a) and including recommendations to increase efficiency and effectiveness within the existing capabilities of the organic base.

SA 1666. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§145. Veterans Day.

"The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the sacrifices and service of veterans of the United States. The proclamation shall—

"(1) 11:11 a.m. Hawaii-Aleutian standard time; or

"(2) 11:11 a.m. Alaska standard time; or

"(3) 11:11 a.m. Pacific standard time; or

"(4) 11:11 a.m. Central standard time; or

"(5) 11:11 a.m. Mountain standard time; or

"(6) 11:11 a.m. Eastern standard time; or

"(7) 11:11 a.m. Universal Coordinated Time; or

"(8) 11:11 a.m. Greenwich Mean Time; or

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"145. Veterans Day.

SA 1667. Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1220. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, relocated voluntarily and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as ‘‘persons under the Fourth Geneva Convention’’ under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq, the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to ensure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safety, care, and protection of Camp Liberty residents; and

(6) encourage the residents of Camp Liberty to fully cooperate with United States, Iraq, and international authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

SA 1668. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD MISSION CHANGE AND IMPACTS TO PUBLIC AIRPORTS.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the number of Air National Guard units that have undergone a mission change in the previous 5 years and who are tenants at a public airport.
SA 1669. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components.

(a) In general.—Chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 107 the following new item:

"107A. Honoring as veterans certain persons who performed service in the reserve components."

SA 1670. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 653, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(D) Australia.

(E) Japan.

SA 1671. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1264. SPECIAL FOREIGN MILITARY SALES STANDARDS FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(b) Definitions.—

(1) In this section, the term "public airport," means an airport that is open to civilian air traffic, both private and commercial.

(2) In this section, the term "rental value," means the amount which, in a competitive market, a well-informed and willing lessor would pay and which a well-informed and willing lessee would accept for the temporary use and enjoyment of the property.

SA 1672. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ASSESSMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL BASE TO MANUFACTURE CERTAIN AUXILIARY SHIP COMPONENTS.

(a) Assessment.—The Secretary of the Navy shall conduct an assessment of the ability of the industrial base to manufacture and support the following components for auxiliary ships:

(1) Auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services.

(2) Propulsion system components, including engines, reduction gears, and propellers.

(3) Shipboard cranes and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

(b) Scope.—In conducting the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall:

(1) Evaluate the potential cost, schedule, and performance impacts by ship class if procurement of the components described in such subsection were limited to manufacturers in the National Technology and Industrial Base.

(c) Determination Required.—Upon completion of the assessment required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make a determination whether manufacturers of the components described in such subsection should be included in the National Technology and Industrial Base.

SA 1673. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 738. STUDY ON PROVIDING CONCURRENT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CERTIFICATION FOR VETERANS SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) In general.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a study on the feasibility and advisability of providing any member of the Armed Forces on active duty serving as a physician with certification to practice as a physician for the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to facilitate the transition of such member to employment in the Department of Veterans Affairs upon the retirement, separation, or release of such member from the Armed Forces.

(b) Report.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of providing members of the Armed Forces on active duty serving as physicians with the certification described in subsection (a).

SA 1674. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PILOT PROGRAM ON SHARING OF PHYSICIAN WORKFORCE AMONG DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) In general.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of the following medical facilities of the Department of Defense and the medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs that are located within 40 miles of each other to share primary care physicians for the purpose of performing routine medical care.
(b) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS NECESSARY.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly determine the administrative action required to be taken by each Secretary—

(1) to ensure the sharing of scheduling records and medical records between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(2) to minimize the impact of the pilot program on wait times and patient load at each medical facility participating in the pilot program; and

(3) to maintain a high quality of care at each such medical facility.

(c) LIMITATION OF FUND.—To the maximum extent possible, health care provided to a patient under the pilot program shall be provided at the location in which the patient would have been provided health care if the pilot program was not being carried out.

SA 1675. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 728. SUBMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO AIRBORNE HAZARDS AND OPEN BURN PITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs such information in the possession of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers necessary to supplement and support—

(1) the development of information to be included in the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry established by the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans’ Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note); and

(2) research and development activities conducted by the Department of Veterans Affairs to evaluate the incidence and prevalence of respiratory illnesses among members of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

(b) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the information submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under subsection (a) information and surveillance efforts conducted by the Department of Defense to evaluate the incidence and prevalence of respiratory illnesses among members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to open burn pits while deployed overseas.

SEC. 236. AUTHORIZATION FOR CONDUCT OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PILOT PROGRAMS.

The Secretary of Defense may carry out one or more pilot programs through the research laboratories of the Department of Defense to expand technology transfer activities with both regional universities and nonprofit research corporations to spur innovation, economic growth, and a high-tech, diverse workforce.

SA 1676. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR POST-WAR EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO INCLUDE SERVICE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN ENTRY LEVEL AND SKILL TRAINING IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE BETWEEN 18 AND 24 MONTHS.—Section 331(b)(5)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”.

(b) FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM, OPERATION IRAQ FREEDOM, OR CERTAIN OTHER CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—Section 331(b)(5)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”;

(2) in paragraphs (6)(A) and (7)(A) by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”;

(3) in paragraphs (8)(A) and (9)(B) by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”;

(4) in paragraphs (9)(C) and (10) by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”;

(5) in paragraphs (11)(A) and (12)(A) by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”;

(6) in paragraphs (13)(A) and (14)(A) by striking “excluding” and inserting “including”;

SEC. 3. IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 114 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following—

(‘‘(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of such tabulation are—

’’(i) fully and accurately counted; and

(‘‘(ii) properly attributed to the State in which their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.’’)

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

SA 1679. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION, TREATMENT, MANAGEMENT, AND USE, FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following:

‘‘4781. Natural gas production, treatment, management, and use, Fort Knox, Kentucky.

‘‘(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army (referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’) may provide, by contract or other arrangement, for the production, treatment, management, and use of natural gas located under Fort Knox, Kentucky, without regard to section 3 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 352).

‘‘(b) NO APPLICATION ELSEWHERE.—Any natural gas produced pursuant to subsection (a)—

‘‘(1) may only be used to support activities and operations at Fort Knox; and

‘‘(2) may not be sold for use elsewhere.

‘‘(c) OWNERSHIP OF FACILITIES.—The Secretary may take ownership of any gas production and treatment equipment and facilities owned or associated with a contractor in accordance with the terms of a contract or other agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a).

‘‘(d) NO APPLICATION ELSEWHERE.—

‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority provided by this section applies only with respect to Fort Knox, Kentucky.

‘‘(2) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section authorizes the production, treatment, management, or use of natural gas resources underlying any Department of Defense installation other than Fort Knox.

‘‘(e) APPLICABILITY.—The authority of the Secretary under this section is effective beginning August 2, 2015.

SEC. 2. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 449 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘4781. Natural gas production, treatment, management, and use, Fort Knox, Kentucky.’’

SA 1680. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year,
and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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


—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and subject to subsection (b), the President shall declassify and release to the public the previously redacted portions of the report on the Joint Inquiry into Intelligence Community Activities Before and After the Terrorist Attacks of September 2001, filed in the Senate and the House of Representatives on December 20, 2002, including all the material under the heading “Part Four—Findings, Discussion and Narrative Regarding Certain Sensitive National Security Matters”.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR NAMES AND INFORMATION OF INDIVIDUALS AND CERTAIN METHODOLOGIES.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the President is not required to declassify and release to the public the names and identifying information of individuals or specific methodologies described in the report referred to in subsection (a) if such declassification and release would result in imminent lawless action or compromise presently ongoing national security operations.

SA 1681. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. PROCUREMENT OF ANCHOR AND MOORING CHAIN.

Section 2535(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Department of Defense moorings and components.”;

(2) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “and moorings” after “NAVAL VESSELS”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Department of Defense moorings and components.”;

SA 1682. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SECTION 706. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER TRICARE.—Section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g)(1) Subject to paragraph (4), in providing health care under subsection (a), the treatment of developmental disabilities (as defined in section 102(b)(5) of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Billings Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002(b)(5)), including autism spectrum disorder, shall include behavioral health treatment, including applied behavior analysis, when prescribed by a physician or psychologist.

“(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) except as provided by subparagraph (B)—

“(i) in the case of a State that requires licensing or certification of applied behavior analysts, applied behavior analyst, or other behavioral health treatment is provided by an individual who is licensed or certified to provide such analysis or treatment, in accordance with the laws of the State; and

“(ii) in the case of a State other than a State described in clause (i), applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment is provided by an individual who is licensed or certified to provide such analysis or treatment in accordance with the laws of the State; and

“(B) applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment may be provided by an employee, contractor, or trainee meets minimum qualifications, training, and supervision requirements as set forth by the Secretary.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting or otherwise affecting the benefits provided to a covered beneficiary under—

“(A) this chapter;

“(B) title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

“(C) any other law.

“(4)(A) Treatment may be provided under this subsection in a fiscal year only to the extent that amounts are provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the provision of such treatment for such fiscal year in the Fund for Staff and Infrastructure.

SA 1683. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC.84. PROCUREMENT OF ANCHOR AND MOORING CHAIN.

Section 2535(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Department of Defense moorings and components.”;

SA 1684. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Reproductive and Fertility Preservation Assistance for Members of the Armed Forces

SEC. 741. PROVISION OF FERTILITY TREATMENT AND COUNSELING TO SPOUSES, PARTNERS, AND SUGAROGES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FERTILITY TREATMENT AND COUNSELING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall furnish fertility treatment and counseling, including the use of assisted reproductive technology, to a spouse, partner, or gestational surrogate of a severely

...
wounded, ill, or injured member of the Armed Forces who has an infertility condition incurred or aggravated while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

(2) FERTILITY TREATMENT AND COUNSELING.—Fertility treatment and counseling shall be furnished under paragraph (1) to a spouse, partner, or gestational surrogate of a member of the Armed Forces, described in such paragraph without regard to the sex or marital status of such member.

(3) IN VITRO FERTILIZATION.—In the case of in vitro fertilization, treatment furnished under paragraph (1), the Secretary may furnish not more than three completed cycles or six attempted cycles of in vitro fertilization, whichever occurs first, to a partner, or gestational surrogate described in such paragraph.

(b) PROCURERS OF GAMETES.—If a member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) is unable to provide their gametes for purposes of fertility treatment under such subsection, the Secretary shall, at the election of such member, allow such member to receive such treatment with donated gametes and pay or reimburse such member the reasonable costs of procuring gametes from a donor.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Secretary—

(1) to connect a gestational surrogate for a member of the Armed Forces or to connect a gestational surrogate with a member of the Armed Forces;

(2) to find or certify gametes from a donor for a member of the Armed Forces or to connect a member of the Armed Forces with gametes from a donor.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) FERTILITY TREATMENT.—The term "fertility treatment" includes the following:

(A) Procedures that use assisted reproductive technology.

(B) Sperm retrieval.

(C) Egg retrieval.

(D) Artificial insemination.

(E) Embryo transfer.

(F) Such other treatments as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(2) ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY.—The term "assisted reproductive technology" includes in vitro fertilization and other fertility treatments in which both eggs and sperm are handled when clinically appropriate.

(3) PARTNER.—The term "partner," with respect to a member of the Armed Forces, means an individual selected by the member who agrees to share with the member the parenthood responsibilities with respect to any child born as a result of the use of any fertility treatment under this section.

SEC. 741. ESTABLISHMENT OF FERTILITY PRESERVATION PROCEDURES AFTER AN INJURY OR ILLNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, shall establish procedures for the preservation of gametes, as soon as medically appropriate, from a member of the Armed Forces in cases in which the fertility of such member is potentially jeopardized as a result of an injury or illness incurred or aggravated while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces in order to preserve the medical options of such member.

(b) CONSENT FOR RETRIEVAL OF GAMETES.—Gametes may be retrieved from a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) only—

(1) with the specific consent of the member; or

(2) if the member is unable to consent, if a medical determination is made that—

(A) the future fertility of the member is potentially jeopardized as a result of an injury or illness described in subsection (a) or will be potentially jeopardized as a result of treating such injury or illness; (B) the member lacks the capacity to consent to the retrieval of the gametes and is likely to regain such capacity; and

(C) the retrieval of gametes under this section is in the medical interest of the member.

(c) CONSENT FOR USE OF RETRIEVED GAMETES.—Gametes retrieved from a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a) may be used by the member—

(1) with the specific consent of the member; or

(2) if the member has lost the ability to consent permanently, as determined by a medical professional, as specified in an advance directive or testamentary instrument executed by the member.

(d) DISPOSAL OF GAMETES.—In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary for purposes of this subsection, the Secretary shall dispose of gametes retrieved from a member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a)—

(1) with the specific consent of the member; or

(2) if the member—

(A) has lost the ability to consent permanently, as determined by a medical professional; and

(B) has not specified the use of their gametes in an advance directive or testamentary instrument executed by the member.

SEC. 743. CRYOPRESERVATION AND STORAGE OF GAMETES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide members of the Armed Forces on active duty in the Armed Forces with the opportunity to cryopreserve and store their gametes prior to deployment to a combat zone.

(b) PERIOD OF TIME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for the cryopreservation and storage of gametes of any member of the Armed Forces under subsection (a), at no cost to the member, in a facility of the Department of Defense or of a private entity pursuant to a contract under subsection (d) until the date that is one year after the retirement, separation, or death of the member from the Armed Forces.

(2) CONTINUED CRYOPRESERVATION AND STORAGE.—At the end of the one-year period described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall permit an individual whose gametes were cryopreserved and stored in a facility of the Department as described in that paragraph to select, including pursuant to an advance medical directive or military testamentary instrument completed under subsection (c), one of the following options:

(A) To continue such cryopreservation and storage in such facility with the cost of such cryopreservation and storage borne by the individual.

(B) To transfer the gametes to a private cryopreservation and storage facility selected by the individual.

(C) To transfer the gametes to a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs if cryopreservation and storage is available to the individual at such facility.

(D) DISPOSAL OF GAMETES.—If an individual described in paragraph (2) does not make a selection under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of such paragraph, the Secretary may dispose of the gametes of the individual not earlier than the date that is 90 days after the end of the one-year period specified in paragraph (1) with respect to the individual.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, shall establish procedures for the cryopreservation and storage of gametes of veterans or veterans who are members of the Armed Forces in cases in which the fertility of such veterans is potentially jeopardized as a result of an injury or illness incurred or aggravated while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to—

(1) providing that the Secretary of Defense will ensure access by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to any gametes of veterans stored in the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of furnishing fertility treatment; and

(2) authorizing the Department of Veterans Affairs to compensate the Department of Defense for the cryopreservation and storage of gametes of veterans under section 741.

SEC. 643. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF PAYMENT OF SPECIAL SURVIVOR INDIGNITY ALLOWANCES UNDER THE SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN.

Section 1449(m) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(I), by striking "fiscal year 2017" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2018 through 2020"; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking "September 30, 2017," and inserting "September 30, 2020," and

(B) by striking "October 1, 2017," and inserting "October 1, 2020."
SEC. 593. REPORT ON EXEMPTION FROM FURLough DURING A Lapse IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR POSITIONS FILLED BY INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN MILITARY EQUIPMENT AND WEAPON SYSTEM MAINTENANCE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Chair and the Ranking Member of the National Guard Bureau, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the exemption from furlough during a lapse in appropriations for positions filled by individuals engaged in military equipment and weapon system maintenance within the Department of Defense, including the position of military technician (dual status) and positions of field and depot level maintenance and engineers.

(b) PURPOSE.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the Department of Defense positions described in subsection (a), and the personnel that were exempted from furlough during the most recent lapse in appropriations for the Department.

(2) An analysis of positions filled by individuals engaged in military equipment and weapon system maintenance within the Department, and the personnel, that were not exempted from the furlough described in paragraph (1).

(3) A cost analysis of the exemption of positions from furlough as described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1687. Mr. Lee (for himself, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Heller, Mr. Moran, Mr. Landforest, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Daines, Mr. Risch, and Mr. Roberts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___ PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE-GROUSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "Federal resource management plan" means—

(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public lands pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for National Forest System lands pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(2) The term "Greater Sage-Grouse" means a species Centrocercus urophasianus.

(3) The term "State management plan" means a State-approved plan for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage-Grouse.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is—

(1) to facilitate implementation of State management plans over a period of multiple, consecutive sage grouse life cycles; and

(2) to demonstrate the efficacy of the State management plans for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage-Grouse.

(c) ENDEavored SPECIES ACT OF 1973 FINDINGS.—

(1) DELAY REQUIRED.—Any finding by the Secretary of the Interior under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) with respect to the Greater Sage-Grouse made during the period beginning on September 30, 2015, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall have no force or effect; and the Secretary of the Interior may not make any such finding during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the Secretary of the Interior transmits to the Committee on Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the Secretary’s implementation and effectiveness of systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.

(c) REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation, this section, including determinations made under subsection (d)(3), shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. ___ IMPLEMENTATION OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN RANGE-WIDE CONSERVATION AGREEMENT AND OTHER CONSERVATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—The terms "Candidate Conservation Agreement" and "Candidate Conservation Agreement With Assurances" have the meaning given those terms in—

(A) the announcement of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce entitled "Announcement of Final Policy for Candidate Conservation Agreements With Assurances" (44 Fed. Reg. 22763 (June 17, 1979)); and

(B) sections 17.22(d) and 17.32(d) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on that date).

(2) RANGE-WIDE PLAN.—The term "Range-Wide Plan" means the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, as endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on October 21, 2013, and published for comment on January 29, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 4652).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TREATMENT AS THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any prior action by the Secretary, the lesser prairie-chicken shall not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) before January 31, 2021.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PROPOSAL.—Effective beginning on January 31, 2021, the lesser prairie-chicken may not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) unless the Secretary publishes a determination, based on the totality of the scientific evidence, that conservation (as that term is used in the Range-Wide Plan and the agreements, programs, and efforts referred to in subsection (c)) have not achieved the conservation goals established by the Range-Wide Plan.

(3) MONITORING OF PROGRESS PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall monitor and annually submit to Congress a report on progress in conserving the lesser prairie-chicken under the Range-Wide Plan and the agreements, programs, and efforts referred to in subsection (c) (i) to judicial review.

SEC. ___ REMOVAL OF ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR AMERICAN BURYING BEETLE.

burying beetle shall not be listed as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 1688. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize and appropriate funds for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 1085. ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the United States should establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CROSS-BORDER SEGMENT.—The term “cross-border segment” means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at the national boundary of the United States with Canada or Mexico.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796). (B) RELEVANT OFFICIAL.—The relevant official has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (g), no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a cross-border segment of an oil or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without by obtaining a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment under this section.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF CROSSING.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a cross-border segment for which a request is received under this section, the relevant official shall issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment unless the relevant official finds that construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment is not in the public interest of the United States.

(B) RELATION.—The relevant official referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) the Secretary of State with respect to oil pipelines; and

(ii) the Secretary of Energy with respect to electric transmission facilities.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing for the request under subparagraph (A), that the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility is operated and maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(i) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(ii) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—This section shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico if—

(A) if the cross-border segment is operating for the import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) if a permit described in subsection (f) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(C) if a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been previously issued under this subsection; or

(D) if an application for a permit described in subsection (f) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which the application is denied; or

(ii) July 1, 2016.

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (g) affects the application of any other Federal law to a project for which a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment is sought under this subsection.

(B) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (g) affects the authority of the President under section 103(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212(a)).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The term “Regional Transmission Organization” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(2) REGIONAL ENTITY.—The term “regional entity” has the meaning given the term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(d) IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717h(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c)” and inserting the following:

(C) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—In the case of an application for the importation or exportation of natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico, the FERC shall approve the application not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the application.”.

(e) TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(2) CONFERRING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE REGULATIONS.—Subsection (e) of section 202 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a) is redesignated by paragraph (1)(B) is amended in the second sentence by inserting “insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission’s powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)”.

(B) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 802(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–4(b)) is amended by striking “the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under subsection (a) of the Federal Power Act” and all that follows through the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting “the Secretary has conducted hearings and made the findings required under subsection (a) of the Federal Power Act”.

(3) NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No Presidential permit is required for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility.

(B) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(A) section 301 of title 3, United States Code;

(B) Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note);

(C) Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note);

(D) Executive Order 10485 (5 U.S.C. 717 note);

(E) Executive Order 12088 (42 U.S.C. 7151 note); and

(F) any other Executive order.

(g) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No certificate of crossing under subsection (c), or permit described in subsection (f), shall be required for a modification to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility—

(1) that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico as of the date of enactment of the Act; or

(2) for which a permit described in subsection (f) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(3) for which a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility has previously been issued under subsection (c).

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (c) through (g), and the amendments made by those subsections, take effect on July 1, 2016.
SEC. 1274. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY COMMITTED IN SYRIA.

(a) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and again not later than 180 days after the cessation of armed conflict in Syria, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

(b) Elements.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of violations of internationally recognized human rights, war crimes, and crimes against humanity perpetrated during the civil war in Syria, including—

(A) an account of incidents that may constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and all forces fighting on its behalf;

(B) an account of incidents that may constitute crimes against humanity committed by violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, and any other combatants in the conflict;

(C) any incidents that may violate the principle of medical neutrality and, when possible, an identification of the individual or individuals who engaged in or authorized such violations; and

(D) where possible, a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such crimes and the origins of the weapons.

(2) A description of efforts by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to ensure accountability for violations of internationally recognized human rights, international humanitarian law, and crimes against humanity perpetrated against the people of Syria by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad, violent extremist groups, and other combatants involved in the conflict, including—

(A) a description of initiatives that the United States government has undertaken to train investigators in Syria on how to document, investigate, and develop findings of war crimes, including the number of United States government or contractor personnel currently designated to work full-time on these issues and an identification of the authorities and appropriations being used for these efforts;

(B) a description and assessment of Syrian and international efforts to ensure accountability for crimes committed during the Syrian conflict, including efforts to promote a transitional justice process that would include criminal accountability and the establishment of international courts to prosecute the perpetrators of war crimes committed during the civil war in Syria; and

(C) an assessment of the influence of accountabilities measures on which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON AGREEMENTS FOR CONTRACT SERVICES.


(1) in subsection (a) and (b), by striking "2015" and inserting "2015, or 2016";

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "and 2015" and inserting "2015, or 2016";

(3) in subsection (d), by striking "or 2015" and inserting "2015, or 2016"; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking "2015" and inserting "2015, or 2016".

SA 1690. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1683 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 919. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

(a) Military Construction.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report on war crimes committed by violent extremist groups, and other combatants in the conflict; and

(2) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on crimes against humanity committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and all forces fighting on its behalf.

(b) Transition.—Pending the submission of the report required under subsection (a) and an obligation to appropriate funds in an amount equal to the amount provided for fiscal year 2016 for military construction and military family housing programs, the Secretary of Defense shall do the following:

(1) include criminal accountability and the establishment of international courts to prosecute the perpetrators of war crimes committed during the civil war in Syria; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "and 2015" and inserting "2015, or 2016".

SEC. 920. COORDINATOR FOR HOSTAGE RECOVERY.

(a) Establishment.—There is hereby established an interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator.

(b) Duties.—(1) The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.

(B) Establish and direct a fusion cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purview over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).

(C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages and appropriate congressional committees informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.

(D) MAINTAIN APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority of the Coordinator shall be limited to hostage cases outside the United States.

(3) In General.—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report on war crimes committed by violent extremist groups, and other combatants in the conflict; and

(e) Definitions.—In this section—

(1) "Coordinating agency"—The term "Coordinating agency" means the Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator designated under subsection (a).

(2) "Hostage group"—The term "hostage group" means—

(A) a group that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 231(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189); or

(B) a group that is engaged in armed conflict with the United States; or

(C) any other group that the President determines to be a hostile group for purposes of this paragraph.

(3) "State sponsor of terrorism"—The term "state sponsor of terrorism" means—

(A) a country of which the Secretary of State has determined under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(B) North Korea.

SA 1692. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1683 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016
for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1049. SUNSET OF 2001 AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless reauthorized.

SA 1693. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HENRICH, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM DEFENSE CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(1) Disclosure by Defense Contractors.—

(1) Disclosure by Defense Contractors.—

(1) In General.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

(2) Contents of Statement.—Each statement filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

(B) The principal business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than $200 during the period covered in the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of more than $1,000 or more to that account during—

(1) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

(2) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed to be a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

(1) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

(2) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

(3) Covered Entity.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) In General.—The term 'covered entity' means—

(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

(B) Person Described.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person has been awarded a contract from the Department of Defense for the procurement of goods or services during the two fiscal years.

(4) Covered Disbursement.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered disbursement' means a disbursement for any of the following:

(A) An independent expenditure.

(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

(ii) is made not more than 60 days before the first date during any calendar year on which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, before the date on which a special election is held and ending on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party, and ending on the date of the general election; and

(iv) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of Senator or Representative in Congress, is made in any State and ending on the date of the general election; and

(5) Covered Transfer.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'covered transfer' means a transfer of more than $200 during the period described in paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

(6) Disclosure Date.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'disclosure date' means—

(A) the first date during any calendar year on which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000; and

(B) any other date during such calendar year on which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of $10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

(7) Contracts to Disburse; Coordination with Other Requirements; Etc.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of section 312 shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to disbursements and transfers received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1694. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. SECURE ENERGY INNOVATION PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop metrics for assessing the costs and benefits associated with secure energy projects proposed or implemented as part of the program conducted under subsection (a). The metrics shall take into account financial and operational costs associated with sustained losses of power resulting from natural disasters or attacks that damage electrical grids serving military installations.

(b) Metrics.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop metrics for assessing the costs and benefits associated with secure energy projects proposed or implemented as part of the program conducted under subsection (a).

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HENRICH, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. AUTHORITY TO USE ENERGY SAVINGS INVESTMENT FUND FOR ENERGY MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.

Section 2313(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking `, and to the extent provided for in an appropriations Act.'',
activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. PLAN TO ENHANCE MISSION READINESS THROUGH GREATER ENERGY SECURITY AT CRITICAL MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall identify ten military installations that are—

(1) critical to mission readiness, and

(2) susceptible to interruptions of power due to geographic location, dependence on connections to the electric grid, or other factors determined by the Secretary.

(b) Report.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report with a plan for integrating energy storage, micro-grid technologies, and on-site power generation systems at the military installations identified under subsection (a) to enhance mission readiness.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex as necessary.

SA 1697. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1643 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1533, add the following:

SEC. 314. REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH REPOSITORY FOR ENERGY SECURITY DEFENSE INITIATIVES.

(a) Report Required.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the implementation of section 332 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–147; 122 Stat. 4420; 10 U.S.C. 2911 note (in this section referred to as "section 332")), including a description of the implementation of the requirements for consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in the planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes.

(b) ELABORATION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A list of acquisition solicitations that incorporate analysis established and developed under section 332.

(2) An analysis of the extent to which Department of Defense planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes incorporate or rely on the fully burdened cost of energy and energy key performance parameters in relation to other metrics.

(3) An estimate of the total fuel costs avoided as a result of inclusion of the fully burdened cost of energy and energy key performance parameters in relation to other metrics.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which energy security requirements of the Department of Defense are enhanced by incorporation of section 332 requirements in the acquisition processes. The Secretary shall report to Congress whether—

(2) of such section is further amended—

(3) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2), after "and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. STUDY ON POWER STORAGE CAPACITY REQUIREMENT.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the impacts and benefits associated with requiring 25 percent of National Guard and Reserve facilities to have at least a 21-day on-site power storage capacity to assist with providing support to civil authorities in case of manmade or natural disasters.

SA 1701. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1643 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 117, insert between lines 12 and 13, the following:

(b) Location of Retention.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by inserting "(1)" before "If the Secretary";

(3) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking "and "no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is location,"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting "within the United States" after "to another location";

and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2)

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply if a United States citizen living abroad adopts the dog at the time of retirement."

SA 1702. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1643 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such
fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 540. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC INFORMATION REGARDING CIVIL AND CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that any online consumer tool offered or supported by the Department of Defense that provides information to servicemembers regarding specific postsecondary educational institutions, such as Tuition Assistance DECIDE or any successor or similar program, includes for each such institution an accounting of pending investigations and civil or criminal actions against the institution by Federal agencies and State attorneys general, to the extent such information is publicly available.

(b) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In gathering publicly available information on investigations and civil or criminal actions described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) consult the heads of other Federal agencies and, as practicable, State attorneys general; and

(2) review any reports required to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 13 or section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m and 78o(d)), including Form 10-Q and Form 10-K.

(c) CONSULTATION REGARDING PRESENTATION.—To ensure that the information required under subsection (a) is presented in the most useful and effective way possible for service members, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of Education, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and service member and consumer advocates.

SEC. 1705. Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) Exchanges described.—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) Focus of Exchanges.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) Civil-Military Affairs.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focusing on the following:

(1)2017 North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United States, meeting the two percent target.

On page 646, strike line 16 and insert the following:

(4) At the 2006 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Riga, North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries agreed to ‘‘allocates currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense will: halt any decline in defense expenditure; aim to increase defense expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the two percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO’s capability shortfalls’’.

On page 646, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1085. CIVILIAN AVIATION ASSET MILITARY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) Participation.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the participating Civilian Aviation Asset Military Partnership Pilot Program (in this section referred to as the ‘‘Program’’), is authorized to enter into partnerships for purposes of (1) improving aviation infrastructure; or (2) improving aviation safety, or otherwise improve an airport or airport system.

(c) Amount.—The amount provided to each eligible airport that receives a grant under the Program shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(d)2017 North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United States, meeting the two percent target.

In accordance with this section.

On page 646, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) Exchanges described.—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) Focus of Exchanges.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) Civil-Military Affairs.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focusing on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(e) Illegal activities.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(f) Civil-Military Affairs.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focusing on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

SEC. 1706. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. CIVILIAN AVIATION ASSET MILITARY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) Participation.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the participating Civilian Aviation Asset Military Partnership Pilot Program (in this section referred to as the ‘‘Program’’), is authorized to enter into partnerships for purposes of (1) improving aviation infrastructure; or (2) improving aviation safety, or otherwise improve an airport or airport system.

(c) Amount.—The amount provided to each eligible airport that receives a grant under the Program shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(e) Eligibility.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, an eligible airport shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, determines is appropriate. An application shall include, at a minimum, a description of the proposed project or project, including the amount to which a grant is requested, estimated costs;
(2) the need for the project at the eligible airport, including how the project will assist both civil aircraft and military aircraft; and
(3) the non-Federal funding available for the project.
(f) SELECTION AND TERMS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly—
(1) select eligible airports to receive grants under the Program; and
(2) establish the terms of each grant made under the Program.
(g) FINDING.—
(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program may not exceed 70 percent of that Federal share shall be paid by the Administrator and 50 percent shall be paid by the Secretary.
(2) COORDINATION.—With respect to the Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program, 50 percent of that Federal share shall be paid by the Administrator and 50 percent shall be paid by the Secretary.
(3) TERMINATION.—The Program shall terminate at the end of the third fiscal year in which a grant is made under the Program.

SEC. 1204. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDIA-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.
(a) AMENDMENT.—Within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:
(2) the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.
(3) the 2014 National Initiative for Two-Sided Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.
(5) the integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 704(a) of the National Defense授权 Act and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76))
(b) PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government that contain or are related to policies and programs developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.
(c) RULES OF AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGETS.—
(1) AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each appropriate military department and agency, the President shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).
(2) ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded or denied funds that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

SA 1709. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill S.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel levels for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE-GROUSE.
(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—
(1) to allow States—
(A) to determine the appropriate management of the sage-grouse species and the habitat of sage-grouse species under the State’s Statewide plan; and
(B) to demonstrate that those Statewide plans can protect and recover sage-grouse species within the States; and
(2) to require the Secretary to implement recommendations contained in Statewide plans for the management of the sage-grouse species and the habitat of sage-grouse species on Federal land.
(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) COVERED WESTERN STATE.—The term "covered Western State" means each of the States of California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.
(2) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term "National Forest System land" means the Federal land within the National Forest System, as described in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1505 et seq.)
(3) PUBLIC LAND.—The term "public land" has the meaning given the term "public lands" in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).
(4) SAGE-GROUSE SPECIES.—The term "sage-grouse species" means—
(A) the greater sage-grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) (including all distinct population segments); and
(B) the Gunnison sage-grouse (Centrocercus minimus).
(c) PARTICIPATION IN STATE PLANNING PROCESS.—
(1) APPOINTMENT OF DESIGNEE.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after that date of receipt from a covered Western State of a notice submitted in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall appoint to the Governor of the covered Western State a list of designees of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, as directed, who will represent the Secretary in assisting in the development and implementation of the Statewide plan.
(B) DESCRIPTION OF NOTICE.—
(i) IN GENERAL.—A notice referred to in subparagraph (A) is a notice that a covered Western State—
(I) is initiating, or has previously initiated, development of a Statewide plan in accordance with clause (ii); or
(II) has previously submitted to the Secretary a Statewide plan in accordance with clause (ii).
(ii) CONTENTS.—A notice under this subparagraph shall include—
(I) an invitation to the Secretary to participate in the development or implementation of the Statewide plan of the applicable covered Western State; and
(II) a statement that the covered Western State—
(aa) has prepared or will prepare, by not later than 1 year after the date of submission of the notice, a Statewide plan that will protect, manage, and conserve the habitat of sage-grouse species and the point that designation of sage-grouse species as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is no longer necessary in the covered Western State; and
(bb) will—
(A) collect monitoring data such as sage-grouse species population trends, fuel reduction, predator control, invasive species control, the condition of sage-grouse species habitat, or other parameters that address the primary threats to sage-grouse species in the covered Western State to address how the threats identified in the Statewide plan are being reduced and how the objectives identified in the Statewide plan are being met; and
(BB) provide to the Secretary relevant data regarding the health of sage-grouse species populations, the condition of sage-grouse species habitat, and activities relating to the implementation of the Statewide plan.
(iii) TIMING.—To be eligible to participate in a planning process under this section, not...
later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a covered Western State shall submit to the Secretary a notice described in subparagraph (B).

(2) Access to information.—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt from a covered Western State of a notice described in paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall provide to the covered Western State all relevant scientific data, research, and information regarding sage-grouse species and habitat within the covered Western State for use by appropriate personnel to assist the covered Western State in the development and implementation of the Statewide plan.

(d) PREVENTION OF STATEWIDE PLAN.—If the Secretary receives from a covered Western State a Statewide plan by the date that is 1 year after the date of receipt of a notice under subsection (c)(1) from the covered Western State, the Secretary shall—

(1) take no action to maintain or re-establish the candidate species status for any sage-grouse species in the covered Western State by Federal land; and

(2) stay any land use planning activities relating to Federal management of sage-grouse species in public land or National Forest System land within the covered Western State.

(e) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Governor of the covered Western State recommendations regarding improvement of the Statewide plan, including relevant data regarding—

(A) actions taken pursuant to the Statewide plan; and

(B) population trends, fuel reductions, predator control, invasive species control, the carrying capacity of public land, and other parameters that address the primary threats to sage-grouse species in the covered Western State.

(f) PREVENTION OF STATEWIDE PLAN.—The Secretary shall—

(1) give effect to a Statewide conservation and management plan for the protection and recovery of sage-grouse species within a covered Western State that is submitted by the covered Western State and approved or endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) for purposes of subsections (d) and (e), treat such a plan as a Statewide plan in accordance with that subsection.

(g) ACTIONS PURSUANT TO NEPA.—An action proposed to be carried out pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) in a covered Western State may not be denied or restricted solely on the basis of the significance or potential to affect the species or the habitat of the candidate species.

(h) AUTHORITY TO EXTEND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.—On review of the report of the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B), the Secretary may extend the provisions of this Act for a period not to exceed an additional 6 years with the consent of the covered Western State.

SA 1710. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 12. EXTENSION OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 1(w), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 6, by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by repealing section 25.

SA 1711. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 12. SOUTHEAST ASIA STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP.

The Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260, chapter 2907; 81 Stat. 584), is amended—

(1) in section 1(w), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 6, by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by repealing section 25.

SA 1712. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 213.

SA 1713. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE FUEL AWARDS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ALTERNATIVE FUEL CONTRACTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—In this section, the term "alternative fuel" has

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for research and development alternative fuel awards or Department of Defense alternative fuel contracts.

SA 1714. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part I of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 384. CONSOLIDATION OF FINANCIAL LITERACY PROGRAMS AND TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for the consolidation of the current financial training programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments for members of the Armed Forces into a single program of financial training for members that—

(1) eliminates duplication and costs in the provision of financial training to members; and

(2) ensures that members receive effective training in financial literacy in as few training sessions as necessary for the receipt of effective training.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall commence implementation of the plan required by subsection (a) 90 days after the date of the submittal of the plan as required by that subsection.

SA 1715. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. RESTRICTIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

Section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) RESTRICTIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN MILITARY OPERATIONS AREAS.—The President shall not establish a national monument under this section on land that is located under the lateral boundaries of a military operations area (as the term is defined in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) unless—

"(1) the proclamation includes language that ensures that the establishment of the national monument would not place any new limitations on the use of the area for military flight operations; and

"(2) the designation of a new unit of special use airspace;

"(c) the use or establishment of a military flight training route;

"(d) any flight operations of military aircraft; or

"(e) any ground-based operations in support of military flight operations; and

"(f) the Secretary of Defense certifies that the establishment of the national monument—

"(A) would not negatively impact any military flight operations in airspace above the national monument; and

"(B) would not reduce the ability of any ground-based operations in support of military flight operations.

SA 1716. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 314. INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a reprogramming or transfer request in the amount of $464,017,143 from unobligated funds in the Operation and Maintenance, Overseas Contingency Operations, account.

(b) TREATMENT OF REPROGRAMMING.—The transfer of an amount pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be deemed to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations by section 1505.

SA 1717. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) LIMITATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a searchable database to uniformly report information regarding installation renewable energy projects undertaken since 2010.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The database established under subsection (a) shall include, for each installation energy project—

(1) the estimated payback period;

(2) estimated project costs;

(3) estimated actual power generation;

(4) actual cost savings to date;

(5) any construction milestones or other requirements; and

(6) the estimation of retrofitting military construction projects in areas of contingency operations.

"(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not obligate or expend funds to carry out a military construction project in the database established under subsection (a) in connection with a contingency operation unless the project is certified to the Secretary of Defense that the project is necessary for support of a contingency operation.

"(b) NON-DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, withhold from the database established under subsection (a) information pertaining to individual projects if the Secretary determines that the disclosure of such information would jeopardize operational security.

"(2) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.—In the event the Secretary withholds information related to one or more renewable energy projects under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include in the database—

(A) a statement that information has been withheld; and

(B) an aggregate amount for each of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (b) that includes amounts for all renewable energy projects described under subsection (a), including those with respect to which information has been withheld under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(c) Certification requirement for military construction projects in areas of contingency operations.

"(a) Certification requirement for military construction projects in areas of contingency operations.

"(e) Certification requirement for military construction projects in areas of contingency operations.

"(a) Certification requirement for military construction projects in areas of contingency operations.
SA 1719. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection A of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2007. USE OF PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENTS IN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS. — Section 2852 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments awarding a construction contract on behalf of the Government, in any solicitations, bid specifications, project agreements, or other controlling documents, shall not—

"(A) require or prohibit bidders, offerors, contractors, or subcontractors to enter into or adhere to agreements with one or more labor organizations; and

"(B) discriminate against or give preference to bidders, offerors, contractors, or subcontractors to enter into or adhere to agreements with one or more labor organizations; and

"(2) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a contractor or subcontractor from voluntarily entering into such an agreement, as is protected by the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.)."

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT. — The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to construction contracts awarded before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1720. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. TRANSPORTATION TO TRANSFER CEREAL MONIES FOR FAMILY AND NEXT OF KIND OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE DURING MILITARY OPERATIONS.

Section 481f(e)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(including those serving during a humanitarian relief operation)" after "located or serving overseas".

SA 1721. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1116. MATTERS RELATING TO BIENNIAL WORKFORCE TURNOVER TO SUPPORT THE WORKFORCE. — Section 241 of title 10, United States Code, is amended —

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and";

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(E) the use of special hiring authorities to be made by such Secretary or head of agency in addressing the matters described in this section and other measures that would support the enhancement of the quality of the workforce.";

(b) TRANSMITTAL OF REPORTS TO CONGRESS. — Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting "and to Congress" after "to the Secretary.";

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE. — The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1722. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. ENERGY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURCHASE OF ENERGY. — In purchasing energy commodities, including electricity and fuel, the Department of Defense shall take into account—

(1) the reliability of the energy source, with a preference afforded to sources that offer a constant, non-intermittent supply of power; and

(2) the cost of the energy source in comparison with other available and reliable energy sources, with a preference afforded to energy sources that are demonstrated to be more cost-effective in the near term.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) GOALS ON USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY TO MEET ELECTRICITY NEEDS. — Section 2901 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e).


(3) STRENGTHENING FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY, AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from Executive Order 13423 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to strengthening Federal environmental, energy, and transportation management).

(4) FEDERAL FLEET CONSERVATION REQUIREMENTS.— The Department of Defense shall be exempt from Federal fleet conservation requirements established under section 400PF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374e).

(5) FEDERAL LEADERSHIP ON ENERGY MANAGEMENT.— The Department of Defense shall be exempt from the renewable energy consumption target established by the document entitled "Leadership on Energy Management: Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies" and published December 10, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 76374).

(6) PLANNING FOR FEDERAL SUSTAINABILITY IN THE NEXT DECADE.—The Department of Defense shall be exempt from Executive Order No. 13693 dated March 19, 2015.

SA 1723. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of title D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. EQUAL BENEFITS UNDER SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN FOR SURVIVORS OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS WHO DIE DURING INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING.

(a) TREATMENT OF INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING IN SAME MANNER AS ACTIVE DUTY. —

(1) IN GENERAL. — Section 1450(c)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended —

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking "or 1448(d)(6)" after "section 1448(d)"; and

(ii) by inserting "or (ii)" after "clause (i)";

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking "section 1448(d)(6) of this title" and inserting "section 1448(d)(6) of this title by reason of the death of a member or former member not in line of duty"; and

(ii) by striking "section 1448(f)" and inserting "section 1448(f)".

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS. — No annuity benefit under the Survivor Benefit Plan shall accrue to any person by reason of the amendments made by paragraph (1) for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act. With respect to an annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan for a death occurring on or after September 19, 2001, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall recompute the benefit amount to reflect such amendments, effective for months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN. — Section 1450(f) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) DEPENDENT CHILDREN ANNUITY.—

(A) ANNUIETY WHEN NO ELIGIBLE SURVIVING SPOUSE. — In the case of a person described in paragraph (1) who is the surviving spouse under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the dependent children of that person under section 1450(a)(2) of this title as applicable.

(B) OPTIONAL ANNUITY WHEN THERE IS AN ELIGIBLE SURVIVING SPOUSE. — The Secretary may pay an annuity under this subchapter to the dependent children of a person described in paragraph (1) who is the surviving spouse under paragraph (1) of this title, if, applicable, instead of paying an annuity to the surviving spouse under paragraph (1), if the Secretary, concerned in consultation with the surviving spouse, determines it appropriate to provide an annuity for the dependent children under this paragraph instead of an annuity for the surviving spouse under paragraph (1).

(5) DEEMED ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL. — Section 1448(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) DEEMED ELECTION TO PROVIDE AN ANNUIITY FOR DEPENDENT. — In the case of a person described in paragraph (1) who dies after November 22, 2003, the Secretary concerned may, if no other annuity is payable on behalf of that person under this subchapter, pay an
annuity to a natural person who has an insurable interest in such person as if the annuity were elected by the person under subparagraph (b) (1). The Secretary concerned may pay such an annuity under this subparagraph only in the case of a person who is a dependent of that deceased person (as defined in section 1070 (2) of this title). An annuity under this paragraph shall be computed in the same manner as provided under subparagraph (B) of subsection (d) (6) for an annuity under that subsection.

SEC. 1040. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND OTHER CARE AND SERVICES FOR INFECTION DISEASE.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of State issues travel warnings regarding travel to foreign countries that include "unstable government, civil war, ongoing intense crime or outbreaks, or other health-related concerns.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—No payment under section 1405(b) of title 10, United States Code, by reason of the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be made for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1052. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND OTHER CARE AND SERVICES FOR INFECTION DISEASE.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of State issues travel warnings regarding travel to foreign countries that include "unstable government, civil war, ongoing intense crime or outbreaks, or other health-related concerns.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—No payment under section 1405(b) of title 10, United States Code, by reason of the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be made for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1724. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1040. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO COUNTRIES COVERED BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE TRAVEL WARNINGS.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of State issues travel warnings regarding travel to foreign countries that include "unstable government, civil war, ongoing intense crime or outbreaks, or other health-related concerns.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—No payment under section 1405(b) of title 10, United States Code, by reason of the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be made for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1052. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND OTHER CARE AND SERVICES FOR INFECTION DISEASE.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of State issues travel warnings regarding travel to foreign countries that include "unstable government, civil war, ongoing intense crime or outbreaks, or other health-related concerns.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—No payment under section 1405(b) of title 10, United States Code, by reason of the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be made for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1725. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 315, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(9) A plan to incorporate into pediatric care from the Department telehealth services to patients to health care providers who are leading providers in their field, including those patients with rare diseases or complex cases.

SA 1726. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 315, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(9) A plan to incorporate into pediatric care from the Department telehealth services to patients to health care providers who are leading providers in their field, including those patients with rare diseases or complex cases.

SA 1727. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 315, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(9) A plan to incorporate into pediatric care from the Department telehealth services to patients to health care providers who are leading providers in their field, including those patients with rare diseases or complex cases.

SA 1728. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MICHELS, Mr. KAIRIS, Mr. TILLS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 652 and insert the following:

SEC. 652. REPORT AND ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZING DEFENSE DEPARTMENT COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commercial activities. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any pilot program to privatize defense commercial activities or the defense commercial activities.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A methodology for defining the total number and status of contracts for commercial activities.

(2) An evaluation of commissary use by military personnel in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commissary system. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any pilot program to privatize defense commissary activities or the defense commissary activities system.

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the viability of privatizing, in whole or in part, the Department of Defense commercial activities. The report shall be so submitted to Congress before the development of any pilot program to privatize defense commercial activities or the defense commercial activities system.

SEC. 1257. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON OPERATION ATLANTIC RESOLVE AND THE EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the continued United States commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and our allies in Europe is critical to peace and stability in the region and critical to United States national security;

(2) actions by Russia, including the invasion and occupation of territories of Georgia, the invasion of Ukraine and annexation of Crimea, continued violations of allied air space by Russia, including dangerous close passes with civilian and military aircraft and vessels by Russia threaten the peace and security of our allies and partners;

(3) Operation Atlantic Resolve, launched in April 2014, demonstrates the steadfast commitment of the United States to our allies in the region against any threat to territorial integrity or sovereignty;

(4) the European Reassurance Initiative, signed into law in December 2014, has improved United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization capability and readiness in Central and Eastern Europe;

(5) pre-positioning ammunition, fuel, and equipment for military purposes, as well as improving infrastructure, will enhance North Atlantic Treaty Organization operations and enable European allies to receive rapid reinforce appointments;

(6) increasing the presence of United States forces in the region, including naval forces in the Black Sea, Baltic seas, and the Mediterranean, through stepped-up rotations, training, and exercises will enhance and improve United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization interoperability and cooperation; and

(7) it is in the United States national interest to continue to support these efforts while the threat to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of our allies persists.
(3) An evaluation of commissary use in locations outside the continental United States and in remote and isolated locations in the continental United States when compared with other locations.
(5) An assessment of potential savings and efficiencies to be achieved through implementation of some or all of recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.
(7) A description and evaluation of the transportation strategy of the Defense Commissary Agency for products sold at commissaries.
(8) A description and evaluation of the formula of the Defense Commissary Agency for calculating savings for its customers as a result of its pricing strategy.
(9) An evaluation of the average savings per household garnered by commissary use.
(10) A description and evaluation of the use of privatization in the commissary workforce as part of the defense commissary system.
(11) An assessment of costs or savings, and potential impacts to patrons and the Government, of the commissary defense commissary system, including potential increased use of Government assistance programs.
(12) A description and assessment of potential barriers to privatization of the defense commissary system.
(13) An assessment of the extent to which patron savings would remain after the privatization of the defense commissary system.
(14) An assessment of the impact of any recommended changes to the operation of the commissary system on commissary patrons, including morale and retention.
(15) An assessment of the actual interest of major grocery retailers in the management and operations of all, or part, of the existing defense commissary system.
(16) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system on off-installation prices of similar products available in the system.
(17) An assessment of the impact of privatization of the defense commissary system, and conversion of the Defense Commissary Agency workforce to non-appropriated fund status, on employment of military family members, in particular those facing military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 152. ADDITIONAL SENSOR SUITES FOR F-22 AND F-35 AIRCRAFT RADAR CROSS-SECTION FACILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY OF INCLUSION OF SENSORS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the feasibility of the inclusion of additional sensor suites to the current radar cross-section facilities for the F-22 aircraft and the F-35 aircraft in order to obtain a prognostic facility capability, benefitting life cycle logistics and maintainability of wastewater aircraft.

(b) DISCHARGE OF ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct the assessment through the F-22 Program Office and the Joint Strike Fighter Program Office.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2016, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment pursuant to section (a).

SEC. 891. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement Act of 2015”.
$750,000, the contracting officer shall make a determination whether two-phase selection procedures are appropriate for use for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when—

(A) the contracting officer anticipates that 3 or more offers will be received for the contract;

(B) design work must be performed before an offeror can develop a price or cost proposal for the contract;

(C) the offeror will incur a substantial amount of expense in preparing the offer; and

(D) the contracting officer has considered information such as—

(i) the extent to which the project requirements have been adequately defined;

(ii) the time constraints for delivery of the project;

(iii) the capability and experience of potential contractors;

(iv) the suitability of the project for use of the two-phase selection procedures;

(v) the capability of the agency to manage the two-phase selection process; and

(vi) other criteria established by the agency.; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity, approves the contracting officer’s justification that an individual solicitation must have greater than 5 finalists to be in the Government’s interest.” The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number of offerors exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process.”.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30 of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the head of each agency shall compile an annual report of each instance in which the agency awarded a design-build contract pursuant to section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending in such calendar year, in which—

(i) more than 5 finalists were selected for phase-two requests for proposals; or

(ii) the contract was awarded without using two-phase selection procedures.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall facilitate public access to the reports, including by posting them on a publicly available Internet website. A notice of the availability of each report shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) GENERAL.—Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

(b) CRITERIA FOR USE.—

(1) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE OF AT LEAST $750,000.—Two-phase selection procedures shall be used for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when a contracting officer determines that the contract has a value of $750,000 or greater, as adjusted for inflation in accordance with section 1908 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) CONTRACTS WITH A VALUE LESS THAN $750,000.—For projects that a contracting officer determines have a value of less than $750,000, the contracting officer shall make a determination whether two-phase selection procedures are appropriate for use for entering into a contract for the design and construction of a public building, facility, or work when—

(A) the contracting officer anticipates that 3 or more offers will be received for the contract;

(B) design work must be performed before an offeror can develop a price or cost proposal for the contract;

(C) the offeror will incur a substantial amount of expense in preparing the offer; and

(D) the contracting officer has considered information such as—

(i) the extent to which the project requirements have been adequately defined;

(ii) the time constraints for delivery of the project;

(iii) the capability and experience of potential contractors;

(iv) the suitability of the project for use of the two-phase selection procedures;

(v) the capability of the agency to manage the two-phase selection process; and

(vi) other criteria established by the Department of Defense.; and

(b) in subsection (d), by striking “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity, approves the contracting officer’s justification that an individual solicitation must have greater than 5 finalists to be in the Government’s interest.” The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number of offerors exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process.”.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30 of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall compile an annual report of each instance in which the Department awarded a design-build contract pursuant to section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending in such calendar year, in which—

(i) more than 5 finalists were selected for phase-two requests for proposals; or

(ii) the contract was awarded without using two-phase selection procedures.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall facilitate public access to the reports, including by posting them on a publicly available Internet website. A notice of the availability of each report shall be published in the Federal Register.

(c) GAO REPORTS.—

(1) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—Not later than 270 days after the deadline for the final reports required under subsection (f) of section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the compliance of the Department of Defense with the requirements of such section.

(2) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Not later than 270 days after the deadline for the final reports required under subsection (f) of section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the compliance of the Department of Defense with the requirements of such section.

SEC. 883. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF A REVERSE AUCTION FOR THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council, in consultation with the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for awarding contracts for construction and design services.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term “design and construction services” means—

(A) site planning and landscape design;

(B) architectural and engineering services (including surveying and mapping defined in section 1101 of title 40, United States Code);

(C) interior design;

(D) performance of construction work for facility, infrastructure, and environmental restoration projects;

(E) delivery and supply of construction materials to construction sites; and

(F) construction or repair or alteration of public buildings or public works; and

(2) the term “reverse auction” means, with respect to procurement by an agency—

(A) a real-time auction conducted through an electronic medium between a group of offerors who compete against each other by bidding through the Internet website with the ability to submit revised bids throughout the course of the auction; and

(B) the award of the contract or task order to the offeror who submits the lowest bid.

SEC. 894. ASSURING PAYMENT PROTECTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION SUBCONTRACTORS AND SUPPLIERS UNDER AN ALTERNATIVE TO A MILLER ACT BOND PAYMENT.

Chapter 83 of title VI of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new section:

“§9310. Individual sureties

‘‘If another applicable law or regulation permits the acceptance of a bond from a surety that is not subject to sections 9305 and 9306 and is based on a pledge of assets by the surety, the assets pledged by such surety shall—

(1) consist of eligible obligations described under section 9303(a); and

(2) be submitted to the official of the Government required to approve or accept the bond and such official shall deposit the assets with a depository described under section 9303(b).’’;

and

(2) in the table of sections for such chapter, by adding at the end the following new item:

“§9310. Individual sureties.”.

SEC. 895. SBA SURETY BOND GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 114(g)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 649c(g)(1)) is amended by striking “70” and inserting “90”.

SA 1732. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, which is ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:
(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and
(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(2) CAPABILITIES OF AIRFIELDS.—The term ‘‘capabilities of airfields’’ means the length and width of runways, taxiways, and aprons, the operation and capacity of lighting, the operation of fuel storage, distribution, and refueling systems, and the availability of airfield services.

(3) AIRFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SUPPORT BOTH MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AIR OPERATIONS.—The term ‘‘airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations’’ means the following:

(A) Airports that are designated as joint use facilities pursuant to section 47175 of title 49, United States Code, in which both the military and civil aviation have shared use of the airfield.

(B) Airports used by the military that have a permanent military aviation presence at the airport pursuant to a memorandum of agreement or tenant lease with the airport owner that is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(d) Appropriations.—In addition to any amounts otherwise made available to carry out this section, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Transportation, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the plans for airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations pursuant to title 49, United States Code, in which both the military and civil aviation have shared use of the airfield.

SA 1733. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE USE OF DOMESTIC AIRFIELDS FOR HOME- LAND DEFENSE AND DISASTER RESPONSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Transportation, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the plans for airfields in the United States that are required to support homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The report shall include the following items:


(2) The utilization rates of the units listed under paragraph (1).

(3) A future force allocation determination with respect to such units in order to achieve the most efficient use of such units with respect to such units in order to achieve the most efficient use of such units.

(4) An assessment of opportunities to expand coverage of C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units in States most prone to wildfires.

SA 1734. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: SEC. 1203. STUDY ON COUNTER-DRUG EFFORTS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a report to Congress that outlines—

(1) the counter-narcotics goals of the Department of Defense in Afghanistan; and

(2) how the Secretary of Defense will coordinate the counter-drug efforts of the Department of Defense with other Federal agencies to ensure an integrated, effective counter-narcotics strategy is implemented in Afghanistan.

(b) C ONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall consult with individuals with relevant experience relating to post-traumatic stress disorders, the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorders, and the impact of post-traumatic stress disorder on members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families, including the following:

(A) Representatives of military service organizations.

(B) Representatives of veterans service organizations.

(C) Health professionals with experience in treating members of the Armed Forces and veterans with mental illness, including those who have experienced traumatic stress.

(D) Members of the Armed Forces and veterans who have experienced traumatic stress.

(E) Members of the Armed Forces and veterans who have experienced traumatic stress.

SEC. 1204. REPORT ON POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a study on reducing the stigma and improving the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall consult with individuals with relevant experience relating to post-traumatic stress disorder, including the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder, on the impact of post-traumatic stress disorder on members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families, including the following:

(A) Representatives of military service organizations.

(B) Representatives of veterans service organizations.

(C) Health professionals with experience in treating members of the Armed Forces and veterans with mental illness, including those who have experienced traumatic stress.

(D) Members of the Armed Forces and veterans who have experienced traumatic stress.

(E) Members of the Armed Forces and veterans who have experienced traumatic stress.

SEC. 1205. REPORT ON POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a study on reducing the stigma and improving the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder among members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall consult with individuals with relevant experience relating to post-traumatic stress disorder, including the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder, and the impact of post-traumatic stress disorder on members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families, including the following:

(A) Representatives of military service organizations.

(B) Representatives of veterans service organizations.

(C) Health professionals with experience in treating members of the Armed Forces and veterans with mental illness, including those who have experienced traumatic stress.

(D) Members of the Armed Forces and veterans who have experienced traumatic stress.

(E) Members of the Armed Forces and veterans who have experienced traumatic stress.
like to receive information from participating individuals. The Secretary shall take such actions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect:

(A) the privacy of individuals participating in the program;

(B) the security of the information stored in the national directory.

(6) BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may use the system and architecture of the eBenefits Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs to support and operate the national directory as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) Outreach.—

(1) Sharing of Directory Information.—

(A) In General.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in order to connect participating individuals with the programs they could be eligible for or services, support, and information they may be interested in receiving, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may share, under the program established under subsection (a)(1), information in the national directory concerning such individuals with entities applicable to participating individuals.

(B) Entities Applicable to Participating Individuals.—For purposes of this subsection, an entity that is applicable to a participating individual is an entity from whom a participating individual has expressed interest in receiving information under the program.

(C) Updated Information.—In a case in which a participating individual updates the information pertaining to the participating individual under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall transmit such information to each entity applicable to the participating individual.

(D) Notification of Disenrollment.—In a case in which a participating individual indicates to the Secretary under subsection (b)(3) that the individual would no longer like to receive information from participating entities under the program, the Secretary shall inform each entity applicable to the participating individual that the individual would no longer like to receive information from the entity under the program.

(2) Limitations.—

(A) Limitations on the Secretary.—

(I) Information Under Program.—Under the program, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may only share that the individual with the national directory the following:

(1) the name of a participating individual;

(II) the e-mail address of a participating individual;

(III) the postal address of a participating individual;

(IV) the phone number of a participating individual.

(B) Limitations on Participating Entities.—

(I) Sharing with Third-Party and For-Profit Entities.—As a condition of participation in the program, a participating entity shall not share any information the participating entity collects under the program with any third-party or for-profit entities.

(II) Purchases of Products or Services.—As a condition of participation in the program, a participating entity shall not include in any information sent by the participating entity to a participating individual or the veterans service organization or the family of the participating individual purchase a product or service.
(iii) Information provided on the form developed under subparagraph (A) will never be sold, provided to a for-profit entity, or used to send any sort of political communication. (D) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the form provided under paragraph (1) is voluntary and submittal of such form to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly take such actions as the secretaries consider appropriate to integrate the collection of information under this subsection; and

(2) TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a member of the Armed Forces who submitted information to the Secretary of Defense under this subsection separates from service in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit such information to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(3) PRIVACY AND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Defense shall take such actions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect—

(A) the privacy of individuals who submit information under this subsection; and

(B) the security of such information.

(i) while it is in the possession of the Secretary; and

(ii) if it is in transit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(4) INTEGRATION WITH TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly take such actions as the secretaries consider appropriate to integrate the collection of information under this subsection with the Transition Assistance Program.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the program established under subsection (a). (2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an examination and assessment of—

(A) the signup process and the effectiveness of the forms developed and provided under subsection (d);

(B) the ways in which contact information is transferred from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the program and any challenges that the secretaries face in transferring such information;

(C) the number of covered entities described in subsection (a)(2)(C) participating in the program and any challenges they face in receiving the contact information from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the program.

(f) EFFECTIVENESS OF EFFORTS OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO PROTECT THE PERSONAL INFORMATION OF PARTICIPATING INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The effectiveness of efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to protect the personal information of participating individuals.

(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF INFORMATION COLLECTED UNDER THE PROGRAM.—Provisions are necessary to protect participating individuals from unwanted contact, or contact that is inconsistent with the program.

(G) WHETHER PARTICIPATING INDIVIDUALS ARE BENEFITING BY PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM AND WHETHER CHANGING THE PROGRAM WOULD IMPROVE THE PROGRAM.—

(H) THE OVERALL PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM, UTILIZATION OF THE PROGRAM, AND HOW SUCH PARTICIPATION AND UTILIZATION COULD BE IMPROVED.

(2) SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS THE SECRETARIES CONSIDER APPROPRIATE.—

(i) INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THE FORM DEVELOPED UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A) WILL NEVER BE SOLD, PROVIDED TO A FOR-PROFIT ENTITY, OR USED TO SEND ANY SORT OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION.

(3) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that completion of the form provided under paragraph (1) is voluntary and submittal of such form to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall be considered an indication to the Secretary that the member would like to receive information from participating entities under the program.

(4) TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a member of the Armed Forces who submitted information to the Secretary of Defense under this subsection separates from service in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit such information to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
(B) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(1), in the case of a referral under subsection (c), and in subsection (d);

"(C) in section 811a(1), by adding at the end the following:

"(D) NOTICE OF DISPUTE RELATED TO ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—(1) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall develop a standardized form to be used by each investigator to submit the certification required under paragraph (1).

SA 1738. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 564, after line 25, add the following:

"(d) REPORT.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "covered employee" means any investigator involved in the covered investigation.

"(2) CONTENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding covered employees hired into a probationary status during the 5-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act, which shall include the number of covered employees:

"(A) hired during the period;

"(B) whose appointment became final after the probationary period;

"(C) who were subject to disciplinary action or termination during the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the appointment of the covered employee became final;

"(D) who were subject to disciplinary action during the probationary period;

"(E) who were terminated before the appointment of the covered employee became final; and

"(F) who, after being subject to disciplinary action or terminated, raised a claim that the disciplinary action or termination was taken because of a disclosure of information by the covered employee reasonably believed evidenced—

"(i) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation;

"(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

SA 1739. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION FOR INVESTIGATIONS RELATED TO WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

"(1) the term "covered employee" means a whistleblower who is an employee of the Department of Defense or a military department, an employee of an employer of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee thereof;

"(2) the term "covered investigation" means an investigation carried out by an Inspector General of a military department or the Inspector General of the Department of Defense;

"(3) the term "covering department" means each of the departments described in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each investigator involved in a covered investigation shall submit to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or the Inspector General of the military department, as applicable, a certification that there was no conflict of interest between the investigator, any witness involved in the covered investigation, and the covered employee or member of the Armed Forces, as applicable, during the conduct of the covered investigation.

"(2) STANDARDIZED FORM.—The Inspector General shall develop a standardized form to be used by each investigator to submit the certification required under paragraph (1).

SA 1740. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. PROTECTION FOR CONTRACTORS AND GRANTEES FROM REPRISAL FOR DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.

(a) ELIMINATION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 7112 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (i).

(b) EXTENSION OF PROTECTIONS TO GRANTEES.—Such section is further amended—

"(1) by striking "or grantee" each place it appears and inserting "or grantee"; and

"(2) in subsection (b), by striking "and grantee" and inserting "and grantee".

SA 1743. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. EXTENSION OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR DEFENSE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES TO EMPLOYEES OF CONCENTRATIONS OF ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) CONTRACTORS OF DOD AND RELATED AGENCIES.—Subsection (e) of section 2009 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) DISCLOSURES WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—(1) Any disclosure under this section by an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, or grantee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) with respect to an element of the intelligence community or an activity or an element of the intelligence community shall comply with applicable provisions of section 3(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) and section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) that are described in paragraph (1) of information required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interests of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that is made to be classified by the court in a manner consistent with the interests of the national security of the United States, including the use of such a disclosure to protect the interests of the intelligence community awarding the contract or grant concerns advises
the court that the national security interests of the United States warrant the use of such summaries or submissions.".

(b) PILOT PROGRAM ON OTHER CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—Section 702 of title 47, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) DISCLOSURES WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) MANNER OF DISCLOSURES.—Any disclosure under this section by an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, or grantee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3004(4))) with respect to the intelligence community or an activity of an element of the intelligence community shall comply with applicable provisions of section 717(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3177(d)(5)) and section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)

"(2) TREATMENT BY COURTS.—Any disclosure described in paragraph (1) of information required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interests of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that is made to a court or a grand jury is evidence of the interest of the United States warrant the use of summaries or submissions.''

SA 1744. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR WHICH AMOUNTS HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATED.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) $30,000,000 to make seismic corrections to Building 205 in the West Los Angeles Medical Center of the Department in Los Angeles, California, which, according to the Department, is designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(B) Through the placement of the community living center and mental health facilities of the Department in Long Beach, California, which, according to the Department, is designated as having an exceptionally high risk of sustaining substantial damage or collapsing during an earthquake;

(C) $187,500,000 to replace the existing special care unit, clinic of the Department in San Diego, California, which, according to the Department, is designated as having an extremely high risk of sustaining major damage or collapse during an earthquake; and

(D) $122,400,000 to make renovations to address substantial safety and compliance issues at the medical center of the Department in Canandaigua, New York, and for the construction of a new clinic and community living center at such medical center.

(2) The Department may obligate or expend the amounts described in paragraph (1) because it lacks an explicit authorization by an Act of Congress pursuant to section 2004(a) of title 31, United States Code, to carry out the major medical facility projects described in such paragraph.

(3) Among the major medical facility projects described in paragraph (1), there are critical seismic safety projects in California.

(4) Every day that the critical seismic safety projects described in paragraph (3) are delayed pursues the Secretary and employees of the Department at risk.

(5) According to the United States Geologic Survey—

(A) California has a 99 percent chance or greater of experiencing an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater in the next 30 years; and, 

(B) Even earthquakes of less severity than magnitude 6.7 can cause life threatening damage to seismically unsafe buildings; and

(C) In California, earthquakes of magnitude 6.0 or greater occur on average once every 12 years.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the major medical facility projects described in such paragraph (3) are in the amounts specified in such explanatory statement, including by obligating and expending such amounts.

SA 1745. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 314. ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ALTERNATIVE FUELLED VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury an alternative fuel vehicle infrastructure fund to be known as the "Department of Defense Alternative Fuel Vehicle Infrastructure Fund".

(b) DEPOSITS.—The fund shall consist of the following:

(1) Amounts appropriated to the fund.

(2) Amounts earned through investment under subsection (d).

(3) Any other amounts made available to the fund by law.

(c) INVESTMENTS.—The Secretary shall invest any part of the fund that the Secretary decides is not required to meet current expenses. Each investment shall be made in an interest-bearing obligation of the United States Government, or an obligation that has its principal and interest guaranteed by the Government, that the Secretary decides has a maturity suitable for the fund.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—The amount described in paragraph (1) shall be available to the Department acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to install, operate, and maintain alternative fuel dispensing stations for use by alternative fueled vehicles of the Department of Defense.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—The term ‘‘alternative fuel’’ has the meaning given such term in section 2004 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE.—The term ‘‘alternative fueled vehicle’’ means a vehicle that operates on alternative fuel.
human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that "the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to the efforts of the United Nations and the Afghan government to improve security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies".

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense’s 2015 Report on Protecting Women in Afghanistan, the United States government and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) "maintains a program dedicated to improving the recruitment, retention, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and to improving the status of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF, and (B) the evaluation of the plans for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including sexual violence; and

(iii) mechanisms to enhance the capacity for units of National Police's Family Response Units to fulfill their mandate as well as indicators measuring the operational effectiveness of these units;

(iii) mechanisms to enhance accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the treatment of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF, and

(iv) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of National Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development of a "committee for Afghan women" to coordinate the efforts of the Afghan government and NGOs to support Afghan women and girls, including female members of the ANSF, and

(D) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3550):

(i) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(ii) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(iii) development and dissemination of guidelines and human rights and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(iv) efforts to address harassment and violence against women in the ANSF;

(v) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station;

(vi) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(vii) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

SA 1748. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REVIEW OF CHARACTERIZATION OR TERMS OF DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DISORDERS ALLEGED TO AFFECT TERMS OF DISCHARGE.

Section 1553(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) A former member described in this subparagraph in paragraph (1) or a former member whose application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as support for their statement or as justification for priority consideration whose post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is related to combat or military sexual trauma, as determined by the Secretary concerned.'

SA 1749. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. Mccain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3550):

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF, and

(B) the implementation of the plans for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including sexual violence; and

(iii) mechanisms to enhance accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the treatment of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF, and

(iv) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of National Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development of a "committee for Afghan women" to coordinate the efforts of the Afghan government and NGOs to support Afghan women and girls, including female members of the ANSF, and

(D) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3550):

(i) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(ii) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(iii) development and dissemination of guidelines and human rights and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(iv) efforts to address harassment and violence against women in the ANSF;

(v) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station;

(vi) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(vii) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.
SEC. 1085. SENSE OF SENATE ON MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT TRAVEL CHARGE CARDS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) in the 2015 report of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense that personnel charged nearly $1,000,000 to government travel charge cards for personal use at casinos and adult entertainment establishments over a one year period demonstrates serious misuse of government travel charge cards, does not comport with the values of the Department, and requires additional oversight to prevent future misuse;

(2) the Director of the Defense Travel Management Office should work with the Armed Forces, the Defense Agencies, and representatives of financial institutions to determine how to prevent and identify the inappropriate personal use of the government travel charge cards under those and similar circumstances; and

(3) the Department of Defense should work to expeditiously address any outstanding recommendations of the Inspector General described in paragraph (1).

SA 1750. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 721. PROHIBITION ON TERMINATION OF VETS4WARRIORS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may not terminate the peer support program known as the Vets4Warriors program unless the Secretary determines, through a public process established by the Secretary, that members of the Armed Forces will receive adequate mental health care and resources in the absence of such program.

(b) EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of peer-to-peer counseling in assisting members of the Armed Forces and their families.

SA 1752. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 355. STARBASE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 recommends no funding for the Department of Defense STARBASE program.

(2) The purpose of the STARBASE program is to improve the knowledge and skills of students in kindergarten through 12th grade in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects, to connect them to the military, and to motivate them to explore science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and possible military careers as they continue their education.

(3) The STARBASE program currently operates at 16 locations in 40 States and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, primarily on military installations.

(4) To date, nearly 750,000 students have participated in the STARBASE program.

(5) The STARBASE program is a highly effective program run by dedicated members of the Armed Forces and strengthens the relationships between the military, communities, and local school districts.

(6) The budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 seeks to eliminate funding for the STARBASE program for that fiscal year due to a reorganization of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs throughout the Federal Government.

(b) SENATE RESOLUTION.—The Senate, by resolution of the Senate, approves the sense of the Senate that the STARBASE program should continue to be funded by the Department of Defense.

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 and available for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4301—

(1) the amount available for the STARBASE program is hereby increased by $25,000,000; and

(2) the amount available by reason of increased bulk fuel cost savings is hereby decreased by $25,000,000.

SA 1753. Mr. WARREN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. AYotte, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3.. HONORING AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In recent years, commemorative chairs honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action have been placed in prominent locations across the United States.

(2) The United States Capitol is an appropriate location to place a commemorative chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

(b) PLACEMENT OF A CHAIR IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL, HONORING AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION.

(1) OBTAINING CHAIR.—The Architect of the Capitol shall enter into an agreement to obtain a chair featuring the logo of the National League of POW/MIA Families under such terms and conditions as the Architect considers appropriate and consistent with applicable law.

(2) PLACEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Architect shall place the chair obtained under paragraph (1) in a suitable permanent location in the United States Capitol.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) DONATIONS.—The Architect of the Capitol may—

(A) enter into an agreement with any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code to solicit private donations to carry out the purposes of this section; and

(B) accept donations of funds, property, and services to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) COSTS.—All costs incurred in carrying out the purposes of this section shall be paid for with private donations received under paragraph (1).

SA 1754. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:
(a) DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT.—
(1) DESIGNATION.—Section 503 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT.—
(1) chair the Program Management Policy Council established under section 503(c); and
(2) issue regulations and guidelines on program and project management within an agency; and
(3) establish a 5-year strategic plan for program and project management.
"(2) APPLICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense to the extent that the provisions of that paragraph are substantially similar to or duplicative of the provisions under section 810 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.
"(3) DEADLINE FOR STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Program Management Policy Council established under section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall issue the standards, policies, and guidelines required under section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(b) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICERS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—
(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1126. Program Management Improvement Officers and Program Management Policy Council.

"(a) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS.—

"(1) DESIGNATION.—The head of each agency designated under paragraph (1) shall—

"(A) adopt governmentwide standards, policies, and guidelines on program and project management for executive agencies;

"(B) develop a written strategy for enhancing the role of program managers within the agency that includes the following:

"(i) Enhanced training and educational opportunities for highly qualified individuals to serve as program managers;

"(ii) Mentoring of current and future program managers within the agency;

"(iii) Improved career paths and career opportunities for program managers;

"(iv) Incentives for the recruitment and retention of highly qualified individuals to serve as program managers;

"(v) Improved resources and support, including relevant competencies encompassed with program project management within the private sector for program managers;

"(vi) Improved means of collecting and disseminating best practices and lessons learned to enhance program management across the agency;

"(vii) Common templates and tools to support improved data gathering and analysis for program management and oversight purposes.

"(b) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of Management and Budget a council to be known as the ‘Program Management Policy Council’ (in this section referred to as the ‘Council’).

"(2) PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall act as the principal interagency forum for improving agency practices related to program and project management. The Council shall—

"(A) advise and assist the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget;

"(B) review programs identified as high risk by the General Accountability Office and make recommendations for actions to be taken by the Department of Defense for the Management of the Office of Management and Budget or designee;

"(C) discuss topics of importance to the workforce development needs;

"(D) advise on the development and applicability of standards governmentwide for program management transparency; and

"(E) review the information published on the website of the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to section 1122.

"(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

"(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of the following members:

"(i) Five members from the Office of Management and Budget as follows:


"(IV) The Director of the Office of Federal Financial Management.

"(V) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management and Personnel Management.

"(B) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—

"(i) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be the Chairperson of the Council. A Vice Chairperson shall be elected by the members and shall serve a term of not more than 1 year.

"(ii) DUTIES.—The Chairperson shall preside at the meetings of the Council, determine the agenda of the Council, direct the work of the Council, and direct subgroups of the Council as appropriate.

"(4) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet not less than twice per fiscal year and may meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Council.

"(5) SUPPORT.—The head of each agency with a Project Management Improvement Officer serving on the Council shall provide administrative support to the Council, as appropriate, at the request of the Chairperson.

"(6) COMMITTEE DURATION.—Section 13(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Council.

"(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Council, shall submit to Congress a report containing the strategy developed under section 1126(a)(2)(B) of such title, as added by paragraph (1).

"(c) PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL MEMBERS.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “agency” means each agency described in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

"(2) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Office of Management and Budget, shall issue regulations that—

"(A) identify key skills and competencies needed for a program and project manager in an agency;

"(B) establish a new job series for program and project management within an agency;

"(C) establish a new career path for program and project managers within an agency.

"SA 1755. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title VI add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall designate at least one city in the United States each year as an “American World War II City”, to include, but not be limited to the following:

"(i) Contributions by a city to the war effort during World War II, including those related to the building, repair, or maintenance of military facilities within the city.
(b) Policies and Programs to Prevent and Treat Gambling Problems.-(1) Department of Defense.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop policies on prevention, education, and treatment of problem gambling, including the following elements:
   (A) Prevention programs for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.
   (B) Responsible gaming education for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.
   (C) Establishment of a center of excellence for the residential treatment of the most severe cases of problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.
   (D) Policy and programs to integrate problem gambling into existing mental health and substance abuse programs of the Department of Defense in order to:
      (i) prevent problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and their families;
      (ii) provide responsible gaming educational materials to Armed Forces and their family members who gamble; and
      (iii) train existing substance abuse and mental health counselors to provide treatment for problem gambling within current mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for members of the Armed Forces.
   (E) Assessment of gambling problems among members of the Armed Forces, factors related to the development of such problems (including co-occurring disorders such as substance use, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, stress, and sensation seeking), and the social, health, and financial impacts of gambling on members of the Armed Forces by incorporating questions on problem gambling behavior into ongoing research efforts as appropriate, including the following:
      (A) Prevention programs for veterans and their dependents.
      (B) Responsible gaming education for veterans and their dependents.
      (C) Establishment of a center of excellence for the residential treatment of the most severe cases of problem gambling among veterans.
   (F) Policy and programs to integrate problem gambling into existing mental health and substance abuse programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including responsible gaming educational materials for veterans and their family members who gamble; and
   (G) Assessment of gambling problems among veterans and their families; including responsible gaming educational materials for veterans and their family members who gamble; and
   (H) train existing substance abuse and mental health counselors to provide treatment for problem gambling within current mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for veterans.
   (2) Department of Veterans Affairs.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop policies on prevention, education, and treatment of problem gambling, including the following:
      (A) Prevention programs for veterans and their dependents.
      (B) Responsible gaming education for veterans and their dependents.
      (C) Establishment of a center of excellence for the residential treatment of the most severe cases of problem gambling among veterans.

(c) Use of Certain Amounts by Department of Defense.—Of the aggregate amount collected each fiscal year by the Department of Defense from the operation of slot machines and bingo games, an amount equal to one percent of such amount shall be provided to the Secretary of Defense to carry out the policy and programs described in subsection (b)(1)(D).

(d) Comptroller General Study on Gambling and Problem Gambling Among Members of the Armed Forces and Veterans.—(1) In General.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to address problem gambling.
   (2) Matters included.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:
      (A) With respect to gambling installations (including bingo) operated by each branch of the Armed Forces—
         (i) the number, type, and location of such gambling installations;
         (ii) the total amount of cash flow through such gambling installations;
         (iii) the amount of revenue generated by such gambling installations; and
         (iv) how such revenue is spent.
      (B) An assessment of the prevalence of problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces and veterans, including recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to address problem gambling.
(1) Gambling addiction, or problem gambling, is a public health disorder characterized by increased preoccupation with gambling, loss of control, restlessness, or irritability leading to step gambling behavior, and continuation of the gambling behavior in spite of mounting serious, negative consequences.

(2) Over 6,000,000 adults met criteria for a gambling problem in 2013.

(3) According to the National Council on Problem Gambling, it is estimated that between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 members of the Armed Forces on active duty meet criteria for a gambling problem.

(4) The Department of Defense operates an estimated 3,000 slot machines at military installations overseas that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their families.

(5) It is estimated that these slot machines generate more than $100,000,000 in revenue for the Department of Defense, which is used for further recreational activities for members of the Armed Forces.

(6) The United States Army operates bingo games on military installations in the United States, which generate millions of dollars per year.

(7) The Department of Defense does not currently have treatment programs for members of the Armed Forces with problem gambling behaviors, although it does operate treatment programs for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction.

(8) Individuals with problem gambling behaviors have higher incidences of bankruptcy, domestic abuse, and suicide.

(9) People who engage in problem gambling have high rates of co-occurring substance abuse and mental health disorders.

(10) Because many members of the Armed Forces are often at high risk for co-occurring substance abuse and mental health disorders, it is critical that they receive adequate treatment for such disorders.

(11) The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Fifth Edition, published in May 2013) includes problem gambling as a behavioral addiction. This reflects research findings that gambling disorders are similar to substance-related disorders in clinical expression, brain origin, comorbidity, physiology, and treatment.

(12) A study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(a) With respect to gambling installations (including bingo) operated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(i) the number, type, and location of such gambling installations;

(ii) the total amount of cash flow through such gambling installations;

(iii) the amount of revenue generated by such gambling installations; and

(iv) how such revenue is spent.

(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Russian Federation—

(i) is complying with the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the ‘Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty’ or ‘INF Treaty’); and

(ii) has verifiably pulled its regular and irregular military forces out of Ukrainian territory, including Crimea; and

(iii) has terminated its contract to sell the S-300 air defense system to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(b) LIMITATION ON INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to integrate in any way United States missile defense systems, including those of NATO, with missile defense systems of the Russian Federation.

SA 1759. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 1649. LIMITATION ON PROVIDING CERTAIN MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TO THE HUMINT SUPPLIER.

(a) EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF LIMITATION ON PROVIDING CERTAIN SENSITIVE MISSILE DEFENSE INFORMATION.—Section 1243(c)(6) of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–40, 115 Stat. 224) is further amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘—No funds’’ and inserting the following—‘‘—No funds shall be obligated or made available...’’;

(2) by striking ‘‘for fiscal year 2014 or 2015’’ and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ‘‘for any fiscal year for the Department of Defense may be used to provide the Russian Federation with sensitive missile defense information or information relating to velocity at burnout of, or telemetry information on, United States missile interceptors or targets...’’; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection (b):

‘‘(b) On or before April 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report assessing the following:’’.
(2) How Iran has used funds made available through sanctions relief, including the extent to which any such funds have facilitated the ability of Iran—
   (A) to procure support for—
      (i) any individual or entity designated for the imposition of sanctions for activities relating to international terrorism pursuant to an Executive order by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury on or before the enactment of this Act;
   (B) any organization designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)) on or before the enactment of this Act;
   (C) any other terrorist organization, including Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, or the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria;
   (D) to advance the efforts of Iran or any other country to develop nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles overtly or covertly; or
   (E) to commit any violation of the human rights of the people of Iran.
   (3) The extent to which any senior officials of the Government of Iran have diverted any funds from sanctions relief into their personal accounts.
   (b) Form of Report.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in classified form, but may include a classified annex.
   (c) Definitions.—In this section:
      (1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).
      (2) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term ‘Joint Plan of Action’ means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and the United States, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People’s Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, and the extension thereto agreed to on November 24, 2014.

SA 1760. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO DISESTABLISH SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS’ TRAINING CORPS PROGRAMS.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated 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 1255.08, dated June 26, 2006; or
   (2) declassify or degranade 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 titled ‘‘Joint Senior Reserve Officers Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria’’ and dated January 27, 2014, or any successor information paper or policy of the Department of the Army.

SA 1761. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. INTERAGENCY HOSTAGE RECOVERY COORDINATOR.
   (a) Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator.—
      (1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism. For purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3), such officer shall have the title of ‘‘Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator’’.
      (2) DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:
         (A) Coordinate and direct all activities of the Federal Government relating to each hostage situation described in paragraph (1) to ensure efforts to secure the release of all hostages in the hostage situation are properly resourced and correct lines of authority are established and maintained.
         (B) Establish a mission cell consisting of appropriate personnel of the Federal Government with purge over each hostage situation described in paragraph (1).
         (C) Develop a strategy to keep family members of hostages described in paragraph (1) informed of the status of such hostages and inform such family members of updates, procedures, and policies that do not compromise the national security of the United States.
      (b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Coordinator shall be limited to countries that are state sponsors of terrorism and areas designated as hazardous for which hostile fire and imminent danger pay are payable to United States Armed Forces for duty performed in such area.
   (c) Quarterly Report.—On a quarterly basis, the Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the members of Congress described in paragraph (2) a report that includes a summary of each hostage situation described in subsection (a)(1) and efforts to secure the release of all hostages in such hostage situation.
   (d) Members of Congress described.—The members of Congress described in this paragraph are, with respect to a United States person hostage covered by a report under paragraph (1), the Senators representing the State, and the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives representing the district, where the hostage described in subsection (a)(1) resides.
   (3) Form of report.—Each report under this subsection may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.
   (d) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate or communicate with a state sponsor of terrorism for the purpose of securing the release of any United States person; provided, that the Secretary of State has designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SA 1762. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1664. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE ATTACKS.
   (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:
      (1) An attack on the United States using an electromagnetic pulse weapon could have devastating effects on critical infrastructure and, over time, could lead to the death of millions of people of the United States.
      (2) The threat of an electromagnetic pulse attack on United States non-military infrastructure remains a serious vulnerability for the United States.
   (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—
      (1) the President should ensure that all relevant Federal agencies responsible for understanding the electromagnetic pulse threat are prepared and for such a contingency;
      (2) the United States Government should formulate and maintain strategies for such a contingency; and
      (3) relevant Federal agencies should conduct outreach to educate owners and operators of critical infrastructure, emergency planners, and emergency responders at all levels of government about the threat of electromagnetic pulse attack.

SA 1763. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year,
and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 884. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an annual study of defense contracting fraud and shall submit a report containing the findings of such study to the congressional defense committees.

(b) PAYMENT FOR MARITIME SECURITY.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ... REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE FROM THE ISLAND OF KAHOOLawe.

The Secretary of Defense shall work with the appropriate officials of the State of Hawaii and the Kahoolawe Island Reserve Commission to explore options to restore funding for the removal and remediation of unexploded ordnance on the island of Kahoolawe to ensure safety on Kahoolawe. Such a study may include training through the Innovative Readiness Training Program for the removal of unexploded ordnance.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 884. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an annual study of defense contracting fraud and shall submit a report containing the findings of such study to the congressional defense committees.

(b) PAYMENT FOR MARITIME SECURITY.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 884. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an annual study of defense contracting fraud and shall submit a report containing the findings of such study to the congressional defense committees.

(b) PAYMENT FOR MARITIME SECURITY.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 884. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an annual study of defense contracting fraud and shall submit a report containing the findings of such study to the congressional defense committees.

(b) PAYMENT FOR MARITIME SECURITY.

SA 1767. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 2815. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY RETENTION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Excess or unutilized or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate;

(2) the property is not suitable for public access;

(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) Repeal of Other Authorization.—Section 53111(3) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "2015" in the middle of the date and inserting before the comma the following: "2015 through 2026.

(c) Funding.—The Secretary of the Army is authorized to be appropriated for expenses to maintain and operate the United States under section 53106(a)(1)(C) of title 46, United States Code, is hereby increased by $114,000,000.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ... REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE FROM THE ISLAND OF KAHOOLawe.

The Secretary of Defense shall work with the appropriate officials of the State of Hawaii and the Kahoolawe Island Reserve Commission to explore options to restore funding for the removal and remediation of unexploded ordnance on the island of Kahoolawe to ensure safety on Kahoolawe. Such a study may include training through the Innovative Readiness Training Program for the removal of unexploded ordnance.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ... REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE FROM THE ISLAND OF KAHOOLawe.

The Secretary of Defense shall work with the appropriate officials of the State of Hawaii and the Kahoolawe Island Reserve Commission to explore options to restore funding for the removal and remediation of unexploded ordnance on the island of Kahoolawe to ensure safety on Kahoolawe. Such a study may include training through the Innovative Readiness Training Program for the removal of unexploded ordnance.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ... REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE FROM THE ISLAND OF KAHOOLawe.

The Secretary of Defense shall work with the appropriate officials of the State of Hawaii and the Kahoolawe Island Reserve Commission to explore options to restore funding for the removal and remediation of unexploded ordnance on the island of Kahoolawe to ensure safety on Kahoolawe. Such a study may include training through the Innovative Readiness Training Program for the removal of unexploded ordnance.

SA 1766. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 884. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) ANNUAL STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an annual study of defense contracting fraud and shall submit a report containing the findings of such study to the congressional defense committees.

(b) REPORT CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include with respect to the most recent reporting period the following elements:

(1) An assessment of the total value of Department of Defense contracts entered into with contractors that have been indicted for, settled charges of, been fined by any Federal department or agency for, or been convicted of fraud in connection with any contract or other transaction entered into with the Federal Government.

(2) Recommendations by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or other appropriate Department of Defense official regarding how to penalize contractors repeatedly involved in fraud in connection with contracts or other transactions entered into with the Federal Government, including an update on implementation by the Department of any previous such recommendations.

SA 1771. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. REINSTATEMENT OF OVERNIGHT SERVICE STANDARDS.

During the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service shall apply the service standards for first-class mail and periodicals under part 121 of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, that were in effect on July 1, 2012.
SEC. 644. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BERRY-COMPATIBLE FOOTWEAR.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, expeditiously purchase of and make available to enlisted initial entrants of the United States Armed Forces, either as an in-kind issue or by cash allowance, such Berry Amendment-compliant athletic footwear as has been qualified for use during initial entran training to the exclusion of similar non-Berry-compliant footwear.

SA 1773. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize military forces fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was or- dered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 643. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT OF REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED UNDER SURVIVOR BENEFITS PLAN BY DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) REPEAL.—

(1) In GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) In section 1450, by striking subsection (c).

(B) In section 1451(c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2); and

(ii) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such subchapter is further amended as follows:

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by striking subsection (d).

(C) In section 1452(c)—

(i) in subsection (1)(c), by striking “does not apply” and all that follows and inserting “does not apply in the case of a deduction made through administrative error.”;

(ii) by striking subsection (e); and

(iii) by striking subsection (f).

(D) In section 1454(c), by striking “, or (B)”,.

(E) PROHIBITION ON RETROACTIVE BENEFITS.—No benefits may be paid to any person for any period before the effective date provided under subsection (f) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) and who has received a refund of retired pay under section 1450(e) of title 10, United States Code, shall not be required to repay such refund to the United States.

(d) REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR OPTIONAL ANNUITY FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Section 1455(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Except as provided in paragraph (2)(B),”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “DEPENDENT CHILDREN.” and all that follows through “in the case of a member described in paragraph (1),”;

and inserting “DEPENDENT CHILDREN ANNUITY WHEN NO ELIGIBLE SURVIVING SPOUSE.”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(e) RESTORATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PREVIOUSLY ELIGIBLE SPOUSES.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall restore eligibility to any eligible surviving spouse who, in consultation with the Secretary, previously elected to transfer payment of such annuity to a surviving child or children under the provisions of section 1455(b)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, in effect on the date provided under subsection (f). Such eligibility shall be restored whether or not payment to such child or children subsequently was terminated due to loss of dependent status or death. For the purposes of this section, an eligible spouse includes a spouse who was previously eligible for payment of such annuity and is not remarried, or remarried after having attained age 55, or whose second or subsequent marriage has been terminated by death, divorce or annulment.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The sections and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the later of—

(1) the first day of the first month that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the first day of the fiscal year that begins in the calendar year in which this Act is enacted.

SA 1774. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was or- dered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEM- BER OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO LOSE THEIR RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY FOR REASONS OTHER THAN DEPART- MENT OF JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 2013.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Families Serve, Too, Military Justice Reform Act of 2013”.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (1), (j), and (k) as subsections (j), (k), and (l), respectively;

and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

(i) BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEM- BER OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO LOSE THEIR RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY FOR REASONS OTHER THAN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REFORM ACT.—

(1)(A) If, in the case of a member, former member, or serviceperson of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2), the case is of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in section 1450(e) of title 10, United States Code, who the Secretary determined and certify the amount of the monthly retired

disposable retired pay of that member or former member (as certified under paragraph (4)) to an eligible spouse or former spouse of that member or former member, the Secretary shall:

(1) upon the request of a court or an eligible spouse or former spouse of that member or former member, begin to provide service of such court order, shall pay that amount in accordance with this subsection to such spouse or former spouse.

(2) in the case of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), a court order provides for the payment as child support of an amount from the disposable retired pay of that mem- ber or former member (as certified under paragraph (4)) to an eligible dependent child of that member or former member, the Secretary, beginning upon the effective service of such court order, shall pay that amount in accordance with this subsection to such dependent child.

(3) A spouse or former spouse, or a de-pendent child of a member or former mem-ber of the armed forces is eligible to receive payment under this subsection if—

(A) the member or former member, while a member of the armed forces and after be-coming eligible to be retired from the armed forces on the basis of at least 20 years of service, has eligibility to receive retired pay terminated as a result of misconduct while a member (other than misconduct described in subsection (h)(2)(A));

(B) in the case of eligibility of a spouse or former spouse under paragraph (1)(A), the spouse or former spouse—

(i) either—

(1) was married to the member or former member at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

(2) was married to the member or former member at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay;

(II) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority by—

(i) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

(ii) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority; and

(III) the convening authority by—

(iii) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

(iv) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority;

and

(2) in the case of eligibility of a dependent child under paragraph (1)(B), the depend-ent child—

(i) had not reached the age of 16 years at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay;

(ii) had reached the age of 16 years at the time of the misconduct and was not, based on the evidence adduced at trial, an aider, abettor, accomplice, or co-conspirator in the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay, as certified in writing to the convening authority by—

(i) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

(ii) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority.

(3) The amount certified by the Secretary concerned under paragraph (4) with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A) shall be deemed to be the disposable retired pay of that member or former member for the purposes of this subsection.

(4) Upon the request of a court or an eli-gible spouse or former spouse, or an eligible dependent child, of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A) in connection with a civil action for the issuance of a court order in the case of such person, the Secretary shall determine and certify the amount of the monthly retired
pay that the member or former member would have been entitled to receive as of the date of the certification—

(A) if the member or former member’s eligibility to receive pay under the armed forces in the same manner as if the member or former member referred to in paragraph (1) if the person is separated under honorable conditions may be subject to revocation under paragraph (1) if the person is separated from the armed forces under other than honorable conditions shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the armed force in which the person last served. The service of the person in the armed forces shall be proved by duly authenticated copies of the service records of the person.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter the process prescribed by sections 328, 329, and 329A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439, 1440, 1441) by which a person may naturalize through service in the armed forces.

(c) CEREMONIAL AND MILITARY DUTIES.—

(1) In general.—The provisions of this subsection shall be treated—

(a) amendments SA 1557 and SA 1558 proposed by Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCaIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was or-

(b) provisions of law instead of this paragraph.

(c) If a spouse or former spouse of a member or former member referred to in paragraph (1) if the person is separated under honorable conditions may be subject to revocation under paragraph (1) if the person is separated from the armed forces under other than honorable conditions shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the armed force in which the person last served. The service of the person in the armed forces shall be proved by duly authenticated copies of the service records of the person.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter the process prescribed by sections 328, 329, and 329A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439, 1440, 1441) by which a person may naturalize through service in the armed forces.

(c) CEREMONIAL AND MILITARY DUTIES.—

(1) In general.—The provisions of this subsection shall be treated—

(a) CEREMONIAL AND MILITARY DUTIES.—

(1) In general.—The provisions of this subsection shall be treated—

"504. Persons not qualified; citizenship or residency requirements; exceptions".

(2) Table of Sections.—The table of sections beginning with such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 504 and inserting the following new item:

"504. Persons not qualified; citizenship or residency requirements; exceptions".

SEC. 525. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS HAVING SATISFIED ENLISTMENT CHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURALIZATION.

(a) IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—

The Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting and after section 322A (8 U.S.C. 1440) the following:

"SEC. 329B. PERSONS WHO HAVE RECEIVED AN AWARD FOR ENGAGEMENT IN ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN COMBAT.

(1) "(a) In general.—For purposes of naturalization and continuing citizenship under the following provisions of law, a person who has received an award described in subsection (b) shall be treated—

(i) as having served honorably in the Armed Forces for (in the case of section 326) a period or periods aggregating 1 year; and

(ii) if separated from such service, as having been separated under honorable conditions.

(2) RECOGNITION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), any person who separated from the Armed Forces under other than honorable conditions may be subject to revocation of citizenship under section 328(f) or 329(c) if the other requirements under such section are met.

(b) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply with respect to the following awards from the Armed Forces of the United States:

(1) The Combat Infantryman Badge from the Army.

(2) The Combat Medical Badge from the Army.

(3) The Combat Action Badge from the Army.

(4) The Combat Action Ribbon from the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard.


SEC. 524. QUALIFICATIONS FOR ENLISTMENT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ADDITIONAL QUALIFIED PERSONS.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 504 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) A person who, at the time of enlistment in an armed force, has resided continuously in a lawful status in the United States for at least two years."

"(D) A person at the time of enlistment in an armed force, possesses an employment authorization document issued by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services under the requirements of the Department of Homeland Security policy entitled "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals" (DACA).

(b) ADMISSION TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF CERTAIN ENLISTED.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) Admission to Permanent Residence of Certain Enlisted.—(1) A person described in subsection (b) who, at the time of enlistment in an armed force, is not a citizen or national of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be treated as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under the provisions of section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255), except that the alien need not—

(A) establish that he or she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1972; and

(B) comply with section 212(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(e))."
(6) Any other award that the Secretary of Defense determines to be an equivalent award for engagement in active combat or active participation in combat.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 239A the following:

"Sec. 239B. Persons who have received an award for engagement in active combat or active participation in combat:"

SA 1777. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 607, strike ''submit to the committee on foreign relations of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the policy developed pursuant to subsection (a).''

SA 1780. Mr. CORZINE (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 607, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

"(3) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless— (A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station; (B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing; or (C) the member and the member's spouse change residence from the residence as of that date.

SA 1778. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 607, strike "submit to the congressional executive committee and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, submit to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives":

SA 1779. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 607, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following: Committee" and all that follows through line 11 and insert the following: "Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the policy developed pursuant to subsection (a)."

"(B) the total costs of all associated— (i) employee salaries, including foreign service, American civilian, and locally employed staff; (ii) programming expenses; (iii) operating expenses; (iv) contractual expenses; and (v) security expenses; (2) a breakdown of the total costs described in paragraph (1) by each space and type of space; (3) the total fees collected for entry to, or use of, American Spaces and related or supporting facilities, including a breakdown by the type of fee for each space and type of space; and (4) the total usage rates, including by type of service, for each space and type of space.

SEC. 5202. IDENTIFYING BILATERAL INVESTMENT TREATY OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a detailed description of—

(1) the status of all ongoing investment treaty negotiations, including a strategy and timetable for concluding each such negotiation; and (2) a strategy to expand the investment treaty agenda, including through—

(A) launching new investment treaty negotiations with foreign partners that are currently capable of entering in such negotiations; and (B) building the capacity of foreign partners to enter into such negotiations, including by encouraging the adoption of best practices with respect to investment; and

(3) any resources that will be needed, including anticipated staffing levels— (A) to conclude all ongoing negotiations described in paragraph (2); (B) to launch new investment treaty negotiations, as described in paragraph (2)(A); and (C) to build the capacity of foreign partners, as described in paragraph (2)(B).

SEC. 5203. REINSTATEMENT OF HONG KONG REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2020, the Secretary shall submit the report required by section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5751) to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—The report submitted under subsection (a) should be unclassified and made publicly available, including through the Department's public website.

SEC. 5204. UNITED STATES-CHINA STRATEGIC AND ECONOMIC DIALOGUE REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, and in consultation with other appropriate departments and agencies, shall—

(1) conduct a review of the United States-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (referred to in this section as the "Dialogue"); and (2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the findings of such review.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report described in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of all commitments agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings; (2) an assessment of the status of each commitment agreed to by the United States and China at each of the first 6 rounds of meetings, including a detailed description of— (A) any actions that have been taken with respect to such commitments; (B) any aspects of such commitments that remain unfulfilled; and (C) any actions that remain necessary to fulfill any unfulfilled commitments described in subparagraph (B); and (3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the Dialogue in achieving and fulfilling significant commitments on United States priorities in the bilateral relationship including— (A) the security situation in the East and South China Seas, including a peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the region;
SEC. 5205. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN BURMA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(1) describes in detail all known widespread or systematic civil or political rights violations, including violations that may constitute crimes against humanity against ethnic, racial, or religious minorities in Burma, including the Rohingya people; and

(2) provides recommendations for holding perpetrators of the violations described in paragraph (1) accountable for their actions.

SEC. 5206. COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for Diplomatic and Consular Programs, $500,000 shall be made available to the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor to support efforts by American and European Jewish and other civil society organizations, focusing on youth, to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of religious, ethnic, or racial intolerance in Europe.

SEC. 5207. BIOENGINEERING CRIMES.

Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 2651a et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 63. BIOENGINEERING GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State is authorized to award, through grants and cooperative agreements, contracts, outreach, and public diplomacy activities, activities promoting the benefits of agricultural biotechnology, biofuels, science-based regulatory systems, and the application of such technologies for trade and development.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The total amount of grants and other assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed $500,000 in any fiscal year."

SEC. 5208. DEFINITION OF "USE" IN PASSPORT AND VISA OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1540 the following:

"SEC. 1540. DEFINITION OF 'USE' AND 'USES'.

"In this chapter, the terms 'use' and 'uses' shall be given their plain meaning, which shall include use for identification purposes.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 75 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1543 the following:

"1540. Definition of 'use' and 'uses'."

SEC. 5209. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIPS.

Section 504 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1979 (22 U.S.C. 2655a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS RELATED TO SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements for science and technology fellowship programs of the Department of State.

"(2) RECRUITMENT; STIPENDS.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) may be used—

"(A) to recruit fellows; and

"(B) to pay stipends, travel, and other appropriate expenses for fellows.

"(3) CLASSIFICATION OF STIPENDS.—Stipends paid under paragraph (2)(B) shall not be considered compensation for purposes of section 209 of title 18, United States Code.

"(4) LIMITATION.—The total amount of assistance provided under this subsection may not exceed $500,000 in any fiscal year."

SEC. 5210. NAME OF DEPARTMENT.

(a) PUBLIC LAW 87–195.—Section 607(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357(d)) is amended by striking "Assistant Secretary of State for Administration and Management" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Administration and Management and Science" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science".

(b) PUBLIC LAW 88–206.—Section 617(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671(a)) is amended by striking "Assistant Secretary of State for International Environmental and Scientific Affairs" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Global Change and Security".

(c) PUBLIC LAW 93–126.—Section 9(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2652c(a)) is amended by striking "Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs" and inserting "Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science".

(d) PUBLIC LAW 106–113.—Section 1112(a) of the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2655a) is amended by striking ""Verification and Compliance."" and inserting ""Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance (referred to in this section as the ‘Assistant Secretary’)”."

SEC. 5211. ANTI-PIRACY INFORMATION SHARING.

The Secretary is authorized to provide for the participation of the United States in the Information Sharing Centre located in Singapore, as established by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships in Asia, done at Singapore on November 11, 2004.

SEC. 5212. REPORT REFORM.

(a) HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.—Section 549 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2397h) is repealed.

(b) ROUGH DIAMONDS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 12 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 3911) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. REPORTS.

"For each country that, during the preceding 12-month period, exported rough diamonds to the United States and was exporting rough diamonds not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, if the failure to do so has significantly increased the likelihood that those diamonds not so controlled are being imported into the United States, the President shall submit a semi-annual report to Congress that explains what actions have been taken by the United States or such country since the previous report to ensure that diamonds, the exportation of which was not controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme, originating in that country into the United States. A country shall be included in the report required under this section until the country is controlling the importation and exportation of rough diamonks through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme.”

Subtitle B—Additional Matters

SEC. 5221. ATROCITIES PREVENTION BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President is authorized to establish, within the Executive Office of the President, an Interagency Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this section as the “Board”).

(b) DUTIES.—The Board is authorized—

(1) to coordinate an interagency approach to preventing mass atrocities; and

(2) to propose policies to integrate the early warning systems of national security agencies, including intelligence and law enforcement agencies, with respect to incidents of mass atrocities; and

(B) to coordinate the policy response to such incidents; and

(3) to identify relevant Federal agencies, which shall track and report on Federal funding spent on atrocity prevention efforts; to develop and implement comprehensive strategies to prevent the emergence or escalation of mass atrocities; and to identify and propose policies to close gaps in expertise, readiness, and planning for atrocity prevention and early action across Federal agencies, including training for employees at relevant Federal agencies; and

(7) to engage relevant civil society and nongovernmental organization stakeholders in regular consultations to solicit current information on countries of concern; and

(8) to conduct an atrocity-specific expert review of relevant policy and programming of all countries at risk for mass atrocities.

(c) LEADERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be headed by a Senior Director.

(A) shall be appointed by the President; and

(B) shall report to the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Senior Director shall have primary responsibility for—

(A) recommending and promoting United States Government policies on preventing mass atrocities; and

(B) carrying out the duties described in subsection (b).

(d) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of—

(1) representatives from—

(A) the Department of State;

(B) the United States Agency for International Development;

(C) the Department of Defense;

(D) the Department of Justice;

(E) the Department of the Treasury;

(F) the Department of Homeland Security;

(G) the Central Intelligence Agency;

(H) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;

(I) the United States Mission to the United Nations; and

(J) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) such other individuals as the President may appoint.
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(e) COORDINATION.—The Board is authorized to coordinate with relevant officials and government agencies responsible for foreign policy with respect to particular regions and countries, and multilateral organizations, regarding aspects of United States policy toward particular regions and the role that United States policy and actions play in contributing to or mitigating the spread of atrocities. The Board shall consult, coordinate with, and receive reports from relevant officials and government agencies responsible for foreign policy with respect to particular regions and the role that United States policy and actions play in contributing to or mitigating the spread of atrocities.

SEC. 5224. REPORT ON DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEBT SUSTAINABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit a report containing an assessment of the current extent of debt distress in developing countries and identifying particular short-term risks to debt sustainability to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees; and

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENT.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the impact of new lending relationships, including the role of commercial lenders; and

(2) the adequacy of current multilateral surveillance mechanisms in guarding against debt distress in developing countries;

(3) the ability of developing countries to borrow on global capital markets; and

(4) the interaction between debt sustainability objectives of the developing world and the development-oriented investment agenda of the G-20, including the impact of—

(A) current debt sustainability objectives on investment in developing countries; and

(B) investment objectives proposed by the G-20 on the ability to meet the goals of—

(i) the Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative; and

(ii) the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.

TITLE III—ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Subtitle A—Organizational Matters SEC. 5301. RIGHTSIZING RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 60 days of receipt of rightsizing recommendations pursuant to a review conducted by the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation relating to overseas staffing levels at United States overseas posts, the relevant chief of mission, in coordination with the relevant regional bureau, shall provide to the Office of Management, Policy, Rightsizing, and Innovation, a response describing—

(1) any rightsizing recommendations that are accepted by such chief of mission and regional bureau;

(2) a detailed schedule for implementation of any such recommendations;

(3) any recommendations that are rejected; and

(4) a detailed justification providing the basis for the rejection of any such recommendations.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall report annually to the appropriate congressional committees, at the time of submission of the President’s annual budget request to Congress, on the status of all rightsizing recommendations and responses described in subsection (a) for the preceding five years, to include the following:

(1) A list of all such rightsizing recommendations made, including whether each such recommendation was accepted or rejected by the relevant chief of mission and regional bureau.

(2) A detailed description of the current status of those recommendations, including an explanation for any departure from, or changes to, such schedule.

(3) Any rejected recommendations, the justification provided pursuant to subsection (a)(4).

(c) REPORT OF REGIONAL BUREAU STAFFING.—The Secretary shall provide an annual report accompanying the report required by subsection (b) that provides—
(1) an enumeration of the domestic staff positions in each regional bureau of the Department;
(2) a detailed explanation of the extent to which each regional bureau reflects the overseas requirements of the United States within each such region;
(3) if the Secretary determines there are any significant imbalances among the regional bureaus or between any regional bureau and the overseas requirements of the United States within such region such that staffing priorities of the United States are the effective conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States, a detailed plan for how the Department will seek to rectify any such imbalances, including a schedule for implementation; and
(4) a detailed description of the current status of implementation of any plan provided pursuant to paragraph (3) according to the schedule provided pursuant to such paragraph, including an explanation for any departures from such schedule.

SEC. 5302. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of State, with the assistance of the Undersecretary of Economic Growth, Energy and the Environment, shall establish foreign economic policy priorities throughout the Department, including the integration of foreign economic policy priorities of the Bureau of African Affairs and the overseas requirements of the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, including with regard to coordination between the Bureau of African Affairs and the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, including with regard to coordination between the Bureau of African Affairs and the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs.

(b) Tasking of Deputy Assistant Secretary.—Within each regional bureau of the Department, the Secretary shall task a Deputy Assistant Secretary, having appropriate training and background in economic and commercial affairs, with responsibility for consideration of economic matters and interests within the responsibilities of such regional bureau, including the integration of the foreign economic policy priorities established pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) Coordination.—The Deputy Assistant Secretary tasked with responsibility for economic matters and interests pursuant to subsection (b) within each bureau shall—

(1) at the direction of the relevant Assistant Secretary, review and report to the Assistant Secretary on all economic matters and interests; and
(2) serve as liaison with the office of the Undersecretary for Economic Growth.

SEC. 5303. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON OFFICE OF THE UNDERSECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, conduct a review of the functions and responsibilities of the Office of the Undersecretary for Economic Growth and Administration of the Department.

(b) Review.—Each such regional bureau, including the integration of the foreign economic policy priorities established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify regional strategic priorities;
(2) assess regional dynamics between the United States and other countries, and emerging from violent conflict, including regions considered to be at risk of, undergoing, or deploying to, countries or regions of strategic significance to the United States such as it specifically relates to the North African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya, and report the findings of the review to the congressional, national security, and foreign affairs committees, including recommendations on whether jurisdictional responsibility among such bureaus should be adjusted.

(c) Coordination.—The review required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify regional strategic priorities;
(2) assess regional dynamics between the United States and other countries, and emerging from violent conflict, including regions considered to be at risk of, undergoing, or emerging from violent conflict, including special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or entity.

(b) Consultation.—In performing the consultation required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make all such systems and networks available to the Director of the National Security Agency and any other such departments or agencies to carry out such tests and procedures as are necessary to ensure adequate policies and protections are in place to prevent penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or entity.

(c) Security Breach Reporting.—Beginning not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, in consultation with the Director of the National Security Agency and any other such department or agency, a report to the appropriate committees of Congress describing in detail all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of those systems and networks following subsection (a) facilitating the use of classified information and all known or suspected significant penetrations or compromises of any other such systems and networks that occurred since the time of such prior report.

(d) Content.—The report required under subsection (c) shall include—

(1) a description of the relevant information technology system or network penetrated or compromised;
(2) an assessment of the date and time such penetration or compromise occurred;
(3) an assessment of the duration for which such system or network was penetrated or compromised, including whether such penetration or compromise is ongoing;
(4) an assessment of the amount and sensitivity of information accessed and available to be stolen, accessed, or obtained and used for any purpose other than its intended use in connection with the Department's responsibilities; and
(5) an assessment of whether such system or network was penetrated by a malicious intruder, including an assessment of—

(A) the known or suspected perpetrators, including state actors;
(B) the methods used to conduct such penetration or compromise; and
(C) the extent to which additional costs savings and greater performance can be achieved.

SEC. 5306. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM SECURITY.

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall regularly consult the Director of the National Security Agency and any other departments or agencies the Secretary determines to be appropriate regarding the security of United States government information technology systems and networks operated, managed, or utilized by the Department, including any such systems or networks facilitating the use of sensitive or classified information.

(b) Consultation.—In performing the consultation required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available to the National Security Agency and any other such departments or agencies to carry out such tests and procedures as are necessary to ensure adequate policies and protections are in place to prevent penetrations or compromises of such systems and networks, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or entity.

SEC. 5304. SPECIAL ENVOYS, REPRESENTATIVES, ADVISORS, AND COORDINATORS.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, which shall include at minimum the following elements:

(1) A tabulation of the current names, ranks, positions, and responsibilities of all special envoy, representative, advisor, and coordinator positions at the Department, including by malicious intrusions by any unauthorized individual or state actor or entity.

(2) For each position identified pursuant to the requirement of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide a report, in consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress describing in detail all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of those systems and networks after the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary shall provide a report, in consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress describing in detail all known or suspected penetrations or compromises of those systems and networks following subsection (a) facilitating the use of classified information and all known or suspected significant penetrations or compromises of any other such systems and networks that occurred since the time of such prior report.

(3) an assessment of the duration for which such system or network was penetrated or compromised, including whether such penetration or compromise is ongoing;

(4) an assessment of the amount and sensitivity of information accessed and available to be stolen, accessed, or obtained and used for any purpose other than its intended use in connection with the Department's responsibilities; and

(5) an assessment of whether such system or network was penetrated by a malicious intruder, including an assessment of—

(A) the known or suspected perpetrators, including state actors;
(B) the methods used to conduct such penetration or compromise; and
(C) the extent to which additional costs savings and greater performance can be achieved.
achieved under the current ICASS system and rules;

(3) the standards applied in the selection of the ICASS provider and the extent to which such standards are consistently applied;

(4) potential reforms to the ICASS system, including—

(A) the selection of more than one service provider and circumstances;

(B) options for all departments or agencies to opt out of ICASS entirely or to opt out of individual services, including by debundling services of;

(C) increasing the reliance on locally employed staff or outsourcing to local firms where appropriate; and

(D) recommendations to the current ICASS system and rules that would incentivize greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

SEC. 5308. PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL ABDUCTION.

Section 433(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 241(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"[(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION—]

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall ensure for an interagency working group to prevent international parental abduction.

"(A) COMPOSITION.—The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

"(i) the Department of State;

"(ii) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

"(iii) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(B) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall convene an advisory committee to the interagency working group established pursuant to paragraph (1), the Director of Research and Evaluation shall create guidance and training for all public diplomacy bureaus and offices for designing and implementing public diplomacy activities across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices are designed to meet appropriate foreign policy objectives; and

"(C) REGULAR MEETINGS.—The Secretary shall convene regular meetings with all public diplomacy bureaus and offices for designing and implementing public diplomacy activities across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices.

"(2) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of the Director of Research and Evaluation pursuant to subsection (c), regarding the research and evaluation of all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

"(A) the selection of more than one service provider, and

"(B) the maximum amount of compensation that is achievable.

"(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department should allocate a not more than 30 days after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5309. DEFINITION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities of the Department including through the routine use of audience research, digital analytics, and impact evaluations to plan and execute public diplomacy programs and activities.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall convene an advisory committee to the interagency working group established pursuant to paragraph (1) for the duration of the working group’s existence, which shall be composed of not less than three departmental officials, including the Director of Research and Evaluation, as appointed by the Secretary, serving for not less than three years, and which shall periodically consult with such advisory committee on all activities of the interagency working group, as appropriate.

SEC. 5310. REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the Director of Research and Evaluation in the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources to the senior foreign service officer level.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, accompanied by the Secretary’s views of the Secretary, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5311. COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AUDIENCE RESEARCH.—The term ‘‘audience research’’ means research conducted at the outset of public diplomacy programs or other public diplomacy activities identified as specific audience segments to understand the attitudes, interests, knowledge and behaviors of such audience segments.

(2) DIGITAL ANALYTICS.—The term ‘‘digital analytics’’ means the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, accumulated in digital format, to indicate the outputs and outcomes of a public diplomacy program or campaign.

(3) IMPACT EVALUATION.—The term ‘‘impact evaluation’’ means an assessment of the effectiveness of the public diplomacy program or campaign.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an impact evaluation of all public diplomacy programs and activities that have been identified as having achieved their stated purpose.

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, accompanied by the Secretary’s views of the Secretary, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5312. REPEAL OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER.

Section 305(d) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3945(d)) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5323. COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR TRAVEL.

Section 555(b) of Title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"(a) APPEAL OF ASSIGNMENT RESTRICTION.—The Secretary shall establish a right and
process for employees to appeal any assignment restriction or preclusion.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide a certification to the appropriate congressional committees upon full implementa-
tion of a right and process to appeal an assignment restriction or preclusion accom-
panied by a written report that provides a detailed account of such process.

(c) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall publish the right and process established pursuant to subsection (b) in the Federal Register and shall include a reference to such publica-
tion in the report required under subsection (b).

(d) PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION.—Section 502(a)(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3982(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(2) In making assignments under para-
graph (1), the Secretary shall assure that a member of the Service is not assigned to, or
restricted from, a position at a post in a par-
ticular geographic area, or domestically in a
position working on issues relating to a par-
ticular geographic area, exclusively on the
basis of the race, ethnicity, or religion of that member.’’

SEC. 5326. SECURITY CLEARANCE SUSPENSIONS.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Section 610 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010) is amend-
ed by adding at the end the following new
paragraph:

‘‘(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION HEADING.—Such
section is amended by striking the heading
thereof and substituting ‘‘Section 610. Separation for cause; suspen-
sion.’’.

SEC. 5327. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT EDUCATION
AND TRAINING.

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall estab-
lish curriculum at the Foreign Service Institute to develop the practical foreign
economic policy expertise and skill sets of
Foreign Service officers, to include mak-
ing available distance-learning courses in
commercial, economic, and business affairs,
specifically including:

(1) the global business environment;
(2) the economics of development;
(3) development and infrastructure finance;
(4) current economic and investment agree-
ment negotiations;
(5) implementing existing multilateral and
World Trade Organization agreements, and
United States trade and investment agree-
ments;
(6) best practices for customs and export
procedures; and
(7) market analysis and global supply chain
management.

(b) ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED.

(1) AMENDMENT.—The term ‘‘(i) with respect to a member of the For-
ign Service Act of 1980’’ is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(4) to provide reasonable accommodation
for qualified employees and applicants with disabilities;
(5) to provide reasonable accommodation
for qualified employees and applicants with
disabilities.’’

(b) FORMING AND CLERICAL AMEND-
MENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENT OF SECTION HEADING.—Such section, as amended by subsection (a), is fur-
ther amended in the section heading by in-
serting ‘‘; SUSPENSION’’ before the period at the end.
(2) Seminar XXI at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Center for International Studies; and

(3) other highly respected international leadership programs.

(b) REVIEW OF PAST PROGRAMS.—Past programs designed to increase minority representation in international affairs positions should be reviewed and the findings of that review:

(1) the USAID Undergraduate Cooperative and Graduate Economics Program;
(2) the Public Policy and International Affairs Internship Program; and
(3) the Institute for International Public Policy Fellowship Program.

TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Subtitle A—United States Contributions to International Organizations

SEC. 5401. REPORT ON ALL UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended by inserting before paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(1) CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—A detailed description of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind contributions, of the United States Government to the United Nations and to each of its affiliated agencies and related bodies during the preceding fiscal year, estimated for the current fiscal year, and requested in the President’s budget request for such following fiscal year.

(A) CONTENT.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall, for each such fiscal year, include—

(i) the total amount or value of all such contributions to the United Nations and to each such affiliated or related body;

(ii) the approximate percentage of all such contributions to the United Nations and to each such agency or body when compared with all contributions to the United Nations and to each such agency or body from any other source; and

(iii) for each such United States Government contribution to the United Nations and to each such agency or body—

(I) the amount or value of the contribution;

(II) a description of the contribution, including whether it is assessed or voluntary;

(III) the purpose of the contribution;

(IV) the Department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution; and

(V) the United Nations or United Nations affiliated agency or related body receiving the contribution.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a text-based, searchable version of the report on a publicly available Internet site.

SEC. 5402. AMENDING THE REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTER-NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 4(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (U.S.C. 287(b)(i)) is amended by striking “in which the United States participates as a member.”, and by adding at the end of the following:

including a tabulation of assessed contributions, voluntary contributions, and the ratio of United States contributions to total contributions received among the following categories: the United Nations, Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and Other United Nations Funds, Programs, and Organizations; Inter-American Organizations; Regional Organizations; and Other International Organizations.”.

SEC. 5403. REPORTING ON PEACEKEEPING ARRAYS AND CREDITS.

Section 4(c) of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287b(c)) is amended by inserting between paragraphs (2) and (3) the following new paragraph:

“(3) PEACEKEEPING CREDITS.—A complete and full accounting of United States peacekeeping assessments and contributions for United Nations peacekeeping operations, to include the following elements:

(A) a tabulation of annual United Nations peacekeeping assessment rates, the related authorized United States peacekeeping contribution rate, and the relevant United States public law that determines each such contribution rate for the United Nations peacekeeping budget for each fiscal year beginning in 1986 through the current and next fiscal year;

(B) a tabulation of current United States accrued shortfalls and arrears in each respective ongoing or closed United Nations peacekeeping mission;

(C) a tabulation of all peacekeeping credits, including in the categories of—

(i) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States;

(ii) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States;

(iii) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States from each open and closed mission;

(iv) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be unavailable to the United States from each open and closed mission;

(v) total peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations prior shortfalls apportioned to the United States;

(vi) total peacekeeping credits applied by the United Nations toward offsetting future contributions of the United States; and

(vii) total peacekeeping credits determined by the United Nations to be available to the United States, which could be applied toward offsetting United States contributions in the following fiscal year;

(D) an explanation of any claim of unavailability by the United Nations of any peacekeeping credits described in subparagraph (v);

(E) a description of any efforts by the United States to obtain reimbursement in accordance with the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.), including but not limited to Department of Defense material and services, including an analysis of any failure to obtain any such reimbursement.”.

SEC. 5404. ASSESSMENT RATE TRANSPARENCY.

The Secretary of State, through the United States Mission to the United Nations, shall urge the United Nations—

(1) to share the raw data used to calculate member state peacekeeping assessment rates; and

(2) to make available the formula for determining peacekeeping assessments.

Subtitle B—Accountability at International Organizations

SEC. 5411. PREVENTING ABUSE IN PEACEKEEPING.

At least 15 days prior to the anticipated date of the vote on a resolution for a new, or to reauthorizing an existing peacekeeping mission under the auspices of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or other multilateral organization, in which the United States participates, or, in exigent circumstances, as far in advance of any such vote as is practicable, the Secretary shall urge each appropriate congressional committee to request a report that shall include the following:

(1) A description of the specific measures taken and planned to be taken by such organization related to such peacekeeping mission to—

(a) prevent the organization’s employees, contractor personnel, and forces serving in such peacekeeping mission from engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse; and

(b) hold accountable any such individuals who engages in any such acts while participating in such peacekeeping mission.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of each of the measures described in paragraph (1).

(3) An accounting and assessment of all cases whereby such organization has taken action to investigate allegations of its employees, contractor personnel, or peacekeeping forces serving in such peacekeeping mission engaging in acts of trafficking in persons, exploitation of victims of trafficking, or sexual exploitation or abuse, including a description of the current status of all such cases.

SEC. 5412. ADDING PEACEKEEPING ABUSES TO COUNTRY REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

Subtitle C—Personnel Matters

SEC. 5421. ENCOURAGING EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 181 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 276c–4) is amended to read as follows:

“Not less than 180 days after enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Congress that provides—

(1) for each international organization which had a geographic distribution formula in effect on January 1, 1991, a description of whether such organization—

(A) is taking good faith steps to increase the staffing of United States citizens, including, as appropriate, as assessment of any additional steps such organization could be taking;

(B) has met the requirements of its geographic distribution formula; and

(2) a specific assessment of American representation at professional and senior-level positions at the United Nations, including—

(A) a description of the proportion of all such United States citizen employment at the United Nations Secretariat and all United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programs;
TITLE V—CONSULAR AUTHORITIES

SEC. 5501. VISA INELIGIBILITY FOR INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS.

Section 221(a)(10)(C)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding “or” at the end;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “; or” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (III).

SEC. 5502. PRESUMPTION OF IMMIGRANT INTENT AND L-1 VISA CLASSIFICATIONS.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking a non-immigrant described in subparagraph (L) or (V) of section 101(a)(15), and other than a non-immigrant described in any provision of section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) except subclause (B) of such section; and

(2) by striking “under section 101(a)(15)” and inserting in its place “under the immigration laws.”

SEC. 5503. VISA INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 223 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1223) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “issuance or refusal” and inserting “issuance, revocation;” and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “illicit weapons; or” and inserting “illicit weapons, or in determining the removability or eligibility for an immigration benefit of persons who would be inadmissible to, or removable from, the United States;”

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(1) by striking “for the purposes” and inserting “for 1 of the purposes;” and

(2) by striking “or to deny visas to persons who would be inadmissible to the United States.” and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) with regard to any or all aliens in the database, aggregated data elements from each record, if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interest to provide such information to a foreign government.”

TITLE VI—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

TITLE VII—EMBASSY SECURITY

SA 1781. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill S. 1785, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

SEC. 1273. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON QATAR FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SAFETY.

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

(1) the United States should consider, in a timely manner, the July 2013 Letter of Request from the Government of Qatar for fighter aircraft;

(2) the approval of such a sale would contribute to the self-defense of Qatar, deter the regional ambitions of Iran, reassure partners and allies of the United States commitment to regional security, and enhance the strike capability of fighter aircraft of the Qatar air force;

(3) the ability of our regional partners to respond to threatening Iranian military actions in the Gulf, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching a ballistic missile attack, is a critical element of deterring Iranian aggression and maintaining security and stability in the region;

(4) the maintenance by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge (QME) is vital, and due diligence is essential to evaluating the impact of such a sale as it relates to the military capabilities of Israel; and

(5) the Department of State should prioritize its consideration of whether to issue a Letter of Offer and Acceptance, to advance the sale of fighter aircraft to the Government of Qatar so that key decisions can be taken regarding the way forward for capabilities that are critical for security and stability in the Middle East.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and Homeland Security, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the risks and benefits of the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar as described in subsection (a).

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

(A) A description of the assumptions regarding the impact of such a sale on the United States’ Armed Forces;

(B) A description of the assumptions regarding the increase to Qatar air force capabilities as a result of the sale.

SEC. 1274. VERIFICATION AND REPORT ON QATAR AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SAFETY.

(a) VERIFICATION.—The Secretary of State应当 shall report to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, with the recommendation of the Secretary of State to Congress that—

(1) the Department of State determined that the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar contributes to regional security, and enhances the capabilities of Qatar as a regional stabilizer;

(2) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar will not increase the threat to the national security of the United States; and

(3) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar does not conflict with United States foreign policy interests.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall report to the Congress that—

(1) the Department of State directed the Secretary of State to conduct a review of the impact of the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar on the national security of the United States; and

(2) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar contributes to regional security, and enhances the capabilities of Qatar as a regional stabilizer;

(3) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar will not increase the threat to the national security of the United States; and

(4) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar does not conflict with United States foreign policy interests.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall report to the Congress that—

(1) the Department of State directed the Secretary of State to conduct a review of the impact of the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar on the national security of the United States; and

(2) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar contributes to regional security, and enhances the capabilities of Qatar as a regional stabilizer;

(3) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar will not increase the threat to the national security of the United States; and

(4) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar does not conflict with United States foreign policy interests.

SEC. 1275. REPORT ON QATAR FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SAFETY.

(a) VERIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall report to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, with the recommendation of the Secretary of State to Congress that—

(1) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar contributes to regional security, and enhances the capabilities of Qatar as a regional stabilizer;

(2) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar will not increase the threat to the national security of the United States; and

(3) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar does not conflict with United States foreign policy interests.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall report to the Congress that—

(1) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar contributes to regional security, and enhances the capabilities of Qatar as a regional stabilizer;

(2) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar will not increase the threat to the national security of the United States; and

(3) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar does not conflict with United States foreign policy interests.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall report to the Congress that—

(1) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar contributes to regional security, and enhances the capabilities of Qatar as a regional stabilizer;

(2) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar will not increase the threat to the national security of the United States; and

(3) the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar does not conflict with United States foreign policy interests.
SA 1784. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title V, insert after section 522 the following:

SEC. 552A. AUTHORITY FOR SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL TO PROVIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF ALLEGED SEX-RELATED OFFENSES.

(a) In General.—Chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1044e the following new section:

"§ 1044f. Legal assistance for civilian individuals who are victims of alleged sex-related offenses; Special Victims' Counsel; civilian counsel

"(a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.—Special Victims' Counsel designated under section 1044e of this title may provide such legal assistance to a civilian individual who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense in connection with such offense as may be provided under subsection (a) of section 1044 of this title to individuals eligible for legal assistance under that subsection.

"(b) ASSISTANCE THROUGH CIVILIAN COUNSEL.—The Secretary concerned may provide legal assistance, including representation in legal proceedings, to a civilian individual who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense in connection with such offense, including as follows:

(1) Through the provision of such assistance to such civilian individual by counsel of the military department concerned.

(2) Through payment or reimbursement of civilian counsel obtained by the civilian individual in connection with such offense.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(d) ALLEGED SEX-RELATED OFFENSE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'alleged sex-related offense' has the meaning given that term in section 1044e of this title.

(b) CEREMONIAL.—The title of sections at the beginning of chapter 53 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1044e the following new item:

"1044f. Legal assistance for civilian individuals who are victims of alleged sex-related offenses; Special Victims' Counsel; civilian counsel."

SA 1785. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1085. AVOIDANCE OF COMMERCIAL AND SUBSISTENCE FISHERIES.

(a) In General.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) endeavor to conduct training exercises in a manner that minimizes impact on subsistence and commercial fisheries and the long term health of fish species and stocks; and

(2) endeavor to schedule and locate training exercises outside of fishing grounds during fishing seasons.

(b) CONSULTATION.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 6 months prior to the commencement of a training exercise subject to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service, State and tribal fish and wildlife managers, fishery user groups, and Regional Fishery Management Councils established under section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852) with respect to the scheduling and location of the training exercise.

(2) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—A consultation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not subject to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(c) EXCEPTION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines that application of such subsection is not in the national security interest of the United States.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to create any legal right or provide a private right of action for any person.

SA 1786. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1126. ENHANCED PENALTIES AND OTHER TOOLS RELATED TO MARITIME OFFENSES AND ACTS OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM.

(a) PENALTIES FOR MARITIME OFFENSES.—

(1) PENALTIES FOR VIOLENCE AGAINST MARITIME NAVIGATION.—Section 2280a(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (b), by inserting 'section 2280a,' after '2280,'; and

(B) by inserting '2281a, after '2281.'

(2) PENALTIES FOR ACTS AGAINST MARITIME FIXED PLATFORMS.—Section 2281a(a)(1) of such title is amended, in the redesignated matter following subparagraph (E), by inserting 'punished by death or' before 'imprisoned for any term'.

(b) PENALTIES FOR ACTS OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM.—Section 2332i(a)(2) of such title, as amended by section 2332i(a)(2), is further amended by inserting '--2332a', after '2332i'.

SA 1787. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1342. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAN NEGOTIATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) President Obama has routinely spoken about a hard line when dealing with Iran on the subject of their nuclear program and related sanctions.

(2) March 5, 2012, in remarks after meeting with Benjamin Netanyahu, President Obama stated: ‘. . . I reserve all options, and my policy here is not going to be one of containment. My policy is prevention of Iran obtaining nuclear weapons. And as I indicated yesterday in my speech, when I say all options are at the table, I mean it.’

(3) On September 27, 2012, in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly, President Obama stated: ‘Make no mistake: A nuclear-armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained, the will do the utmost to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.’

(4) On April 2, 2015, in an address in the Rose Garden, President Obama stated that ‘Iran has also agreed to the most robust and intrusive inspections and transparency regime’ and, ‘This deal was not based on precedent. It’s based on unprecedented verification.’

(5) Iran’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, has routinely spoken out openly against the United States and its policies against Iran’s nuclear program and related sanctions.

(6) April 9, 2015, in response to the nuclear agreement, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said: ‘Iran’s government and security forces wouldn’t permit outside inspections of the country’s military sites, which are officially nuclear but where United Nations investigators suspect Tehran conducted tests related to atomic weapons development.’

(7) On May 20, 2015, in a graduation speech at the Iran University of Medical Sciences in Tehran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei ruled out ‘allowing international inspectors to interview Iranian nuclear scientists as part of any new deal on its nuclear program’, and reiterated that the country ‘would not allow the inspection of military sites’. 
(b) SENATE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that no negotiations should be allowed to continue with respect to a nuclear agreement with Iran that does not include robust inspection and proper verification of all Iran’s nuclear programs, military installations, and access to scientists and their respective progress.

SA 1788. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 474, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(1) Future design and requirements of the replacement for the Ticonderoga class cruiser,

SA 1789. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 10. LIMITATION OF THE TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No portion of the land or water listed by Article I of the United States-Cuba Agreements and Treaty of 1934 shall be transferred to the Government of Cuba, unless—

(1) a democratically-elected Government of Cuba and the United States Government mutually agree to new lease terms for such land or water;

(2) the elections of the Government of Cuba were—

(A) free and fair;

(B) conducted under internationally recognized observers; and

(C) carried out so that opposition parties had ample time to organize and campaign using full access media available to every candidate;

(3) the Government of Cuba has committed itself to constitutional change that would ensure regular and free elections;

(4) the Government of Cuba has made a public commitment to respect, and is respecting, internationally recognized human rights and basic democratic freedoms;

(5) the President certifies to Congress that Cuba is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism and no longer harbors members of recognized foreign terrorist organizations; and

(6) the Secretary of Defense certifies that the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is inconsequential to United States national security or to the operation of the Navy and the Coast Guard in the Caribbean Sea.

(b) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT LEASE.—It shall be the policy of the United States to continue to lease the land or waterways that encompass the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless the criteria set out in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) are met.

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON RELOCATION OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT AND CAPABILITIES FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES OR OTHER COUNTRY IN THE CARIBBEAN REGION.

(a) LIMITATION.—No military equipment may be moved to any other United States military facility to complete the same tasks conducted on, or from, the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PRESERVATION OF OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States may not reduce the operational capabilities provided by assets operating aboard, or from, the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in support of meaningful defense activity.

(2) INCLUDED CAPABILITIES.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(A) the United States Coast Guard personnel and equipment supporting maritime operations in the vicinity of the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as for the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) civilian personnel who support military activities directly or otherwise, unless Congress enacts a law agreeing to move resources to a more suitable location which allows for comparable defense activity in the region.

SEC. 10. REQUIREMENT TO TEMPORARILY HOUSE MIGRANTS INTERCEPTED IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CARIBBEAN AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

The United States may not use appropriated funds to move migrants intercepted in the waters between the United States and any foreign country in the Caribbean region to a location other than the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless—

(1) the migrant may reasonably be returned to their country of origin; or

(2) uncontrollable circumstances do not allow for a safe transfer of migrants to the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 10. LIMITATION IN THE REDUCTION OF MUNITIONS OR IN THE WATERS NEAR UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

The United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba shall continue to perform as the logistical port for the Navy and Coast Guard operating in the Caribbean Sea at operational levels equal to or greater than such level on the date of the enactment of this Act, unless—

(1) the Government of Cuba displays a legitimate capacity to interdict narcotics trafficking throughout the international waterways surrounding Cuba;

(2) the Government of Cuba has an established maritime authority capable of inspecting cargo and safeguarding ships traversing the international waterways near the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and

(3) the Government of Cuba displays the capacity to intercept human traffickers operating throughout the waterways surrounding Cuba.

SEC. 10. LIMITATION ON MODIFICATION OR RELOCATION OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) LIMITATION.—The United States may not modify the 45 square mile lease of land or waterways that encompass the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, unless—

(1) the President notifies Congress not less than 90 days prior to the proposed modification of such lease; and

(2) after such notification, Congress enacts a law authorizing a modification of such lease.

(b) RETENTION.—The United States may not abandon any portion of the land or water that contains the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless—

(1) the President notifies Congress not less than 90 days prior to the proposed abandonment of such land or water;

(2) after such notification, Congress enacts a law authorizing such abandonment.

(c) NO NEW GRANT OF AUTHORITY.—This section may not be construed to grant the President any authority not already provided by the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6021 et seq.).

SA 1790. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1040. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS WHEREBY PRIMARY FOCUS IS CLOSURE OF THE TERRORIST DE- TENTION FACILITY ABOARD NAVAL STATION GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the purpose of funding personnel or programs whose primary focus is facilitating the closure of the terrorist detention facility aboard Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SA 1791. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2822. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVY OUTLYING LANDING FIELD, NAVAL AIR STATION, WHITING FIELD, FLORIDA.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to the Florida County, Florida (in this section referred to as the ‘‘County’’), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, containing Naval Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County associated with Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Milton, Florida, to be acquired.—In exchange for the property described in subsection (a), the County shall convey to the Secretary of the
Navy land and improvements thereon in Santa Rosa County, Florida, that is acceptable to the Secretary and suitable for use as a Navy outlying landing field to replace Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 to the replacement location.

(c) Payment of Costs of Conveyance.—

(1) Payment Required.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the County to cover costs incurred by the Secretary for environmental documentation, other administrative costs related to the land exchange, and all costs associated with relocation of activities and facilities relocated to the replacement Site 8, to the replacement location.

(2) Treatment of Amounts Received.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the land exchange. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) Description of Property.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) Conveyance Agreement.—The exchange of real property under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy and the County, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SA 1792. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 1283. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF VIETNAMESE NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) THIRTY-YEAR LIMIT ON NUCLEAR EXPORTS.—

(1) In general.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be used to implement any aspect of an agreement for civil nuclear cooperation pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) after the date that is 30 years after the date of entry into force of such agreement unless—

(A) the President, within the final five years of the agreement, has certified to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the party to such agreement continues to fulfill the terms and conditions of the agreement and that the agreement continues to be in the interest of the United States; and

(B) Congress has enacted a joint resolution permitting the continuation of the agreement for an additional period of not more than 30 years.

(2) Exceptions.—The restriction in paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) any agreement that had entered into force as of August 1, 2015; and

(B) any agreement with the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO), or the International Atomic Energy Agency; or

(C) any amendment to an agreement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Each proposed export pursuant to an agreement described under paragraph (1) shall be subject to United States laws and regulations in effect at the time of each such export.

SEC. 1094. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—To carry out the purposes of this subtitle, there is established in the legislative branch a Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age (in this subtitle referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the President, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 2 shall be appointed from private life.

(2) Two members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(3) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(4) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the House; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(5) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the House; and
The Commission shall hold its initial meeting not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Commission shall—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) initial meeting.—On or after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, and not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall hold its initial meeting.

SEC. 1095. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) FURNISHING OF INFORMATION.—If the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson, or any member of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission submits to a Federal department or agency a request for information under paragraph (1) of section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, such department or agency shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish the information directly to the Commission.

(c) RULES OF PROCEDURE.—The Commission shall prescribe rules of procedure necessary to carry out the powers and duties of the Commission.
Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a final report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by majority of Commission members.

(c) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) or (b) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities under this subtitle, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which Commission submits the final report under subsection (b).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the final report.

SEC. 1099C. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subtitle.

(b) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available to the Commission under subsection (a) shall remain available until the termination of the Commission.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room S–240 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room S–216 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Security Assistance in Africa.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights, and Federal Courts be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Rewriting the Law: Examining the Process That Led to the ObamaCare Subsidy Rule.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND OVERSIGHT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 4, 2015, at 1:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining Practical Solutions to Improve the Federal Regulatory Process.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that MAJ Justin Gorkowski, a U.S. Army fellow for the office of Senator Roy Blunt, be granted floor privileges throughout the duration of consideration of H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my interns, Jasper MacNaughton and Holly O’Brien, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2146 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes,

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Toomey amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1782) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To change the effective date)

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2146), as amended, was passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 8; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, there will be no rollover votes during Monday’s session of the Senate. Senators should expect votes around lunchtime on Tuesday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the
previous order, following the remarks of Senator COLLINS and Senator SULLIVAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise this evening in support of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, which provides our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with the critical resources they require to meet our critical national security missions.

Let me begin by expressing my sincere gratitude to both the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, for tackling many of the complex and challenging issues facing our Nation and our military.

During my time in the Senate, I have never been more concerned about global instability and the threats posed to our country by radical Islamic extremists. We must work together to ensure our collective defense and this bill puts us on the path to doing so.

The legislation confirms the strategic importance of our Navy and shipbuilding programs by fully funding the DDG 1000 Program and authorizing $400 million in incremental funding authority toward an additional DDG 51 beyond those included in the current multiyear procurement contract. This additional ship is very much needed by our Navy and it would fulfill the terms of a 2002 swap agreement between the two major shipbuilders regarding the construction of large surface combatants. Both my colleague Senator AUGUST KING and I advocated for these critical provisions.

I am so proud of the highly skilled and hard-working men and women of Bath Iron Works in my State who construct the Navy's new warships. The DDG 1000 is the lead ship of its class. It will bolster our ability to project power. It promises to deliver a wide array of cutting-edge innovations such as stealth technology, electric propulsion, and a smaller crew size.

Our destroyers are the workhorses of the Navy. Recently, the Bath-built USS Farragut, which I was honored to christen almost 10 years ago, was dispatched to the Strait of Hormuz after Iranian naval forces harassed commercial vessels transiting the area. The USS Farragut escorted U.S.-flagged ships through the Strait, projecting American power and sending a strong signal to enemies and allies alike that the U.S. Navy is prepared and ready to respond to acts of aggression.

Our Navy fleet provides the robust forward presence our Nation requires to respond not only to acts of aggression but to humanitarian disasters as well. It is also crucial to protect critical trade groups that facilitate global commerce and our national security.

The power of presence cannot be taken for granted or ignored, which is why the investments in our Navy that are authorized by this bill are so critical. We simply need more ships to be where we want to be in the world when we want to be and need to be there. The Navy’s plan shows that unless we make the investments that are needed, our fleet will continue to shrink and, thus, jeopardize our national security.

This bill also maintains investments in our public shipyards, which are another set of strategic facilities in our national security arsenal.

Recently, I had the honor of hosting our Secretary of Labor, Thomas Perez, in Maine. We visited and were so impressed by the very successful apprenticeship program at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME. The shipyard in Kittery is one of only four remaining public naval shipyards, and it is renowned for its skilled and dedicated workforce that is helping our Nation transition from the Los Angeles Class to the Virginia Class submarines.

This bill would bolster our ability to project the critical resources they require to meet our critical national security missions. The legislation confirms the strategic importance of our Navy and shipbuilding programs by fully funding the DDG 1000 Program and authorizing $400 million in incremental funding authority toward an additional DDG 51 beyond those included in the current multiyear procurement contract. This additional ship is very much needed by our Navy and it would fulfill the terms of a 2002 swap agreement between the two major shipbuilders regarding the construction of large surface combatants. Both my colleague Senator AUGUST KING and I advocated for these critical provisions.

The legislation confirms the strategic importance of our Navy and shipbuilding programs by fully funding the DDG 1000 Program and authorizing $400 million in incremental funding authority toward an additional DDG 51 beyond those included in the current multiyear procurement contract. This additional ship is very much needed by our Navy and it would fulfill the terms of a 2002 swap agreement between the two major shipbuilders regarding the construction of large surface combatants. Both my colleague Senator AUGUST KING and I advocated for these critical provisions.

During those countless attacks, it was the Iron Dome missile defense system developed in Israel, with cooperation and assistance from the United States, that saved countless civilian lives.

In addition, this bill continues to improve and strengthen the military’s response to sexual assault. How well I remember at an Armed Services subcommittee hearing a decade ago when I first raised the issue of sexual assault in the military, and how dismissive the reply was of GEN George Casey. Fortunately, that attitude has changed, and in the last 2 years, significant reforms have been implemented to help combat these crimes and provide care for the survivors of sexual assault.

Still, the work of translating the military’s stated policy of zero tolerance into reality remains unfinished business. Key provisions in this year’s bill build upon the past reforms we have made by improving the protections for victims of sexual assault, enhancing confidential reporting options, and expanding the authority of special victims’ counsel to assist the survivors of sexual assault. The Department of Defense must, however, do more to eliminate, once and for all, retaliation against the victims of sexual assault who come forward to report these crimes.

To further support our men and women in uniform, this bill rejects a provision proposed by the administration that would consolidate TRICARE and limit care options for servicemembers and their families. This bill preserves the U.S. Family Health Plan, which serves as a model of high-quality and cost-effective care. This program has been extremely successful and popular among enrollees in Maine. I have been impressed with the work I have seen them do in case management of chronic diseases such as diabetes.

This bill also directs the Pentagon to rein in or eliminate unnecessary, wasteful spending. It cuts headquarters and administrative costs by 7.5 percent in the year 2016. In this time of budget constraints, we owe it to taxpayers to assess every efficiency and use every cost-saving measure, while also continuing to ensure the security of our Nation.

Finally, I wish to thank the committee for making the right decision in rejecting the President’s proposal to authorize a new base realignment and closure round. The process has been through BRAC rounds, and they have required significant costs and have failed to deliver on the promised savings, as has been documented by the Government Accountability Office—GAO.

This bill would also better tailor the HUBZone Program to meet the needs of communities affected by the closure of U.S. military installations through the previous BRAC process. The provisions included in the bill are drawn from the HUBZone Expansion Act that I authored with my colleague Senator King.

I urge support of this highly significant legislation. I am pleased to have worked with the members of the committee on which I have served for so many years. Again, I congratulate the leaders of the committee and the members of the committee for their excellent work.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act. This is a bipartisan bill that will provide our servicemembers with the funding they need to continue to keep our country safe.

Over the last 5 months, we have had numerous senior military officials, senior military officers, and foreign policy experts talk to the Senate Armed Services Committee on which I serve about the significant challenges that our country faces. The senior Senator from Arizona talked about this very eloquently today on the floor about ISIL, a resurgent Russia, North Korea with nuclear weapons, and this house has been that we are now debating on the floor focuses on addressing these challenges.

It also makes important modernizations to our investments with regard to military weapons, cuts bureaucratic red tape at the Pentagon, and ensures that our Armed Forces remain the most agile and lethal in the world. It upholds our commitments to our servicemembers, to their families, to military veterans, and to their families.

It is remarkable that right now, as we debate this bill—this critically important bill on the Senate floor—the
President of the United States has already come out and said he is going to likely veto it if it is in its current form. He is going to veto the NDAA. Think about that. One of the most important things we are doing is to take care of our troops, all this talk about increasing the debt against the bill. But we stood firm—the chairman and other members of the committee—and said: This is not the kind of bill we play politics with. This is not the kind of bill we want to see happen. This is not the kind of bill that funds our troops, that funds the defense of our Nation. Guess what happened. They got the message. Only four members of the Senate Armed Services Committee voted against this bill. It was a very bipartisan bill coming out of the committee, and certainly hope when this bill passes the U.S. Senate and moves to conference with the House and then moves to the President's desk, that he does not play politics with our troops; that he removes his thumb to veto one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will work on this year.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for his criticism in ushering this bill out of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I had the distinct honor of traveling with Senator McCain recently to Asia, including to Vietnam, where his service has inspired countless millions of Americans as well as the people of Vietnam. I saw that first-hand. It was humbling. It was an honor to be there with him, Senator Reed, and Senator Ernst on a trip I will certainly remember for a lifetime.

Now look about a few months ago to pledge solemnly to “defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.” We took that oath right and Senator Ernst on a trip I will certainly remember for a lifetime.

That was last year. This year it is worrisome product, which is the value of everything this country produces, last quarter shrank. Let me repeat that. We didn’t grow. We didn’t grow by 1 percent, 2 percent. The economy of the United States has ever had. We have not had a slower recovery in well over 50 years. The American Enterprise Institute has called this recovery “glacially and painfully slow by historic standards.”

Even the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank, has said that “this has been a poor recovery in every regard.”

That is why 53 NDAAAs have consecutively passed the Congress. It hasn’t been about partisanship. This has been about working in ushering this bill out of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I had the distinct honor of traveling with Senator McCain recently to Asia, including to Vietnam, where his service has inspired countless millions of Americans as well as the people of Vietnam. I saw that first-hand. It was humbling. It was an honor to be there with him, Senator Reed, and Senator Ernst on a trip I will certainly remember for a lifetime.

Now look about a few months ago to pledge solemnly to “defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.” We took that oath right here on this floor. That is what the NDAA does. It gives our servicemembers what they need to fight and defend our great Nation. That is why 53 NDAAAs have consecutively passed the Congress.

I want to talk about those rising threats and one of the biggest ones that doesn’t get enough attention. We have heard from the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and from both sides of the aisle about what those threats are facing our Nation: ISIS, Iran, Russia, China. These are rising threats, no doubt. But there is a rising threat to our national security that almost never gets talked about, and in some ways it is the biggest threat that our Nation faces.

I am talking about our economy. I am talking about the need for a strong economy. Our economy is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we do not have this. As a matter of fact, our economy is getting weaker, not stronger. The verdict is in. Economists from all across the country, of all political persuasions, agree that the recovery from the last recession has been one of the slowest economic recoveries this country has ever had. We have not had a slower recovery in well over 50 years. The American Enterprise Institute has called this recovery “glacially and painfully slow by historic standards.”

Even the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank, has said that “this has been a poor recovery in every regard.”

That was last year. This year it is worrisome product, which is the value of everything this country produces, last quarter shrank. Let me repeat that. We didn’t grow. We didn’t grow by 1 percent, 2 percent. The economy of the United States shrank nearly 1 percent. We contracted. It is the third time the economy has shrunk since 2009.

We don’t even have a recovery. We don’t have a recovery. Right now we have no growth. That means Americans are worse off in their pockets. It means wages haven’t kept up with inflation. It means the gap between the richest and the poorest is growing. We must get back to higher growth rates. We must get back to traditional levels of American growth. We must get back to an economy that makes us stronger globally and produces hope and opportunity at home.

It wasn’t too long ago that we expected in this country at least 4 percent annual GDP growth. That is a very normal, traditional level of American growth. When President Reagan was in office, the average growth rate was about 4.8 percent. During Presi-
President Obama and the Congress should be agreeing on what it takes to achieve 3.5% growth. Looking at Social Security Trustee’s reports, 3.5% is the rate of growth required to ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, with no tax increases and no benefit cuts.

These are tangible steps we can take toward a pro-growth economy. One step is to reform the uncompetitive corporate tax code, as recommended by President Obama’s Bipartisan Debt Commission, among others, including the repatriation of overseas profits without any additional taxation. Increase oil and natural gas exports, which the National Association of Manufacturers estimates would raise 2020 GDP by as much as 1%, while reducing unemployment by 0.5% due to an increase in manufacturing jobs. Rein in the EPA’s animus for fossil fuels. Replace ObamaCare with a plan that lowers, rather than raises, the cost of employment, and which does not incentivize businesses to lay off low-wage workers or cut their hours.

Congress should devise a plan for 3.5% economic growth. This isn’t wishful thinking. High growth is historically normal for the United States. It is the present imperative, it is the only way forward.

Mr. SULLIVAN. The title is “Dismal Growth Needs the 3.5% Solution.” He noted that from 2010 to 2014, almost every year of the entire history of our great Nation, this country grew annually at 3.7 percent GDP growth—3.7 percent. The Obama administration’s annual growth rate has been 1.3 percent. Think about that—1 percent.

According to the former CBO Director, the difference between 2.5 percent and 3.5 percent growth—just 1 percent GDP growth difference—will have a huge impact on American families. We would be able to produce nationally 2.5 million more jobs and the average income in terms of wages would be $9,000 higher—$9,000 higher. Think about what you could do with that amount of money. Think about what American families could do with that amount of money, just by going 1 percent higher in our growth rate.

Our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania recently mentioned that in order to double the standard of living for a family—to double their income—at 3 percent growth, you can do that in 24 years, or a generation. That is why every generation of Americans has benefitted and done better than the previous one, because we have grown at 3, 3.5, 4 percent growth rate. We are doubling our standard of living. At 1 percent growth, which is the Obama growth rate, it takes 72 years to double your standard of living. 72 years. That is the length of a lifetime.

What is most disturbing about this is that this is a huge issue for the country. You don’t read about it in the press. Heck, last quarter we shrank. The economy of the United States, the greatest economy in the world, shrunk, and there was barely a press report about it. It has become what people are now referring to as the new normal. Traditional levels of American growth at 3.5%, or 4 percent GDP growth—nope, in the Obama era that is a thing of the past. We are in the new normal era, with 1.5 percent GDP growth—maybe 2, if we are lucky.

We need to change that. We need to get the traditional levels of American growth. What is most amazing is that the administration seems to be just shrugging its shoulders. Oh, we contracted last quarter? That is no big deal. A 1.5 percent to 2 percent GDP growth for the Obama administration record—that is fine.

But it is a big deal, and it is not fine. We need to change this.

Since 2009, the White House has blamed everything from former George W. Bush to the weather to climate change to Europe’s health to growth problems in Africa for these slow growth rates. But have you ever heard the President say: It might be the policies of my own administration. It might be the fact that we are overregulating every element of this great economy of ours. They need to stop blaming and start fixing this economy.

We need to get our country moving again. We have so many comparative advantages to other countries—so many. We have the greatest universities in the world right here in America—the greatest universities in the world compared to any other country. We have agriculture, farmers who feed the world, we have a high-tech sector that is the envy of the world. We have a capital markets sector that commercializes great ideas quicker than any place in the world. We have natural resources—oil, gas, minerals—that are the envy of the world. We are producing more natural gas than any place in the world right now. We are producing more oil than Saudi Arabia right now because our private sector has innovation, ingenuity, hard work. We have tremendous advantages that almost any other country would envy.

What we need to do now is unleash this country’s might, unleash the great potential that is the American economy. We need to refuel America. When we grow our economy, we will protect our country.

We need regulatory reform. Right now the cost of regulations to our economy according to the President’s own Small Business Administration is close to $2 trillion a year. That is almost $15,000 per American family. Think about that—$15,000 per family is keeping us down. We need a competitive tax system. We need to unleash the might of our private sector through an attracting sure that we are open for business, not strangling businesses with redtape from Washington.

I want to emphasize these issues because we have been talking about the NDAA, the national defense of our country, for the past few days on the Senate floor, and we are going to be talking about these important issues next week as well. And they are critical issues, but this is a critical issue. If we can’t grow our economy, if we can’t get back to traditional levels of American growth, we are going to continue to have challenges. But if we can do this, if we can grow consistently by 4.5 or 5 percent in GDP growth, that is the best way to address our challenges, our deficit, our $18 trillion debt, our national security and the funding of our military. We need to focus more on the economy.

This administration has failed the American people on these issues. We need to unleash the might of this great economy of ours, and we will keep our country safe by doing so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday. The adjournment of the Senate, at 6:08 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 8, 2015, at 3 p.m.
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