the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus’s democratic processes or institutions that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus’s democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

Barack Obama.

The White House, June 10, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2685 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Rule X, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I rise to present the House Appropriations Committee’s recommendation for the fiscal year 2016 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, there are nearly 200,000 servicemen and women serving abroad, doing the work of freedom on every continent, and there are many more at home who are serving in every one of our States—Active, Guard and Reserve—all volunteers. We are grateful to them and their families.

They are certainly not all experts in some of the language and terms that will be part of our vocabulary during this debate over the next 24 hours—phrases like "sequester" and "continuing resolution," "Budget Control Act," "overseas contingency account," and the "global war on terrorism account"—but they have every expectation that they will have our united, bipartisan support for this bill whether they serve aboard a ship, fly through airspace, or provide overwatch on land to support a military mission. This legislation was developed after 12 hearings, many briefings, travel to the Middle East and Europe, and countless staff hours, with those who serve us, military and civilian, very much in mind.

This is a product of a very bipartisan and cooperative effort, for which I thank my good friend, the ranking member, and all those who have been a great pleasure to work with him. We are both fortunate to have committee members who are engaged and committed so much to this product. We are grateful for the support of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY.

In total, the bill provides just over $578 billion in discretionary spending, an increase of $24.4 billion over the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. This topline includes $88.4 billion in the global war on terrorism funding for war efforts, and it is at the level assumed in the House-Senate budget conference agreement. I would point out that our House total is very close to the number President Obama submitted in his fiscal year 2016 budget request for national defense. Of course, the base funding recommendation is just over $490 billion, which reflects the budget caps enacted in 2011 as part of the Budget Control Act, signed by President Obama.

To reach our reduced allocation, we reviewed in detail the President’s submission and found areas and programs where reductions were possible without harming military operations, warfighter readiness, or critical modernization efforts. Simply put, we made every dollar count. To do so, we have taken reductions from programs that have been restructured or terminated, subject to contract or schedule delays, contain unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need, or because of historical under-expenditure and rescissions of unneeded funds.

Of course, our bill keeps faith with our troops and their families by including a 2.3 percent pay increase, a full percentage above the President’s own request. It also provides general funding to their benefits and critical defense health programs. In another key area, this package contains robust funding to counter serious worldwide cyber threats—now an everyday occurrence.

But I think we would all agree that the world is a much more dangerous, unstable, and unpredictable than it had been back then could never have envisioned the emerging and evolving threats that we are seeing today in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

So, to respond to current and future threats and to meet our constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common defense, we developed, in a bipartisan way, a bill that adheres to the current law and provides additional resources to end catastrophic cuts to military programs and people. These additional resources are included in title IX, the global war on terrorism account. That account has been carefully vetted to assure its war-related uses.

Our subcommittee scrubbed the President’s base budget for this year and past budget requests, and it has focused on those systems and programs that are absolutely connected to our ongoing fight against threats presented by ISIL, al Qaeda, al-Nusra, the Khorasan Group, Boko Haram, and other radical terrorist organizations, including the Iranian Quds Force.

We also projected what resources the military and intelligence community will need to meet ongoing challenges of nation-state aggressors like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and others. Not surprisingly, we have heard objections about the use of title IX to boost our topline national security spending in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the Capitol who believes this should be our first go-to option. Rather, it is a process we undertake as a last resort to make sure our troops can answer the call amid a worsening threat environment around the world.

Again, we have been very careful about what went into this global war on terrorism account. We resisted the temptation to simply transfer large portions of the base bill’s operations and maintenance accounts into the global war on terrorism account. We included the Iranian Quds Force, those state actors and other programs we believe are essential to counter nation-state aggressors and other threats.

In recent Statement of Administration Policy, the White House asserted that the global war on terrorism funding—the old OCO account, the overseas contingency account—in their words is a “funding mechanism intended to pay for wars.” I could not agree more, and this is why we enforce that account to provide President Obama with the funding resources he needs to lead us as Commander in Chief. Within that
account. I want to highlight two areas of critical importance—ISR and readiness.

We believe that a strong intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—ISR—capability is a critical component of the global war on terror; yet a succession of combatant commanders has testified before our committee that only a fraction of their ISR requirements is being met, in essence, leaving them blind to the enemy's activities, movements, and intentions. Accordingly, the global war on terrorism account contains an additional $500 million above the President's 2016 request to improve our ISR capabilities: the procurement of additional ISR aircraft and ground stations, the training of ISR pilots and other personnel, and the processing of that type of derived data.

Likewise, we share the concern of the Army, Air Force, and Marines about the overall erosion of readiness in the force. So, to begin to reinvest in readiness, title IX includes an additional $2.5 billion above the President's request for this purpose to be distributed to all of our services and to the Guard and Reserves. I would add that this sum must be detailed and justified to Congress 30 days before it is spent.

Again, this bill is structured to give the President the tools he needs to act. For example, when he finally does develop a long-awaited, complete, and comprehensive strategy to combat ISIL and other terrorist groups, we have provided in this bill the resources he will need to execute his plans. I think we would all agree that America must lead, and this bill enables leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I will allow myself a closing thought: The Washington Post recently editorialized on the defense authorization bill: "There isn't much bipartisan governance left in Washington, but if anything fits that description, it's probably the annual defense bill."

Mr. Chairman, this bill deserves bipartisan support, and after many hours of productive debate, I look forward to a bipartisan vote. Our troops deserve it. Our national security requires it. Our adversaries need to see it.

I reserve the balance of my time.
### Title I

#### Military Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation and Maintenance, Army</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41,116,120</td>
<td>41,130,748</td>
<td>-3,620,558</td>
<td>-3,620,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Navy</td>
<td>27,433,200</td>
<td>26,226,396</td>
<td>-1,206,804</td>
<td>-1,206,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Marine Corps</td>
<td>12,826,021</td>
<td>12,125,249</td>
<td>-6,996,722</td>
<td>-6,996,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Air Force</td>
<td>27,376,402</td>
<td>27,965,322</td>
<td>-1,589,920</td>
<td>-1,589,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Army</td>
<td>4,247,650</td>
<td>4,550,974</td>
<td>+145,324</td>
<td>+145,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Navy</td>
<td>1,355,024</td>
<td>1,884,961</td>
<td>+530,937</td>
<td>+530,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps</td>
<td>660,424</td>
<td>706,481</td>
<td>+46,057</td>
<td>+46,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Air Force</td>
<td>1,603,146</td>
<td>1,606,263</td>
<td>+3,117</td>
<td>+3,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army</td>
<td>7,643,832</td>
<td>7,942,132</td>
<td>+298,300</td>
<td>+298,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Air Force</td>
<td>3,148,700</td>
<td>3,221,051</td>
<td>+72,351</td>
<td>+72,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title I, Military Personnel</strong></td>
<td>128,004,618</td>
<td>130,491,227</td>
<td>-2,486,610</td>
<td>-2,486,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title II

#### Operation and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation and Maintenance, Army</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,961,020</td>
<td>35,107,546</td>
<td>-3,146,526</td>
<td>-3,146,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy</td>
<td>37,590,854</td>
<td>42,200,768</td>
<td>+4,611,914</td>
<td>+4,611,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps</td>
<td>5,610,083</td>
<td>8,228,782</td>
<td>+2,618,700</td>
<td>+2,618,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force</td>
<td>34,539,805</td>
<td>36,191,929</td>
<td>+1,652,124</td>
<td>+1,652,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Defensewide</td>
<td>30,524,752</td>
<td>32,442,224</td>
<td>+1,917,472</td>
<td>+1,917,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve</td>
<td>2,513,393</td>
<td>2,665,792</td>
<td>+152,400</td>
<td>+152,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve</td>
<td>1,021,200</td>
<td>1,001,766</td>
<td>-9,434</td>
<td>-9,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve</td>
<td>270,046</td>
<td>277,939</td>
<td>+7,893</td>
<td>+7,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve</td>
<td>3,062,342</td>
<td>3,064,257</td>
<td>+2,915</td>
<td>+2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard</td>
<td>6,175,021</td>
<td>6,717,977</td>
<td>+542,956</td>
<td>+542,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard</td>
<td>6,408,558</td>
<td>6,955,216</td>
<td>+546,658</td>
<td>+546,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces</td>
<td>41,773</td>
<td>45,078</td>
<td>+3,305</td>
<td>+3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Restoration, Army</td>
<td>201,092</td>
<td>234,229</td>
<td>+33,137</td>
<td>+33,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Restoration, Navy</td>
<td>277,294</td>
<td>292,463</td>
<td>+15,169</td>
<td>+15,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Restoration, Air Force</td>
<td>408,716</td>
<td>368,131</td>
<td>-40,585</td>
<td>-40,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Restoration, Defensewide</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>8,223</td>
<td>+176</td>
<td>+176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites</td>
<td>200,023</td>
<td>203,717</td>
<td>+3,694</td>
<td>+3,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Contingency, Disaster, and Civilian Affairs</td>
<td>103,002</td>
<td>108,286</td>
<td>+5,284</td>
<td>+5,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Threat Reduction Account</td>
<td>305,080</td>
<td>358,498</td>
<td>+53,418</td>
<td>+53,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund</td>
<td>63,034</td>
<td>84,140</td>
<td>+21,106</td>
<td>+21,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance</strong></td>
<td>161,655,679</td>
<td>176,517,228</td>
<td>+14,861,552</td>
<td>+14,861,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TITLE III

**PROCUREMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army</td>
<td>5,216,225</td>
<td>5,689,357</td>
<td>+473,132</td>
<td>+5,113,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Army</td>
<td>1,201,992</td>
<td>1,419,957</td>
<td>+218,965</td>
<td>+207,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army</td>
<td>1,722,138</td>
<td>1,877,073</td>
<td>+154,935</td>
<td>+154,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</td>
<td>1,019,477</td>
<td>1,223,378</td>
<td>+203,901</td>
<td>+203,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army</td>
<td>4,747,523</td>
<td>5,893,028</td>
<td>+1,145,505</td>
<td>+1,145,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Navy</td>
<td>14,751,035</td>
<td>16,125,100</td>
<td>+1,374,065</td>
<td>+1,374,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions Procurement, Navy</td>
<td>5,137,437</td>
<td>6,124,158</td>
<td>+986,721</td>
<td>+986,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps</td>
<td>674,100</td>
<td>723,741</td>
<td>+49,641</td>
<td>+49,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy</td>
<td>15,904,276</td>
<td>16,507,457</td>
<td>+5,934,181</td>
<td>+5,934,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy</td>
<td>5,484,054</td>
<td>6,014,715</td>
<td>+530,661</td>
<td>+530,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps</td>
<td>920,396</td>
<td>1,121,414</td>
<td>+201,018</td>
<td>+201,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>12,067,703</td>
<td>15,657,769</td>
<td>+3,590,066</td>
<td>+3,590,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>4,629,662</td>
<td>2,987,045</td>
<td>-1,642,617</td>
<td>-1,642,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,584,081</td>
<td>+2,584,081</td>
<td>+2,584,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force</td>
<td>859,909</td>
<td>1,758,442</td>
<td>+898,533</td>
<td>+898,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>16,701,246</td>
<td>16,272,438</td>
<td>-428,808</td>
<td>-428,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide</td>
<td>4,420,303</td>
<td>5,135,353</td>
<td>+715,050</td>
<td>+715,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Production Act Purchases</td>
<td>51,634</td>
<td>46,680</td>
<td>-4,954</td>
<td>-4,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title III, Procurement</strong></td>
<td>93,805,072</td>
<td>106,014,372</td>
<td>+12,209,300</td>
<td>+12,209,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army</td>
<td>6,875,585</td>
<td>6,924,950</td>
<td>+49,365</td>
<td>+49,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy</td>
<td>15,959,460</td>
<td>17,865,916</td>
<td>+1,906,456</td>
<td>+1,906,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force</td>
<td>23,843,953</td>
<td>26,473,869</td>
<td>+2,630,916</td>
<td>+2,630,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide</td>
<td>17,225,666</td>
<td>18,329,261</td>
<td>+1,103,595</td>
<td>+1,103,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense</td>
<td>209,376</td>
<td>170,558</td>
<td>-38,818</td>
<td>-38,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>93,713,275</td>
<td>99,764,963</td>
<td>+6,051,688</td>
<td>+6,051,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVERSING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Working Capital Funds</td>
<td>1,649,468</td>
<td>1,312,568</td>
<td>-336,892</td>
<td>-336,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Sealift Fund</td>
<td>405,612</td>
<td>474,164</td>
<td>+68,552</td>
<td>+68,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title V, Reversing and Management Funds</strong></td>
<td>2,055,080</td>
<td>1,786,732</td>
<td>-268,348</td>
<td>-268,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)
(Amounts in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE VI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defense Health Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance</td>
<td>30,030,650</td>
<td>30,889,940</td>
<td>849,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>328,453</td>
<td>373,287</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, development, test and evaluation</td>
<td>1,761,709</td>
<td>980,103</td>
<td>781,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Defense Health Program</strong></td>
<td>32,609,772</td>
<td>32,243,328</td>
<td>31,440,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance</td>
<td>186,125</td>
<td>139,088</td>
<td>47,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>11,227</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>9,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, development, test and evaluation</td>
<td>505,913</td>
<td>579,342</td>
<td>73,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Chemical Agents 2</strong></td>
<td>602,265</td>
<td>720,721</td>
<td>720,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-narcotics support</td>
<td>699,031</td>
<td>739,209</td>
<td>40,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug demand reduction program</td>
<td>105,591</td>
<td>111,589</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard counter-drug program</td>
<td>175,605</td>
<td>147,688</td>
<td>27,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense 4</strong></td>
<td>970,237</td>
<td>998,486</td>
<td>998,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for International Sporting Competitions 7</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>310,159</td>
<td>310,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General 7</td>
<td>310,030</td>
<td>310,159</td>
<td>310,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs</strong></td>
<td>34,144,057</td>
<td>34,230,597</td>
<td>33,356,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TITLE VII** | | | |
| **RELATED AGENCIES** | | | |
| Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund | 514,000 | 514,000 | 514,000 | --- | --- |
| Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA) | 507,600 | 530,203 | 530,203 | +23,603 | -22,600 |
| **Total, Title VII, Related agencies** | 1,021,600 | 1,044,203 | 1,044,203 | +323 | -22,600 |
### Title VIII: General Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional transfer authority (Sec. 8005)</strong></td>
<td>(4,500,000)</td>
<td>(5,500,000)</td>
<td>(4,500,000)</td>
<td>(-1,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec. 8017)</strong></td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PFOS (Sec. 8023)</strong></td>
<td>-46,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-88,400</td>
<td>-42,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec. 8035)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rescissions (Sec. 8040)</strong></td>
<td>-1,126,020</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-896,839</td>
<td>+229,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National grants (Sec. 8046)</strong></td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O&amp;M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec. 8050)</strong></td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Security Contingency Fund (O&amp;M, Defense-wide transfer)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisher House Foundation (Sec. 8057)</strong></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised economic assumptions (Sec. 8074)</strong></td>
<td>-386,268</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,152,296</td>
<td>+766,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisher House O&amp;M Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec. 8080)</strong></td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defense Health O&amp;M transfer authority (Sec. 8094)</strong></td>
<td>(146,000)</td>
<td>(121,000)</td>
<td>(121,000)</td>
<td>(-25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ship Modernization Operations and Sustainment Fund</strong></td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic allowance for housing (Sec. 8114)</strong></td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>+312,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military pay raise (Sec. 8124)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>+700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Capital Fund excess cash balances (Sec. 8125)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-359,000</td>
<td>-359,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised fuel costs (Sec. 8125)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-814,000</td>
<td>-814,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&amp;M, Navy transfer authority)</strong></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title VIII, General Provisions</strong></td>
<td>803,288</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-2,133,035</td>
<td>-1,329,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TITLE IX

**GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM (GWOT)**

#### Military Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Army (GWOT)</td>
<td>3,259,970</td>
<td>1,828,441</td>
<td>+2,404,500</td>
<td>+3,038,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT)</td>
<td>332,366</td>
<td>251,011</td>
<td>+1,310,970</td>
<td>+1,392,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)</td>
<td>403,371</td>
<td>171,970</td>
<td>+231,401</td>
<td>+264,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td>728,334</td>
<td>726,126</td>
<td>+2,208</td>
<td>+2,649,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT)</td>
<td>24,990</td>
<td>24,482</td>
<td>+508</td>
<td>+528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT)</td>
<td>13,953</td>
<td>12,693</td>
<td>-1,260</td>
<td>-1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>3,393</td>
<td>-324</td>
<td>-324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td>19,175</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>+465</td>
<td>+465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT)</td>
<td>174,778</td>
<td>166,015</td>
<td>-8,763</td>
<td>-8,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td>4,484</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>-2,662</td>
<td>-2,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Military Personnel: 4,966,640

#### Operation and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army (GWOT)</td>
<td>16,108,056</td>
<td>11,382,750</td>
<td>+4,725,304</td>
<td>+7,527,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Navy (GWOT)</td>
<td>6,263,810</td>
<td>5,131,986</td>
<td>+1,131,824</td>
<td>+1,615,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard (by transfer) (GWOT)</td>
<td>1,890,884</td>
<td>952,034</td>
<td>+938,850</td>
<td>+938,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT)</td>
<td>10,076,383</td>
<td>9,090,013</td>
<td>+986,370</td>
<td>+1,709,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td>5,231,025</td>
<td>5,805,633</td>
<td>+574,608</td>
<td>+1,753,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT)</td>
<td>(1,260,000)</td>
<td>(1,260,000)</td>
<td>(1,260,000)</td>
<td>(1,260,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT)</td>
<td>41,532</td>
<td>24,559</td>
<td>+16,973</td>
<td>+16,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT)</td>
<td>45,876</td>
<td>31,643</td>
<td>+14,233</td>
<td>+14,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Coast Guard Reserve</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>-7,989</td>
<td>-7,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT)</td>
<td>77,794</td>
<td>59,106</td>
<td>+18,688</td>
<td>+18,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army National Guard</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>+2,100</td>
<td>+2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance: 42,776,870

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT)</td>
<td>1,303,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>+797,000</td>
<td>+40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Reassurance Initiative (GWOT)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT)</td>
<td>4,109,333</td>
<td>3,762,927</td>
<td>+386,406</td>
<td>+386,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT)</td>
<td>1,688,000</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td>-973,000</td>
<td>-973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>+600,000</td>
<td>+600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Operation and Maintenance: 49,978,203

---

**Note:** The table above represents the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY 2016 (H.R. 2885) with specific amounts and changes compared to the previous fiscal year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWDT)</td>
<td>196,200</td>
<td>164,387</td>
<td>+152,572</td>
<td>154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Army (GWDT)</td>
<td>32,138</td>
<td>37,260</td>
<td>+64,590</td>
<td>35,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWDT)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,030</td>
<td>+64,630</td>
<td>62,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWDT)</td>
<td>141,905</td>
<td>192,040</td>
<td>+30,135</td>
<td>239,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Army (GWDT)</td>
<td>773,333</td>
<td>1,205,596</td>
<td>+232,263</td>
<td>442,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWDT)</td>
<td>243,350</td>
<td>217,394</td>
<td>+71,247</td>
<td>350,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWDT)</td>
<td>66,765</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>-63,521</td>
<td>-3,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWDT)</td>
<td>134,019</td>
<td>138,930</td>
<td>+4,911</td>
<td>31,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Navy (GWDT)</td>
<td>123,710</td>
<td>12,186</td>
<td>-111,524</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT)</td>
<td>65,889</td>
<td>29,743</td>
<td>-36,146</td>
<td>-34,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWDT)</td>
<td>401,015</td>
<td>120,400</td>
<td>-91,215</td>
<td>-91,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWDT)</td>
<td>136,398</td>
<td>209,142</td>
<td>+72,744</td>
<td>+484,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td>219,785</td>
<td>228,874</td>
<td>+9,089</td>
<td>+9,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)</td>
<td>3,607,026</td>
<td>3,859,964</td>
<td>+252,938</td>
<td>+3,165,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT)</td>
<td>250,686</td>
<td>212,418</td>
<td>-52,268</td>
<td>+5,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Procurement</td>
<td>7,686,691</td>
<td>6,763,899</td>
<td>+1,035,000</td>
<td>+1,813,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation                               |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWDT)                    | 2,000           | 1,500           | -500            |                 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)                    | 36,820          | 35,747          | +181,677        | +181,900        |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT)              | 14,706          | 17,100          | +3,394          | +1,349,142      |
| Defense-Wide (GWOT)                                                     | 174,647         | 137,087         | -37,560         | +82,177         |
|                             Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation | 227,373         | 191,434         | +1,057,280      | +1,852,219      |

| Revolving and Management Funds                                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT)                                    | 21,350          | 88,850          | -2,500          |                 |
## Other Department of Defense Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT)</td>
<td>300,531</td>
<td>272,704</td>
<td>-27,827</td>
<td>-27,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (GWOT)</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>+50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General (GWOT)</td>
<td>10,623</td>
<td>10,762</td>
<td>-139</td>
<td>-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other Department of Defense Programs</td>
<td>966,118</td>
<td>882,467</td>
<td>+40,651</td>
<td>+40,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE IX General Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec. 9002)</td>
<td>(3,500,000)</td>
<td>(3,500,000)</td>
<td>- (3,500,000)</td>
<td>- (3,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions (GWOT)</td>
<td>-1,355,000</td>
<td>-1,355,000</td>
<td>+1,355,000</td>
<td>+1,355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexploded ordnance (GWOT)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-250,000</td>
<td>-250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Ukraine (GWOT) (Sec. 9014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (GWOT) (Sec. 9014)</td>
<td>-200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>+200,000</td>
<td>+200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness (GWOT) (Sec. 9017)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>+1,500,000</td>
<td>+2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, General Provisions</td>
<td>13,420</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>+3,066,580</td>
<td>+3,066,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Title IX</td>
<td>63,935,295</td>
<td>50,949,581</td>
<td>+24,485,705</td>
<td>+37,471,439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE X

#### EBOLA RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-wide (emergency)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-17,000</td>
<td>-34,000</td>
<td>-34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide (emergency)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Title X (emergency)</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>-42,000</td>
<td>-84,000</td>
<td>-84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>547,753,298</td>
<td>571,719,413</td>
<td>+23,966,115</td>
<td>+37,471,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(484,894,013)</td>
<td>(520,770,552)</td>
<td>+45,876,539</td>
<td>+56,834,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(112,000)</td>
<td>-112,000</td>
<td>-224,000</td>
<td>-224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global War on Terrorism (GWOT)</td>
<td>(65,171,075)</td>
<td>(50,949,581)</td>
<td>+23,221,494</td>
<td>+37,471,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions (GWOT)</td>
<td>(-1,228,020)</td>
<td>(-446,429)</td>
<td>+781,591</td>
<td>+1,236,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recissions (GWOT)</td>
<td>(-1,236,580)</td>
<td>-1,236,580</td>
<td>-17,000</td>
<td>-17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Congressional Budget Recap

**Scorekeeping Adjustments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2016 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2016 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease of defense real property (permanent)</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>+2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of defense real property (permanent)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD, WM to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund (permanent)</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-defense function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD, WM to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (Sec. 8102)</td>
<td>-146,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>+26,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>+26,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-defense function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy transfer to John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-defense function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX O&amp;M, Navy transfer to Coast Guard, Op Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-defense function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) $/1</td>
<td>6,983,000</td>
<td>6,631,000</td>
<td>-352,000</td>
<td>-32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O&amp;M)</td>
<td>64,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>-64,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less emergency appropriations</td>
<td>-112,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+112,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, scorekeeping adjustments</td>
<td>6,945,700</td>
<td>6,672,000</td>
<td>-282,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2015 Enacted: 31,000
FY 2016 Request: 35,000
Scorekeeping adjustment: +2,000
Bill vs. FY 2015 Enacted: +2,000
Bill vs. FY 2016 Request: -20,000

**Departments of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2016 (H.R. 2685)**

(Units in thousands)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I - Military Personnel</th>
<th>128,004,618</th>
<th>130,491,227</th>
<th>-2,486,610</th>
<th>-2,486,610</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II - Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>161,655,679</td>
<td>176,517,228</td>
<td>14,861,549</td>
<td>14,861,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III - Procurement</td>
<td>93,855,072</td>
<td>108,914,372</td>
<td>15,059,299</td>
<td>15,059,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>63,713,275</td>
<td>69,784,863</td>
<td>6,071,588</td>
<td>6,071,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V - Revolving and Management Funds</td>
<td>2,136,680</td>
<td>1,786,732</td>
<td>-349,948</td>
<td>-349,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs</td>
<td>34,144,537</td>
<td>34,230,507</td>
<td>863,970</td>
<td>863,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VII - Related Agencies</td>
<td>1,001,000</td>
<td>1,044,023</td>
<td>43,023</td>
<td>43,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VIII - General Provisions (net)</td>
<td>-603,268</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,603,268</td>
<td>1,603,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT)</td>
<td>63,095,293</td>
<td>50,949,361</td>
<td>-12,145,932</td>
<td>-12,145,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title X - Ebola Response and Preparedness</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total, Department of Defense | 547,755,288 | 571,718,813 | 24,963,525 | 24,963,525 |
| Scorekeeping adjustments | 5,904,700 | 6,672,000 | 767,300 | 767,300 |

| Total mandatory and discretionary | 554,659,988 | 578,390,813 | 24,730,825 | 24,730,825 |

1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
3/ Budget request assumes enactment of DoD’s pharmacy/Consolidated Health Plan proposals
4/ Budget request does not break out total recommended in bill language
5/ Contributions to Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund

NOTE: In FY 2015, the amount provided for Space Procurement, Air Force was included in the appropriation for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The House reported table counts the FY 2015 amount for Space Procurement, Air Force ($2,658,789) twice—as part of Missile Procurement, Air Force and as a separate appropriation.
Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and to congratulate him on the collegial and the transparent manner in which he has crafted this legislation.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the efforts of Chairman HAI ROGERS, Ranking Member NTRA LOWY, and of all the members of the Defense Subcommittee.

This bill, obviously, could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, discerning judgment, and thoughtful input of our committee staff and personal staffs. I thank them very much.

The chairman has fully and fairly described the bill we are considering today. I believe he has accurately described the very dangerous and unpredictable world in which we live. As such, I will enter my detailed comments on the bill for the RECORD.

Instead, I want to use my time during general debate to discuss the albatross around Congress neck—the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Despite near universal disdain and plenty of buyer’s remorse from the 187 current House Members who voted in favor of the Budget Control Act, it has proven to be an extremely resilient—yet overly inscrutable—piece of law.

We have seen short postponements of sequestration. We have seen 2-year extensions of the budget caps. Yet we find ourselves nearly 5 years since its enactment far from the consensus needed to repeal the law.

Further, the continued halfhearted attempts to fix the Budget Control Act are almost as detrimental to the law, itself, as they add to the Nation’s uncertainty.

Additionally, it is becoming increasingly difficult to point to any positive changes to the situation as a result. While intended to reduce the budget deficit through spending limits and reductions, our national debt has increased by 24.5 percent since the enactment of the legislation, mainly because the committees that are not truly constrained by discretionary spending caps continue to push politically popular legislation with little regard for its impact on the Federal budget.

For example, in April of this year, Congress passed legislation that permanently fixed the longstanding issues with Medicare’s payment rates for physician services. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this fix will result in a $141 billion increase in Federal budget deficits over the next 10 years; yet the measure sailed through both Houses of Congress with very little opposition, and it was greeted by a cheerful signing statement at the White House. After 17 temporary measures, this permanent fix was long overdue. However, I believe it illustrates my larger point that we are nowhere close to having a sincere conversation about our deficits while nondiscretionary spending and a lack of revenue continue to, largely, get a free pass.

Until the President and Congress stop whistling past the graveyard and allow the growth and mandatory spending, while simultaneously increasing revenues, our committee—the Appropriations Committee—has no choice but to carry out the implausible mandate contained in the law to cut defense deficits with jurisdiction over only 34 percent of one half of the Federal Ledger.

It does not help, I fear, that a majority of our colleagues have no idea when the fiscal year starts except that that is when you shut the government down. I despair that most think continuing resolutions are the norm and that sequestration is not all that bad, and that there is some delight every time a civilian is furloughed. To me, all are symptoms of failure.

The time we have caused people to waste by not finishing Congress’ work on time, enacting innumerable continuing resolutions, and vacillating from one top line to another is deplorable. Whether it is a Federal agency, a State, other political subdivisions, a nonprofit organization, contractors, or an allied nation all have been less efficient in recent years because of the constant uncertainty surrounding the Federal Government’s finances.

To illustrate, in nearly every fiscal year since the Budget Control Act’s enactment, there have been attempts to alter the caps on defense and non-defense spending. Two years ago, the House and Senate had allocations that were $91 billion apart, yet the sub-allocation for defense was only about $1 billion as far as a difference. Both were in excess of the caps. Needless to say, we landed somewhere between the two, but only after we wasted an incredible amount of time, and shut down the Federal Government.

While not a mirror image of 2 years ago, the fiscal year 2016 process is careening toward a similar fate. This fiscal year, the President got the process started by submitting a budget request that did not comply with the limitations of the Budget Control Act across all budgeted fiscal years. The majority party’s response to the President was to pass a budget resolution that purports to abide by the caps for fiscal year 2016 for defense and non-defense spending, yet evades the defense cap by proposing $38 billion above the President’s budget request for overseas contingency operations—for purposes of this act, the global war on terror. Despite the objections of the Secretary of Defense, this additional funding was further entrenched by the recently passed fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

There is no question that Presidents Bush and Obama, the Department of Defense, and Congress have been complicit since 2001 in using emergency war funding to resource enduring requirements for the military. For the past few years, despite the constraints of the Budget Control Act, led by my good friend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, has begun to make strides in limiting what is an eligible expense for OCO and shift activities to the base budget; and he is definitely correct that was done because it is increasingly difficult, after 14 years, to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our great Nation and our interests.

Needless to say, I find the increased reliance on contingency funding very troubling—and not because I object to providing additional funds for the Department of Defense. I agree with the Department, and I agree with the chairman that sticking to the caps for defense spending would necessitate our forces assuming unreasonable risk in carrying out our national defense strategy.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we need a strong nation as well as a strong defense. We cannot continue to let our country deteriorate, with interstate bridges that collapse and kill our citizens, meaningful scientific research that starves, and a population whose educational attainment falls further and further behind.

Looking ahead, only the most Pollyannaish among us fails to see that we will be in the throes of another crisis in December. Our time, our staff’s time, Congress’ time, the country’s time should not be wasted any longer.

The President of the United States and the leaders of both parties of both Houses ought to start meaningful negotiations now so that they can conclude before October 1 to allow this great committee, the Committee on Appropriations, to again do the business of the country in an orderly, thoughtful, and timely fashion.

I stress, this is not an issue of process. Congress should not be searching for ways to alter the process in order to avoid making hard decisions on an annual basis. This is a matter of will, and we need to use the power of the purse for the fullest.

I expressed a number of concerns, but I would close, relative to the legislation before us, given the constraints that this committee faces, by observing that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the subcommittee have done an exceptional job in putting this bill together. In particular, the chairman has been meticulous with the $37.5 billion added to title IX of this bill. He has avoided the easy path. Rather, he has painstakingly worked to provide the needed resources to fortify our forces in the field. Further, the chair was very thoughtful in his construction of the base portion of the bill, and
I believe it and the report provide the stability needed for our military personnel—as the chairman emphasized, its readiness—and it preserves our industrial base.

I close by indicating I look forward to the briefing described earlier and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Defense Appropriations bill. The demands on our military are high. We are confronted with escalating Russian and Chinese aggression, threats from ISIS and other Islamic terrorist groups, burgeoning nuclear programs in countries like North Korea, and ongoing war in Syria, Yemen, Libya, and other places. We just don’t know what may sprout up next. But in the face of this uncertainty, we can ensure that our military forces are ready and able to meet whatever challenges may arise. We can make very sure that our troops and command structures have the tools and support that they need to protect this great Nation and our way of life.

To this end, the bill provides $578.6 billion in discretionary funding. That is $24.4 billion above the last year’s level and includes $58.4 billion to ensure that we can meet the needs of our military as they fight the global war on terrorism.

This level of funding complies with the caps set by the Budget Control Act, as well as the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. Within this total, the bill prioritizes military readiness, providing $219 billion for operation and maintenance programs that keep our troops trained and prepared to respond quickly and decisively.

The bill also provides priority funding to ensure that our Armed Forces are supplied with the equipment and the weapons that they need to conduct successful military operations.

Mr. Chairman, our military is the best in the world, and this bill ensures that it stays that way. We invest $67.9 billion in research and development that will keep us on the cutting edge of defense technology and enable us to meet the range of future threats to our security.

But our military is nothing without the brave men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much in their service to this Nation. We must keep morale high and provide the best health and well-being of our warfighters and their families. So the bill includes a 2.3 percent pay raise for our troops. That is more than the President requested.

The bill contains $31.7 billion for the Defense Health Program to meet all estimate needs this year. This funding includes important increases above the President’s request for things like cancer research, traumatic brain injury and psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriations bill accomplishes all of this but also takes important steps to streamline spending at the Pentagon, ensuring that no dollar goes to waste and that we live within our means.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee staff and members and his very trusted ranking member for their good bipartisan work on this bill. The chairman and ranking member demonstrated ironclad commitment to our troops and to the security of this Nation with this bill. I would also like to acknowledge the hard-working staff, Mr. Chairman. They spent many, many hours preparing this bill for consideration by us today.

Mr. Chairman, above all else—above all else—we must provide for the national defense of the United States. Nothing can exist—not our domestic government, not our private enterprise, not our freedoms—without ensuring that that basic need is met.

Our national security is far too important to fall victim to political games. We can’t risk having an underfunded military during these uncertain times, and our troops deserve unflagging, unanimous support as they lay their lives on the line. No political games on this bill, Mr. Chairman. This is for real.

I urge Members to support this bill. These are bipartisan priorities addressed in a bipartisan way, and I want to see that our colleagues send a strong message to our military showing our support and our willingness to sacrifice for them. I urge support of this bill on this floor.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full committee. At the start of this debate, Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and Chairman ROGERS for their efforts. I particularly want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for working in such a cooperative manner.

However, the two parties remain very far apart in their approach to the appropriations process. Our differences were plainly evident during consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. Not one of my Democratic colleagues supported the majority’s budget because it maintained sequestration levels. As the President said: the majority has returned our economy to the same top-down economics that has failed us before and slashes investments in the middle class that we need to grow the economy.

During debate on the previous five appropriations bills, my majority colleagues argued strenuously that allocations at that level were non-negotiable. They argued our committee was hamstrung by the Budget Control Act and that we were powerless to re-negotiate another sequester relief package, as had been done under the Murray-Ryan agreement 2 years ago. At the same time, others on our committee told the press that “pressure would build” to address sequestration or pass a continuing resolution because sequester-level bills were not enacted.

The Defense bill before us appears to be operating under a different set of rules, with funding over the magical sequester level, a level we were told was the law of the land. It was not cut because the President were all the other nondefense bills. By using $38 billion in overseas contingency operations funding to plug the hole created by the budget caps, this bill fully funds defense programs and avoids the inadequacies facing the other bills.

Let me be very, very clear. I am not making a case that the Defense bill is too high or advocating that it should be reduced. We live in a very dangerous world. We need to attend to our defense needs and we should do so in a responsible fashion.

Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department’s ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon’s regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.

This practice irresponsibly addresses only one of the budget imperatives, creating clear losers in most of the other appropriation bills.

If this bill were to move forward as is, I fear my majority colleagues would mentally move on; the urgency facing the entire appropriations process would fade because we have been taken care of—our national security needs.

That, my friends, is a dangerous strategy, especially given that we know none of these bills are likely to be signed into law by the President as they are currently written.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. We can deal with that fact now or deal with it again over the holidays, but we are going to have to deal with it.

Members of the armed services and their families live in every one of our communities. They drive crowded highways and over crumbling bridges. Most of them send their kids to public schools.

These families expect the meat and products they buy to be safe and the airplanes in which they fly to be protected. They expect sick people to get sick, they need to have the biomedical research in place so that safe and effective treatments are available to them.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentlewoman has expired.

Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department’s ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon’s regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.
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Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department’s ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon’s regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.
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Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department’s ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon’s regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.

Our military leaders have discouraged the use of the overseas contingency operations/global war on terror budget to fund regular defense costs. They contend that doing so undermines the Defense Department’s ability to plan over the long term. Funding $38 billion of the Pentagon’s regular base budget activities with war funds creates future-year budget caps that would be difficult to fill.
These are reasonable expectations. What is not reasonable is to put forward several annual spending bills that mindlessly cut these priorities simply because we can’t agree on a reasonable budget.

National security and economic strength are inextricably linked. Let’s get back to the table and set realistic spending caps to provide what is needed both for our national security and to create jobs, improve infrastructure, fund biomedical research, and grow the economy.

Let’s get together. Let’s vote “no” on this bill and move on.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENshaw) and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for the hard work they have put into bringing the bill before us today. I think, arguably, this is the most important issue we face every year.

Last year I pointed out the fact that I think the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and we work to do that every day. We talked about the fact that the best way to keep America safe is to keep America strong. I think that, if you look back, here we are a year later, and not much has changed.

National security is still a critical element of what we do here. Back home in northeast Florida, the constituents that I represent are greatly concerned about national security. They are greatly concerned about the men and women in uniform and greatly concerned that they will have the necessary resources to accomplish their mission successfully and return home safely.

They are also concerned that we don’t get caught up in the politics of the moment and lose sight of the fact that we have a constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I just want to say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that, when we look at the ever-increasing dangerous world that we live in, I think we have to meet these challenges head on.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill.

Please allow me to acknowledge the tremendous work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and the Appropriations staff in moving this Defense bill forward.

This bill deserves better treatment by the leadership of this House than to have it cloaked in unfinished budget wrangling that could force future changes harmful to the defense of our Nation.

The bill before us funds key priorities, such as assuring the strongest, most agile and resilient military on Earth; securing base and operational independence through energy innovation; improving defense health for the lives of our military and civilian forces; advancing cutting-edge research at our defense labs to improve efficiency on the battlefield and drive technology transfer to the private sector to grow our economy; and maintaining and upgrading essential defense facilities across our Nation and globe.

Moving forward, our Nation must still address lingering veteran unemployment among 2 million Americans, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. A majority are 45 years of age or older, but over 200,000 are between the ages of 18 and 44.

The capabilities of our National Guard remain too small to address this imperative, engaging their talents to meet domestic needs.

Globally, too, as leader of the free world, the United States holds a special responsibility to uphold commitments made in the Budapest Memorandum to Ukraine and our allies in Central Europe. This was recently reaffirmed by President Obama and German Chancellor Merkel at the G7 summit.

A threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere. Russia’s invasion of Ukraine cannot be tolerated. Tough sanctions on Russia and enforcement of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act lay the base for liberty’s advancement.

Those Members who in good conscience ultimately will vote “no” on this measure will do so to fight for a responsible budget plan that not only meets the needs of our men and women in uniform, but builds up the Nation and citizenry they are fighting to protect.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a member of the Appropriation Committee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working closely with you on this important issue. I can tell you I know where the finest warships are built by the finest craftsmen, that is right there in Mississippi’s Fourth Congressional District.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and concerns and for his own military service. I share his concern.

The gentleman is correct. The Navy has been struggling to maintain its shipbuilding program for many years. Despite a requirement for 306 ships, the Navy’s fleet has seemed to reach a plateau of about 285 ships for the last several years.

It is our responsibility to work with you and the Navy to ensure that our sailors and marines have the finest ships and equipment this Nation can provide.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working closely with you on this important issue. I can tell you I know where the finest warships are built by the finest craftsmen, that is right there in Mississippi’s Fourth Congressional District.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his passion and his remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, for more than a decade, this House has been committed to providing our troops with the body armor they need. Body armor is essential to our deployed troops.

In order to provide our troops with modern, lightweight body armor, the Department requires a viable industrial base to produce the body armor and to continually work to improve it. The fiscal year 2015 NDAA Defense Appropriations bill sustaining the industrial base was prioritized: $80 million was appropriated to the Army to
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today to echo the concerns expressed by my colleague across the aisle from Minnesota in concern for our Nation’s warfighters and our military base.

As you know, the FY15 NDAA authorized and the FY15 Defense Appropriations bill provided $30 million for a body armor industrial base initiative in the Army’s operations and maintenance program. However, the U.S. Army is not properly utilizing the appropriated funds in the manner Congress intended.

Congress has been clear on this matter. Report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations measures states that the importance of body armor is critical to protecting our soldiers in combat. Because of the Army’s repurposing of these funds at odds with congressional intent and the safety of our troops, the Army’s body armor industrial base will lose the unique capability critical for meeting high-tech U.S. light-weight body armor standards.

After the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we must rehabilitate and replace used body armor to ensure the readiness and the safety of our troops in the field if they are called to serve in another conflict.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BARR. If we do not act now to ensure that the body armor industrial base is able to continue to develop and manufacture more advanced lightweight body armor, there will not be a capable body armor industrial base left in the future to fund.

Mr. VISCHLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a colloquy. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana. Mr. VISCHLOSKEY, I yield.

Mr. VISCHLOSKEY. I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention. We look forward to working with you on this important issue as we move forward with the legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for the purpose of a colloquy. He is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. Mr. VISCHLOSKEY, I yield his work to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, this legislation includes billions of dollars to programs that are vital to the Nation’s security and the men and women who have volunteered to serve our Nation.

However, I do have a question regarding a recommended reduction of $61 million from the Missile Defense Agency request for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle. Does the gentleman share my belief that this is a critically important program, and that it, and the 2020 goal for deployment of this capability, are vital to a robust and reliable national missile defense system, which is paramount to the defense of the Nation against ever more capable adversary ballistic missiles?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I agree with the gentleman, and I hope the gentleman from California, at the very least, will agree that the oversight of scarce defense dollars is important. The request for this program has spiked significantly between fiscal years 2015 and 2016. Yet, there is no real acquisition plan.

The Department owes us this information if we are to be responsible stewards of these taxpayer dollars.

Mr. ROGERS. Alabama, I thank the gentleman for that explanation, and I hope he will let me know if there is anything the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces can do to make sure that the Department knows that the acquisition strategy needs to be delivered to the Congress without further delay.

The gentleman also assure me that the deployment of the Aegis Ashore site in Poland remains a priority of his and that its deployment by not later than December of 2018 will not be affected by any of the marks in this bill today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Alabama that this deployment is vital to our missile defense, and the United States should be grateful for strong allies like Poland.

Nothing in the bill today will in any way impact the one-time deployment of the European Phased Adaptive Approach Phase III.

Mr. ROGERS. Alabama, I thank the gentleman. I look forward to supporting the bill today and urge the House to do the same to get this vital bill passed and to the President for his support of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCHLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask how much time remains for both sides, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8% minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCHLOSKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank our ranking member for yielding, and for your tremendous leadership on this subcommittee.

I also want to thank the ranking member and our chair for including report language on the Department of Defense’s efforts to achieve auditability by the end fiscal 2017.

Ensuring that the Pentagon is auditable is common sense, and it is something that Congress mandated, mind you, 25 years ago. It is long past due to address the culture of unlimited spending and zero accountability at the Pentagon, and I know this issue has strong bipartisan support.
Yet, there are many provisions of this bill which I cannot support. The appropriations bill includes an additional $38 billion over budget caps in the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and that is what it is; it is a slush fund. This is simply outrageous and totally unseemly. In my opinion, it should be eliminated.

We should have transparency, and the public should know how much it is costing to fight these wars.

This bill includes $1.3 billion for DOD operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant. Mr. Chair, it has been 10 months since the war started and 4 months since the President submitted his draft authorization to Congress, and Congress has yet to act. Now we see additional troops being sent into this war zone. Again, no congressional debate, no vote.

Congress cannot continue to fund a war—and that is what this is—without a robust debate on an ISIL-specific authorization. The reason why I offered an amendment in committee, which was adopted on a bipartisan basis, that simply reaffirms that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force.

It is also why I am offering two amendments to this bill that would prohibit funding for the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force. With these authorizations still on the books, Congress is allowing this President—and any President really—to wage war against anyone, at any time, anywhere.

I hope we defeat this bill because we have got to stop this policy of endless wars.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to express my support for the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill and my appreciation for the hard work of the chairman in drafting this very good bill, which will provide essential funding to our national security.

However, I have a serious concern with the production of funding in this bill for an existing weather collection satellite called the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, or DMSP.

As early as 2017, our military is facing a critical capability gap in the Department of Defense’s two highest priority weather requirements. As the Air Force continues to work through its plan for addressing weather requirements, launching DMSP will help address those issues.

Much has been spent on DMSP already, and it would be a shame to waste those dollars when the satellite could be put to good use.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that the Air Force has not properly managed the space weather program, and they must submit a better plan. However, I ask for your support in working with me in conference to ensure that our military and intelligence professionals need to safely prosecute our missions.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And congratulations on producing a very good bill that will provide the necessary funding to properly defend our Nation.

And let me express my appreciation for providing $26 million in your bill to fund an Air Force pilot program for the acquisition of commercial SATCOM services.

Aligned with the House-passed fiscal year 2016 NDAA, the program has the potential to lower costs and increase utilization of commercial satellites.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss military satellite communications, or SATCOM. As you are aware, the demand for SATCOM has increased by a factor of 10 since the outset of our simultaneous commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it continues to grow.

Further, the need for protection against jamming, spoofing, and other interference has also increased as our adversaries deploy more sophisticated countermeasures to deny and degrade communications to our warfighters.

The government-operated SATCOM system, Wideband Global Satellite Communications System, or WGS, cannot keep up with demand—not even close. As a result, the Air Force has sought less expensive, more protected SATCOM solutions from the commercial sector to augment national capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, the military needs more SATCOM capacity, and it needs it protected. Congress can help by restoring $32.8 million for development and testing activities associated with the Protected Tactical Testbed.

We also need additional funding for the Protected Tactical Wave Form itself. This effort will help make both commercial and WGS satellites more robust and protected against jamming. Alongside the Air Force’s pilot program I referenced earlier, the Protected Tactical Testbed, and Wave Form may begin to give warfighters access to a global architecture of protected commercial SATCOM.

That said, I understand the Air Force has programmatic challenges with the Protected Tactical Testbed that must be addressed. However, I urge the committee to keep an open mind in conference. If the Air Force addresses your concerns, then I hope the committee will consider restoring funding for the Protected Tactical Testbed and Wave Form.

I thank you again for this opportunity to speak on such an important issue to our military servicemen and women.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen from Alabama and Oklahoma, both veterans, for bringing these matters to our attention, and we look forward to working with you on this issue as we move forward with the legislation.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH),
the dean of the New Jersey delegation, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding, and I rise to raise an issue of particular importance to my constituents in New Jersey.

Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst was created by the 2005 BRAC round. And while joint basing has been successfully implemented at MDL, there remains an outstanding issue of gross unfairness for some employees.

The male majority of employees at the joint base are included in the New York pay locality area; yet, the wage grade employees on the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix remain in the Philadelphia locality area. These employees work on the same installation, but they are paid 7 percent less than their counterparts for the same work.

Joint Base MDL made a formal request for realignment of the Philadelphia wage survey area to OPM’s Advisory Committee, FPRA, in 2010, and the base leadership continues to believe pay parity should be a priority.

Mr. Chairman, the joint base is a critical asset to DOD and our National security. Their missions could not be carried out effectively without the skills of the men and women stationed there and those working in civilian support roles across the base.

Joint Base MDL is one installation, and the men and women who work there are part of the same workforce. It is timed to fix this outdated policy.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that you will work with me to bring about fairness to the roughly 20 percent of the workforce that does not receive equally earned pay.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank my colleague for his leadership and for bringing my attention to this important matter. I assure him we will look forward to working with him as we move forward with our bill into conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the chairman, for your commitment to the men and women who support our warfighters. I look forward to working with you to move the pay parity for all joint base employees forward.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY.

Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

As you are aware, our Nation’s Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, or FFRDCs, play a critical role in advancing national security goals and ensuring that our Nation stays at the cutting edge of technological innovation.

Mr. Chair, I wanted to engage in this colloquy to clarify Congress’ intent in section 803(3)(c), which states: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC through a fee or other payment mechanism for construction of new buildings.”

Mr. Chair, I am concerned that some could take an expansive interpretation of this provision, that it’s this provision that’s preventing the execution of critical facilities modernization projects, even when authorized by Congress through military construction projects.

I am also concerned about the provision’s medium- and long-term implications for building maintenance and facility modernization projects that are necessary to continue important innovation programs for decades to come.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, is it the committee’s understanding that this provision is not intended to apply to military construction projects or to advanced planning and design funds that are authorized by Congress?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. TSONGAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. TSONGAS, yes, that is my understanding.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with you, and I appreciate that construction.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee. Is that your understanding?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is my understanding as well.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you both, and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, could you give us the time that we each have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my support for the Vets4Warriors program, a program in my district that is operated by Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care. Rutgers University has provided invaluable assistance to the military in their efforts to prevent suicide among veterans. The program ensures that those veterans who are struggling with depression or psychological concerns get the support they need; peer-to-peer.

Safely, the Defense has terminated this program without any public notice. Our nation is now faced with a crisis: since the start of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, more than 3,000 active-duty personnel have taken their own lives. Programs like Vets4Warriors help us to combat this troubling trend.

The Vets4Warriors program is unique and will be difficult to replace. It allows veterans a safe space in which they can find help apart from the DOD structure. Service members are often hesitant to reach out to their superiors regarding personal concerns like mental health. By integrating these programs into the Department’s Military OneSource program, many service members will lose the sense of confidentiality provided by Vets4Warriors.

We must fulfill our responsibility to care for those who put themselves in harm’s way to protect our nation. It is my hope that the DOD will reconsider their decision so that we can assure our veterans have access to the best mental health resources possible.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except those moving the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking minority member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. Chair, I wanted to engage in this colloquy to clarify Congress’ intent in section 803(3)(c), which states:
The Turkish army delivers crucial messages—especially with the local population, especially with women, and carrying out civil-military cooperation projects effectively in the health care and education sectors. Thus, the Turkish army is determined to establish more effective links with local populations in low-intensity conflict areas and peace support missions.

The ideological reason for increasing the number of females in the Turkish army is women and a more active participation of women in society.

A female in uniform backed by the Turkish army would be better disciplined. I want to thank Turkey, for instance, inclined to violence against his wife. “Because of my uniform and as stipulated by law, I will go after anyone using women, but then, of course, the finding that these organizations are employers of women in society.

...standing our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality: the Caliphate, ISIL, ISIS, Boko Haram, al Qaeda, al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. We are also finding that these organizations are using women, but then, of course, the institutionalized militaries are also putting more women in.

What better interface than that of the United States military and women, in particular.

I have an article that I would like to submit into the RECORD, “Turkey’s Women Expand Role in Military.”

TURKEY’S WOMEN EXPAND ROLE IN MILITARY

At the 20th International Defence Film Festival in Rome, a documentary by film director Elif Ovar of the Turkish Army’s Photo-Film Center was selected for the Jury’s Award.

Her documentary “Light of Hope”—about Senay Haydar, Turkey’s first female gendarmerie commander and senior non-commissioned officer (NCO), against the backdrop of gender and discrimination and violence against women in the small Anatolian town of Mesudiye—atttracted much interest.

Haydar works closely with local officials and families and has been credited for eradicating violence against women among the 40,000 residents of Mesudiye. Thanks to Haydar’s actions, there hasn’t been a single case of violence against women in the last nine months in Mesudiye.

Ovar told Al-Monitor that a woman she has been much impressed with Haydar’s accomplishments in the Anatolian town where traditional culture prevails. “NCO Senay’s success, as much as this is due to [her own accomplishments], is also the success of the commanders who believed in her.” Ovar said. “Appointing a female NCO as a representative of law and order to a town with 40,000 residents is truly a revolution for the Turkish army.”

Over the last three years, there have been extensive changes in the personnel policy of the Turkish army with the increase of the number of females in the army and, in part, this was the case with Haydar, in assigning women to active field positions instead of just administrative work at the headquarters.

In an interview with Al-Monitor Haydar said: “I always wanted to be a field commander, the idea of working at a desk. I was encouraged by the Gendarmerie General Command. When the results of my employment turned out to be positive, scores of female officers and NCOs followed in my footsteps.” According to a source at the Gendarmerie School in Beykent, Ankara, in October alone, 67 female cadets were accepted to the Gendarmerie General Command field posts after they completed their basic training; another 90 female NCOs and 30 officers will follow.

Capt. Hussein Al-Shebli of the Uh-60 Sikorsky helicopter at Ankara’s Gendarmerie Aviation School, is the first female gendarmerie pilot in Turkey. In an interview with Al-Monitor she said: “My husband is a captain. I raised my daughters Bensu and Ovar told Al-Monitor that as a woman she is inclined to violence against his wife. “Because of my uniform and as stipulated by law, I will go after anyone using women, but then, of course, the finding that these organizations are using women will have the ability to provide the resources that they need.

In particular, my amendment is recognizing the new face of war and the new form of terrorism.

I hold up these pictures of the numbers of countries who are adding women to their military. America, of course, has had women in different parts of its military for a number of years, going back to nurses in World War I and II and in the various types of work that have been done recently in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the women are enormously proud and very effective.

My amendment simply says that, in this new war on terrorism and human trafficking, we would have the opportunity to use the women in the United States military who have achieved levels of rank that are extremely important to be able to train and to provide technical assistance to those who are just adding women to their military.

The United States Armed Forces possesses an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists, who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons—especially women, girls, and the elderly—but we must also recognize that, notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality: the Caliphate, ISIL, ISIS, Boko Haram, al Qaeda, al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. We are also finding that these organizations are using women, but then, of course, the institutionalized militaries are also putting more women in.

What better interface than that of the United States military and women, in particular.

I have an article that I would like to submit into the RECORD, “Turkey’s Women Expand Role in Military.”

TURKEY’S WOMEN EXPAND ROLE IN MILITARY

At the 20th International Defence Film Festival in Rome, a documentary by film director Elif Ovar of the Turkish Army’s Photo-Film Center was selected for the Jury’s Award.

Her documentary “Light of Hope”—about Senay Haydar, Turkey’s first female gendarmerie commander and senior non-commissioned officer (NCO), against the backdrop of gender and discrimination and violence against women in the small Anatolian town of Mesudiye—attacted much interest.

Haydar works closely with local officials and families and has been credited for eradicating violence against women among the 40,000 residents of Mesudiye. Thanks to Haydar’s actions, there hasn’t been a single case of violence against women in the last nine months in Mesudiye.

Ovar tolidd the amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So my amendment, of course, is to provide that...
pathway for the collaboration of U.S. military women with other excellent forces to be able to help these women and to be able to fight the global war on terrorism through technical assistance, counsel, and advice, which I think will address the important need of the military, but, more importantly, to the work of the United States military.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCOSI for shepherding this legislation to the floor for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe and for their work in ensuring that they have resources needed to keep our Armed Forces the greatest fighting force for peace on earth.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth.

The purpose of the Jackson Lee amendment is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, and narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Armed Forces possess an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons, especially women, girls, and the elderly.

But we are aware that notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality and decency.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Syrian Ansar Beil al-Maqdis in the Sinai peninsula which poses a threat to Egypt.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technologies and resources that promote the security of the American people and nation states.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as weapons of war, affecting over twenty thousand women and girls.

Looking at the history of terrorism alone highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this experience unites us at terrorism which has plagued us here in the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment will help curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical military expertise to military in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists in their country and to keep those terrorists out of our country.

Time and again American lives have been lost at the hands of terrorists.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers, schoolchildren, and members of the diplomatic corps and the Armed Services.

This is why the technical assistance offered by our military personnel is integral to promoting security operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and special operations forces.

Mr. Chairman, from the United States to Africa to Europe and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of highest national priorities.

Collectively, through every action and effort towards empowering our neighbors and their military to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe is in our national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read.

The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would like to take this moment to thank the chairman and the ranking member and their staff for working with me on this matter. I am hoping to be able to revise or to resubmit this.

At this time, if the chairman would allow me, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the withdrawal.

I thank the gentlewoman for her advocacy.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty while traveling between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–37, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $12,586,679,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty while traveling between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets, for members of the Air Force Reserve, for members of the Air Force Officer’s Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–37, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,226,952,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 12111, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under sections 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,866,691,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 12112 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code; and while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $705,271,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 12111, 10305, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,689,333,000.
For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard on duty under sections 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,202,010,000.

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under sections 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,202,010,000.

TITLE II
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law, $29,349,761,000: Provided, That not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by $1,000,000).

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $5,000,000)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, providing science, technology, engineering, and math education to America’s youth is critical to the global competitiveness of our Nation. The STARBASE program engages local fifth-grade elementary students by exposing them to STEM subjects through an inquiry-based curriculum and is currently active in 56 congressional districts throughout the Nation. Today I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member Visclosky for their strong leadership in reestablishing funding for the program over the past 2 years. I am respectfully requesting an additional $5 million to help expand the program nationwide.

Today I am offering STARBASE amendment No. 18 to H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. My amendment increases funding to the STARBASE Youth Program by $5 million, and while providing support for the program, it also reduces spending by $1 million.

The STARBASE program is carried out by the Army, Navy, and Air Force services because the lack of STEM-educated youth in America has been identified as a future national security issue by the Department of Defense. Two years ago, both the House and Senate rejected the Office of Management and Budget’s, the OMB, proposal to terminate this critical program.

As a Member of Congress, I appreciate OMB’s desire to consolidate STEM’s programs across the spectrum into one funding line. Mr. Chair, this is a national defense item and has been identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as such. STARBASE was created under the auspices of the Department of Defense to meet its critical needs in STEM-related fields. Regrettably, the funding uncertainty caused by OMB’s action during that time resulted in the elimination of all programs operated by the Navy and reduced the fundable number of DOD STARBASE programs from 79 to 56. DOD currently has 25 sites on the waiting list for a program, and that is why we need a small increase in funding for a number of STARBASE programs.

It is one of the most effective STEM programs as well. The students demonstrate undisputed improvement in STEM.

I will conclude by reading a warrant officer's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $40,548,338,000: Provided, That not to exceed $15,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $5,328,785,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance...
of the Air Force, as authorized by law, $36,094,481,000: Provided, That not to exceed $7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the appropriations to which the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense other than the military departments, as authorized by law, $30,182,187,000: Provided, That not more than $15,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: Provided further, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $35,045,000 shall be available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program of which not less than $2,500,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(c)(1)(D): Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available hereunder may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of the Army or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: Provided further, That $9,031,000,000, or $29,000,000, whichever is larger, available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment with the intent of bolstering funds for a worthwhile program in the National Guard that assists with securing our southwest border.

In my State of Arizona, we are under attack. The Arizona border is a main thoroughfare for the black market and trafficking. Guns, money, drugs, and people are smuggled over the border at an alarming rate. Once the smugglers make it to Interstate 10 in Tucson, they can make easier runs to Phoenix, Los Angeles, and beyond.

Let’s clarify that Arizona’s southwest border mission has bipartisan support. Even President Obama supported this program during his time in the White House. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois seek recognition?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise to ask which of the three amendments I have before me is the one that we are now considering in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOSAR. 107.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I have got it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment once again.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reads the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. In fact, since 1981, Congress has authorized military support to civilian law enforcement agencies, and those narrow authorizations are prescribed in title 10, chapter 18 of the United States Code. When the United States sums, they act to support law enforcement efforts, but they do not direct them.

Finally, I will remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was offered last year by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), and the amendment was accepted by voice vote. This amendment today seeks to achieve the same goal. The amendment is offset by a reduction to the defensewide operations and maintenance account, $30.2 billion account.

Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas are all struggling. We are in desperate need of expertise and support at our southwestern border. If you support efforts to secure the border and interdict illegal trafficking in guns, money, drugs, and humans, including sex slaves, then you should support this amendment.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their tireless efforts to prioritize resources in this bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time, but I am in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the Representative from Arizona has firsthand knowledge of the value of the southwest border mission, and I support his amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PASCARELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to support your amendment.

I think all of us are particularly shocked that they would shut something down in our home State that actually serves the rest of the Nation. They enjoy a good reputation. It sort of falls into the category of “what were they thinking?” We appreciate your standing for the VetsWarriors.

Mr. LANCE. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PASCARELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.
Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. PASCARELL for his leadership on this issue, as he has led on so many other issues. I also thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN. It is due to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN’s leadership on this legislation that this bipartisan–equipped to keep our Nation safe and secure.

The Vets4Warriors program has saved lives in New Jersey. It has made a great difference during very challenging times for servicemen and servicewomen, who are often suffering and support on the other end of the telephone remind our brave heroes of their great potential, the love of a grateful nation, and what they can accomplish in their lives.

The program has been proven effective. Thousands of veterans have received critical care and assistance. It works and it should be maintained. The statistics on veterans’ suicides are heartbreaking, but programs like Vets4Warriors are the types of efforts that we can implement to make a lasting difference.

I applaud Deans of Bridgewater, New Jersey, and the district I serve for his support and leadership in this area, and for fighting for this program and for being a great friend and resource to other veterans.

I urge adoption of the amendment.
Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $1,500,000)’’.
Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,500,000)”.
Page 56, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,500,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I too am offering an amendment to bolster suicide prevention programs. I rise to offer an amendment which would provide additional resources for mental health programs for our Nation’s servicemembers. Traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder have been consistently contributing to behavioral issues with our veterans, and all too often these ongoing mental health issues result in suicide. With an average of 18 to 20 veteran suicides per day, more resources are desperately needed.

The DOD is already an expansive bureaucracy, and I appreciate the work of the committee to prioritize resources and to provide appropriation levels for the defense-wide operations and maintenance that are actually lower than those in fiscal year 2015.

My amendment takes a relatively small amount from that account—$1.5 million out of a $30.2 billion budget. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the amendment would have no impact on budget authority or outlays.

Too many of our men and women in uniform are struggling with traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of serving in combat. If you support increased mental health for our servicemembers, you should support this amendment. Let’s prevent future suicides amongst our troops and ensure they are getting the help they need. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I strongly admire the advocacy on behalf of suicide prevention by the gentleman from Arizona. It is very needed, but I insist on my point of order because the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the level of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by $7,463,000)”.
Page 88, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by $5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Maryland and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for their unwavering support of our national defense and our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the funding for a program called Fisher House from $5 million to $10 million, and it funds that increase by reducing the amount in the operation and maintenance account by $5 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Fisher House is a very successful and very well-regarded nonprofit with a single mission, which is to provide free housing and lodging to families of veterans. The facilities are located near veterans hospitals and medical hospitals in VA facilities.

The purpose of this housing is to allow the families of veterans to be with their loved ones, the servicemen or -women who have served our country and are receiving medical care at one of these facilities. Mr. Chairman, we know how important that is for the families and for the loved ones, but we know in particular how important that is for our veterans when they are receiving care incurred in the service to our great Nation for them to have their families with them.

The Fisher House program has been in business for 25 years, and they have been a proven and exceptional steward of taxpayer money at 65 facilities all around the country. Again, these facilities are near military hospitals or veterans facilities.

They operate to a very high standard. They have a deep pipeline of new facilities that they want to build. Unfortunately, there is a great need for these facilities, which is why we are proposing to increase their funding from $5 million to $10 million.

I have introduced this amendment for the past 3 years. It has enjoyed bipartisan support. This year, it also has the support of the gentlewoman from Michigan.
I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. Dingell).

Mrs. Dingell. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and for his leadership on this critically important issue. I rise in very strong support of this amendment.

For many years, I have worked with hospitalized veterans and their families who have often had to travel far from home to get treatment and have seen what the Fisher House has done. The Fisher House Foundation does wonders in being a home away from home during very difficult times for our veterans and their families.

As Congress continues to address veterans issues, it is critical that their families also have support systems in place and a safe place to stay while the veterans are receiving treatment.

We should be building more Fisher House facilities across the country. We are currently trying to put one in Michigan and, as I explored that possibility, I was encouraged by the gentlewoman from Michigan and, as I explored that possibility, I was encouraged by the Fisher House Foundation does wonders in helping veterans and their families.

Mr. FrelenghuySEN. Mr. Chairmen, I rise in opposition and I want to say that I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FrelenghuySEN. The Fisher House Foundation does incredible work. Both my predecessors, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Young, were strong supporters of this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. Delaney. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend Congressman Delaney for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. Delaney. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend Congressman Delaney for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. Delaney. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend Congressman Delaney for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

Mr. Delaney. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend Congressman Delaney for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment that helps veterans and their families.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the amendment, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed will control 5 minutes.

Mr. Delaney. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for allowing me to offer this amendment to this year's Defense Appropriations bill to establish and reestablish the Commission to assess the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attack, which was authorized in the House-passed FY16 NDAA.

Mr. Chairmen, as your committee knows, the United States faces many challenges today, perhaps more than ever before in history. One of those threats is the reliance across all critical infrastructure sectors on an aging and highly vulnerable electric grid.

As the GAO reported, the Department of Defense relies upon that very same electric grid for 99 percent of its electricity needs within the continental United States, without which it cannot effect its mission.

The previous EMP Commission stated that a collapse of large portions of the electrical system will result in significant periods of power outage and loss of significant portions of that system.

Should the electrical power system be lost for any substantial period of time, the consequences are likely to be catastrophic to civilian society. They concluded that negative impacts on the electrical infrastructure are certain in an EMP event. Practical steps are taken to provide protection for critical elements of the electrical system.

The Commission must be established, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that research into addressing these vulnerabilities continues within the Department of Defense to enable practical steps to actually secure and harden the grid. The House Armed Services Committee has already acted this year and authorized $2 million to reestablish the Commission.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that these funds are appropriated as well.

Mr. FrelenghuySEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FrankS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FrelenghuySEN. The gentleman brings up a huge issue, EMP, electromagnetic pulse. I accept the amendment.

Mr. FrankS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert: "reduced by $5,000,000" (increased by $5,000,000)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, formed in 1993, the Youth ChalleNGe is a 17-month program run by individual State National Guards. Its mission is to give troubled youth a second chance and to give them the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma.

Youth ChalleNGe has transformed the lives of over 120,000 young people since 1993 and has expanded to 35 sites in 27 States, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—people like Tatiana Zambrano, a 2011 Puerto Rico ChalleNGe Academy graduate, who with the help of Youth ChalleNGe overcame much adversity to graduate, as was stated, over 120,000 nationally. It is voluntary, free, with no cost to the child or to his or her family. It is a 22½-week residential boot camp program that is led by the National Guard cadre. It also prepares them to reenter society and to be successful, to build employment potential, and to return to school. A 2012 RAND study finds, for every dollar spent, it results in a return of $2.66 to the taxpayer.

It is rated as the best youth program in the Nation. It effectively addresses part of our Nation’s dropout epidemic on a small level. It is beneficial to business, communities, and the Nation’s ability to compete in our future economy. We need more programs, not fewer. More than 12,000 applicants are rejected due to no space, so we ask our colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is all about just trying to help these young kids get a second chance. By expanding this program as we are doing, which is a modest expansion to reach into some other States, we know we are going to reach some other lives that society has given up on. I don’t want to give up on them, and I don’t think our Nation wants to give up on them. This is a chance to do it, and I thank the committee for its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 15 and insert the following: "(reduced by $21,300,000)."

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert: "reduced by $21,300,000".

Mr. SABLAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, we all agree that the Department of Defense has the responsibility to defend our Nation, but the Department also has a responsibility to clean up after itself when it contaminates our environment or threatens public health, and we in Congress have a responsibility to give the military the money it needs for that cleanup.

The amendment I offer adds $21.3 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program.

I plan to withdraw the amendment out of respect for Chairman FREELINGHUYSEN and his subcommittee, which actually added $25 million to the FUDS program above the President’s budget request. Yet I want to make the point that we ought to keep the funding at the same level we appropriated in fiscal year 2015, which was $250 million, and that is what my amendment would do, because now is not the time for the military to backslide on its cleanup.

There are 5,000 sites—in every State and territory—that we know are contaminated, and these sites are not in someone else’s backyard. There are 67 Formerly Used Defense Sites in California, 62 in New Jersey, and there are 42 FUDS sites in Ranking Member VISCLOSKY’s State of Indiana. We are...
In the district I represent, which is the Northern Mariana Islands, there are 24 contaminated areas, dating back to World War II, that are still waiting to be cleaned up. For example, there are 17 rusted fuel tanks in the little village of Tanapag that have been leaking oil and sand since Harry Truman was President, and, every day, there are kids who are walking by on their way to school; there are fishermen in the lagoon just a few feet away; and, there are families who are living with the smell of oil in their homes.

This is not just an environmental issue. This unfinished cleanup damages our military’s ability to defend our Nation. Let me explain.

In the Northern Mariana Islands today, the Defense Department wants to expand training activities—using live fire, running pipelines, building more fuel tanks—doing the very things we know contaminate the environment and threaten public health. The people I represent are saying “no” to this expanded military activity.

Now, restoring FUDS funding will not change anyone’s mind about the military’s proposed buildup in my district, but at least the military will have a little more credibility when it promises that it will clean up after itself because, if the people I represent see Congress cutting funding for FUDS, then the military’s promise has no credibility at all.

This is not just about the Northern Mariana Islands. This is a national issue. We have 5,000 sites currently identified for cleanup nationwide and another 10,000 on the list of potentially contaminated sites. Even if we appropriate $250 million for 2016, it is not enough. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates a full cleanup cost of $14 billion. So, at $250 million a year, we will still be having this same discussion 50 years from now.

Again, I commend the chairman and his subcommittee for adding the $25 million to the Formerly Used Defense Sites program, but, ultimately, we all have to do better.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman’s statement before the floor and for bringing the issue to the Members’ attention.

As you frankly point out, not only for the constituency you represent but whether it was in any of our districts, as you also rightfully point out, this is a national problem. It tends to be forgotten because it is not seen visually by the average constituent. It is a very serious health and environmental problem, and I do appreciate your raising it during this particular debate.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection from the request of the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by $1,300,000,000)."

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by $10,000,000)."

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by $10,000,000)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote.

Veterans of the first Gulf war suffered from persistent symptoms, including chronic headaches, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, debilitating fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medicine or by psychiatric diagnoses.

Research shows that, as veterans from the first Gulf war age, they are twice as likely to develop Lou Gehrig’s disease as are their nondeployed peers. There also may be connections to multiple sclerosis and to Parkinson’s disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for this lifelong pain and affliction that these veterans must endure through this disease.

For decades, the Veterans Health Administration has downplayed any neurological basis for the disease, but recent research has shown unequivocally that this disease is biological in nature. The time has come for us to right the wrong that our servicemen and -women have had to live with now for over 20 years. In this Department of Defense Appropriations bill, we allocate more money for breast cancer, orthopaedic, and prostate cancer research than we do for finding a cure for Gulf War Illness. Equivalent funds are appropriated for ovarian cancer research.

I think if we are going to spend money on medical research within the Department of Defense, which I am in favor of, the Department must adequately fund research on those diseases that originate in war and wholly affect our servicemen and -women. Over a quarter of a million veterans display symptoms of this disease, and the time has come to find and to fund a cure for it.

The offset for my amendment today comes from the $30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account.

This increase would result in a total funding level of $90 million, which is still $10 million below what this account was funded at in 2001, more than a decade ago. The offset for my amendment comes from the $30 billion operation and maintenance, defensewide account.

This amendment passed the House by a voice vote last year and as part of an en bloc amendment the year before. I hope that we will all agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his previous amendment, which I supported,
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and also for this amendment, which supports greater funds for prostate cancer research.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of history, my predecessor died from prostate cancer, and, of course, around this room and around the country, we know too many have lost this battle. What they should do to look after their health and, therefore, the welfare of their families.

I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy in this area and also remind those who are on the Hill that I think next week the House will be sponsoring a screening for all men here. It is a good way not only to look after yourself, but the people who love you. I want to commend the gentleman for his advocacy on an annual basis and thank him for yielding the time. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I reclaim my time. I want to thank the chairman for his kind and insightful words, and I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in making sure that the healthcare needs of those who serve are met.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

Page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Alzheimer's disease is a threat to our country—not a direct threat like ISIS or al Qaeda, but it is an insidious, persistent threat, both to the minds and bodies of our family members and to the fiscal health of our country.

The Alzheimer’s Association estimates that the cost of caring for people with Alzheimer’s right now through the Medicare system is $226 billion. By the year 2050, it will be $1.1 trillion. This is a genuine budgetary threat. If it grows unchecked, the cost to Medicare from a single disease will zap our ability to pay for national security. Interestingly enough and timely enough, on the front page of USA Today is a story that reads how 15 percent of seniors have Alzheimer’s. For 30 years, we have known about a clear correlation between TBI and the risk of developing Alzheimer’s disease and other types of dementia. By researching the link between TBI and Alzheimer’s, we can help cure both.

I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the funding for the Peer Reviewed Alzheimer’s Research Program from $12 million to its prequestration levels of $15 million, but the funding for Alzheimer’s research in the United States is still underfunded.

Today, I am offering this amendment to increase the funding for the Peer Reviewed Program by $5 million, which would take it up to $20 million. This modest investment from modest revenues at the end of the year in research can eventually yield billions in savings in the future on the cost of care. That is why I urge my colleagues to support our servicemembers with TBI and Alzheimer’s and vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKAI

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Hawaii and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Alzheimer’s disease is a threat to our country—not a direct threat like ISIS or al Qaeda, but it is an insidious, persistent threat, both to the minds and bodies of our family members and to the fiscal health of our country.

The Alzheimer’s Association estimates that the cost of caring for people with Alzheimer’s right now through the Medicare system is $226 billion. By the year 2050, it will be $1.1 trillion. This is a genuine budgetary threat. If it grows unchecked, the cost to Medicare from a single disease will zap our ability to pay for national security. Interestingly enough and timely enough, on the front page of USA Today is a story that reads how 15 percent of seniors have Alzheimer’s. For 30 years, we have known about a clear correlation between TBI and the risk of developing Alzheimer’s disease and other types of dementia. By researching the link between TBI and Alzheimer’s, we can help cure both.

I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the funding for the Peer Reviewed Alzheimer’s Research Program from $12 million to its prequestration levels of $15 million, but the funding for Alzheimer’s research in the United States is still underfunded.

Today, I am offering this amendment to increase the funding for the Peer Reviewed Program by $5 million, which would take it up to $20 million. This modest investment from modest revenues at the end of the year in research can eventually yield billions in savings in the future on the cost of care. That is why I urge my colleagues to support our servicemembers with TBI and Alzheimer’s and vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $25,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

Page 36, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment is designed specifically to support the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and to dramatically improve the quality of life while they are deployed.

On a daily basis, the United Service Organizations, USO, reaches United States military members in numerous ways. They provide calling cards at deployed locations for servicemembers to call their families. They provide toiletries and necessities for deployed servicemembers and those in austere locations. They are the first persons to
welcome back redeploying servicemembers. They volunteer to run morale and welfare tents offering Internet connectivity for deployed locations. Connecting troops to their families through calling cards and the Internet is just part of the USO’s plus program portfolio, but it is incredibly important to our deployed men and women and to their spouses, parents, siblings, and children.

In an era where our servicemembers are fighting prolonged wars, connecting them to their families and friends back home is a service to our military that we cannot afford to underfund. In fact, 93 percent of troops surveyed in 2012 agreed that USO services boost morale, ease separation from friends and family, and convey a feeling of support to the servicemember. Unfortunately, however, our deployed servicemembers too often go to the USO tent only to find that USO provisions, including supplies and calling cards, have been decreased. Increasing funding to the USO will help alleviate this unacceptable problem.

In the proposed fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations bill, the USO is funded at just $20 million. This amendment will reduce the operations and maintenance defense-wide account by less than one two-thousandths, while having an immeasurable impact on the quality of life of our servicemen and women.

It has been a time for us to look at the quality of life of the men and women that sacrifice everything to defend our Nation. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. I would like to salute the dean of the House for his strong support of the USO. Over 40 years ago, I was one of those soldiers, and it made a real difference in my life.

All of us want to thank the gentleman for his significant leadership here over so many years and for choosing this incredibly wonderful organization to plus up.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by $1,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by $1,000,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. We haven’t received a copy of the amendment. Will there be a copy? Will we have a copy of the amendment if that would be possible. That is the reason for the reservation.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to add an additional $1 million for research and development of Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Duchenne muscular dystrophy is the most common genetic disorder affecting American children today.

In this amendment, we propose to take a $1 million cut to the USO and increase it to $2 million.

It is a progressive neuromuscular disorder that affects approximately 1 in every 3,500 boys or 200,000 babies born each year worldwide. Over time, patients experience severe loss of muscle strength and control.

Most boys diagnosed with Duchenne lose their ability to walk by the time they become teenagers. There is no known cure for Duchenne, and life expectancy for individuals with this disease are significantly shortened. Many do not live past their 21st birthday.

Like many of my colleagues, I have met with many Duchenne patients and their families and have seen the impact this disease has and what it imparts on their daily lives.

There have been very promising advances in recent years, including development of a new drug which has achieved success in early clinical trials. I have had one child in my district confined to a wheelchair who, under this clinical trial, is able to walk by himself currently. However, much more work needs to be done to find a cure for this disease and to better understand what causes Duchenne in the first place.

This amendment will directly benefit the thousands of Duchenne patients throughout the United States, as well as their countless loved ones who care for them every day. By increasing funding for peer-reviewed research, institutions across the country will have the resources necessary to make progress on eliminating this devastating disease.

We as a nation are on the cusp of historic progress in advancing critical research. Now is the time to recommit to robust support of our country’s biomedical research for this disease.

In closing, I would like to thank the countless physicians, researchers, and scientists who work tirelessly to find a cure for Duchenne. I would also like to thank the Jett Foundation, which has long been a national leader in increasing awareness and providing support for patients and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and thank the chair and ranking member for their consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order. We are doing the more home-work on the amendment. Certainly, I am supportive of it.

I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I understand the gentleman’s concern is the lack of the copy of the amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. I think we wanted to make sure we have the figure that go with what it is set against.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make sure it comports to the rule of the House. We are not against it. We just want to make sure it is in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. We had moved this with a later change to the defense-wide operations and maintenance fund for the pay-for for this; that probably explains this balance, but it is coming from that portion. The $1 million, I think, is in excess, if my memory is correct, of the $3.5 million that is already there.

We are able to leverage this for a greater opportunity to move quickly on this. That is the rationale. That is where it came from.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. While I check the figures to make sure that it is properly offset, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. KEATING. I would just like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN), the chairman, if that information is currently being analyzed now.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSSEN. If the gentleman will yield, there is some consultation going on at the desk. At the conclusion of those consultations with the Parliamentarian, I will have a better opportunity to respond in, hopefully, a more positive fashion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the chairman for the effort he is going through and the consideration he is giving with this.

Many times, we have the opportunity to talk to families and deal with issues. It is a particular issue, we have an opportunity. As I mentioned, we are right on the cusp of very significant research. Leveraging a small additional
amount now would have tremendous ramifications.

I was just completely struck by the fact that I saw a person—a young boy in his teens, confined to a wheelchair, like so many of those afflicted with this terrible disease, had to suffer through, and as a result of those clinical trials, to see that person no longer in a wheelchair and up and ambulatory and walking, those are the type of dramatic improvements we are on the cusp of right now.

This is why this amendment just seeks to get an incremental increase with that because I think it would be leveraged and have enormous significance as a result.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. While I continue to reserve, let me compliment the gentleman on his amendment, as we do further investigation on the offsets.

Medical research for diseases that affect our military members and their families are a priority of our committee; you can be sure of that. That is why our bill includes $3.2 million, again, this year for the Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Research Program.

This is provided, which I think would be of interest, more than $43 million for this research area since fiscal year 2003, and you have alluded to it, but research breakthroughs in this area will only help those suffering from this debilitating disease, but will also help research in other various muscular and motor neuron diseases.

I think the research is absolutely essential, and I think we are closer to a resolution of the issue that would allow me to withdraw my reservation. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

I would be happy to withdraw my reservation of the point of order and support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his indulgence and patience and the good work he has done in this respect, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk reads as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY Reserve

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $999,621,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY Reserve

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,815,862,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE Reserve

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,153,119,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; paying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $6,605,400,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $14,078,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $234,829,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided. That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, cleaning of contaminated lands and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to the appropriation for which such funds are available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes for which transferred, such funds transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 36, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $1,000,000)".

Page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and their staff because I have worked on this in past appropriations and had the privilege of receiving the support of both the chair and the ranking member on the question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I heard the chairman mention both Chairman Young and Chairman Murtha. Over the years, I have had the privilege of working with them on this question of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I just want to use a little anecdote, particularly as it relates to Vietnam vets. Many of us remember Vietnam vets coming back and, some long years later, getting a better understanding of Agent Orange. I remember a Vietnam vet telling me about it, but as he indicated, they mentioned it or spoke about it or tried to explain it when they came back directly from Vietnam. I just want to note that Agent Orange came about in Vietnam, and in years going forward, there was great medical care needed, medical costs needed, because those veterans had been suffering for a long time.

We now understand post-traumatic stress disorder; and, as I look over the landscape of the last years of war, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, about 11 to 20 out of every 100 veterans, or 11 to 20 percent, who served had a post-traumatic stress disorder in any given year.

In the Gulf War, Operation Desert Storm, about 12 out of every 100 Gulf
Mr. CHAIRMAN, I ask for support of the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $300,000,000, to remain available until transferred:

Provided. That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further. That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided hereinafter, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further. That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by $10,290,000)”.

Page 33, line 3, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by $10,290,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be offering and then withdrawing this amendment because of a point of order on the timing of the budget outlays that we are not able to reconcile at this point in time.
Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the House that the outlay issue somewhat has complicated matters on the floor this evening.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the subcommittee chairman’s words, and I will certainly work with him on that effort.

But I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, for their leadership.

Now, this is an important amendment though. My amendment would protect from possible cancellation an innovative program that promises to provide a breakthrough capability for a very small amount of money.

Right now, if Iran or North Korea launches a ballistic missile attack on our homeland, unfortunately, we have no enhanced way of knowing whether or not our defensive missiles actually hit the target or not.

That is why the Missile Defense Agency is executing a promising and groundbreaking space sensor system called Space-Based Kill Assessment.

The U.S. desperately needs improved sensors in space to provide tracking, discrimination, and more. A robust, multimission space sensor network will be vital to ensuring a strong missile defense program. Without this, we might otherwise waste extremely expensive ground-based interceptors, costing the taxpayer more money, and depleting our limited number of interceptors.

The Space-based Kill Assessment program cannot survive a 50 percent cut. Program cancellation may result, and it would waste taxpayer dollars already invested and would also fail to meet congressional intent to have an initial operating kill assessment capability by 2019.

This experiment, up until today, has had zero scheduling delays since it was conceived in fiscal year 2014.

Finally, this program is a great example of the cost savings and other benefits the government can leverage through commercially-hosted satellite payloads. This program, and other similar efforts, are critical to ensuring that the United States stays ahead of future ballistic missile threats.

I would hope that this amendment would have been adopted because it would take money from a lower priority fund and put it into critical ballistic missile defense against our homeland.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Allow me to commend the gentleman from Colorado for pointing up the value of what he talks about here. And let me promise to him that I am sure I will be working very closely with Mr. Visclosky to see what we can do to elevate our investment and our knowledge and support for this program.

I do appreciate your willingness to withdraw the amendment and regret that the outlay issue somewhat has complicated matters on the floor this evening.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the subcommittee chairman’s words, and I will certainly work with him on that effort.
It exists within the President’s budget under Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Vehicles: Bradley Modifications.

This year’s budget request includes $225 million for Bradley modifications. Unfortunately, none of these funds were designated for the Bradley Fighting Vehicles digital upgrades. In fact, the President’s budget does not provide funding for these upgrades over the entire FYDP.

So it is unclear whether or not these Operation Desert Storm-era Bradley vehicles will ever receive the upgrades necessary to make them combat effective or adequate training platforms. It is for this reason I am offering this amendment.

My amendment would designate and fence off $100 million of the $1.8 billion under the Army’s procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles accounts to prioritize and upgrade the oldest Bradley Fighting Vehicles in the fleet. This is 0.005 percent of the total appropriation.

The $100 million is less than half of what is necessary to upgrade the remaining nondigital, nonstandard variants, but it is an important step to ensure that formations within our National Guard maintain the combat effectiveness and readiness they have attained over the last decade.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I very much regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I very much regret that I rise in opposition to the amendment, knowing what a strong supporter of our national defense the gentleman from Nevada is and what a strong supporter he is of the National Guard, not only across the Nation, but in his own State. And I regret even more so since we have been talking about this for several weeks. I feel badly that I have to rise.

The amendment, as the gentleman has stated, directs the Secretary of the Army to repurpose approximately one-half of the $225 million in the budget request that was requested and included for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle Upgrade Program.

The amendment would direct the Army to revise the schedule for the Bradley Upgrade Program by accelerating the schedule for providing more modern Bradley Fighting Vehicles to the 1st Squadron of the 221st Armored Cavalry of the Nevada National Guard, which I am sure is most deserving because, as he said, they have the oldest of the oldest.

I have said that the schedule change would disrupt, as I am advised, a carefully synchronized plan for Abrams Tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle modernization and would cause production breaks at both manufacturing lines.

The production break would also add significant startup costs to the Bradley Engineering Change Proposal. In other words, this amendment would throw out of balance the Army-wide modernization plan and drive up costs in order for one squadron of one State’s Guard forces to receive more modern vehicles.

As you can tell, Mr. Chairman, from my rather convoluted response, I am prepared to work with the gentleman from Nevada to assist him, but at this point, I need to respectfully oppose his amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman’s offer to work with the gentleman as we proceed but would associate myself with the chairman’s concern relative to the amendment that has been offered and, particularly, with an emphasis to the break in production, which I think is a very serious issue.

So I do want to associate myself with the chairman’s concerns and objection that he has raised, but again, his willingness to work with the gentleman in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, I do recommend a “no” vote, certainly not a position of hope, valid offer to work with the gentleman because I know that he is going to be working on me to make sure that this occurs, and I want to be helpful to him. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Thank you both, Mr. Chairman and ranking member, for your offer to work with me to try to rectify the situation where we have an important National Guard unit that is dealing with and working with Desert Storm-era Bradley Vehicles and, yet, expected to be ready to deploy on to the newer materiel in the theater should they ever be called.

With your assurance to work with me on this effort, I appreciate that. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor, special equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon with the approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private

plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon with the approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private
plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,520,677,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non- tracked combat vehicles; purchase of passenger motor vehicles; construction of employee facilities, training devices, expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,230,677,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, including ordnance, aircraft and related parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,007,778,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories thereof; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $16,871,819,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $2,998,541,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the construction, procurement, production, and modification of vessels, armor, armament, and ship equipment, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliance, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead equipment items for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $1,599,977,000;
Carrier Replacement Program (AP-CY), $874,658,000;
Virginia Class Submarine, $3,346,570,000;
Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,971,840,000;
CVN Refueling Overhaul, $637,588,000;
CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP), $14,951,000;
DDG–0910 Program, $433,494,000;
DDG–091 Destroyer, $3,012,904,000;
Littoral Combat Ship, $1,347,411,000;
LPA–1970, $575,000,000;
Afloat Forward Staging Base, $635,000,000;
LHA (Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs), $389,305,000.

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $601,008,000.

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $16,852,569,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2020, of which $14,382,300,000 may be obligated: Provided, That amounts made available for prior year shipbuilding programs may be transferred to and merged with appropriations made available for such purposes in prior Acts: Provided further, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2020, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed for continuation of ship or weapon construction: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the conversion or construction of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modification of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $6,696,715,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories thereof; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead equipment items for vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $973,084,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories thereof; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,552,901,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories thereof; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $2,334,165,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of spacecraft, rockets, and associated equipment including spare parts and accessories thereof; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $1,938,034,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,263,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.
For acquisition and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erosion of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, $253,496,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for bringing this bill to the floor.

The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment is not a reflection of concern with what is a good bill under the circumstances. The Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment would appropriate $25 million to fund military responses to Russia’s continuing violation of the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the INF Treaty. This is the exact same amount that the House Armed Services Committee, the HASC, authorized recently in a bipartisan and noncontroversial provision in H.R. 1735, which passed the House Armed Services Committee on a 60-2 vote.

Senior DOD officials, from the Secretary of Defense to lesser Senate-confirmed officials, have testified that the United States is considering a range of military options to respond to Russia’s violation of the INF Treaty. DOD defined these as countervailing and counterforce options. What do these in-clause?

Number one, extending the range of the Army’s current Army Tactical Missile System, ATacMS; land-based Tomahawk or otherwise modifying similar capabilities; and also other capabilities per classified DOD reporting. The emphasis should be on modifying current systems as opposed to developing brand-new capabilities, which would take longer and cost far more.

This amendment is imperative to enforcing with you and your staff on this important issue, as we have already been doing, and appreciate your indulgence and willingness to withdraw the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the gentleman for his willingness and especially for his dedication and support for our Air National Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.
As The New York Times reported on June 5, following the submission of the most recent State Department annual report on arms control compliance: “American officials have made no discernible headway in persuading the Russians to acknowledge that the proliferation problem does not already exist.”

In December, the Pentagon told Congress that it had developed a range of military options to pressure Russia to remedy the violation or neutralize any advantages it might gain if diplomatic efforts fail. Mr. McKeon, a senior Pentagon official, told Congress that . . . if a diplomatic solution was not found, “This violation will not go unanswered.”

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of all Members for the Bridenstine-Rogers-Turner-Poe amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman’s concern relative to Russia and his desire to make sure that they do abide by the existing treaty.

Certainly, I would acknowledge that they have invaded the country of Ukraine. They control a quarter of that country’s industrial production, and as the gentleman has indicated, are very concerned about their violation potentially of the treaty that exists.

My concern is that the gentleman’s amendment is premature. He is absolutely correct that the authorizing committee in this body did pass legislation that you are trying to address with your amendment. The other body has not yet acted.

Additionally, I would point out—and again, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct—that DOD is considering a range of options. You have enumerated at least three of them. I think, very correctly. Again, I think it is premature, given the fact that we are still, as a country, considering what options should be utilized to deal with this very serious question that the gentleman raises. Given the fact that we don’t have direct authorization and we are considering options, while I agree with the intent, I would have to object to the timing of the gentleman’s amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chair, I would just argue that, while it is true that the other body has not acted on this yet, it is also true that this body has already acted in the Defense Authorization bill. It came through committee, and certainly it had overwhelming support in committee and overwhelming support on the floor of the House.

I think that the will of this body ought to be done by all of my colleagues supporting this very important amendment and to make sure that Russia understands that they cannot go unchecked when they violate a treaty of this magnitude.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I will simply conclude by again expressing sympathy for the aim of the gentleman but pointing out that to appropriate money, we need authority. We do not yet have that, given the absence of action by the Senate and signature of the authorization into law by the President. I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense other than the military departments necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts, including construction, procurement, processing, and protection of national defense fuel, and services, and for the payment of such personnel salaries and expenses, and for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and privates, and equipment, and installation thereof in such a manner as to be reusable; the acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and contracts for the purchase of the property shall be subject to prior approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,143,095,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the authority granted by the House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the staff, first, for working with Members and getting everyone to be able to present their amendments; and then I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their understanding of this amendment and, again, make the point that this amendment that I am offering at this time I have been able to work with the appropriators over the years.

I am a breast cancer survivor, and as I, myself, was going through that period, I met women who were experiencing triple negative, which is a very deadly aspect of breast cancer.

My amendment increases funding for Defense Health Program’s research and development by $10 million, and these funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Just the fact, to take note of the point, that more than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times, 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2001.

My amendment will add additional research dealing with this question. And the good news is that, when the military research component works on this, there is a great possibility of moving forward.

Breast cancer strikes relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male servicemembers, veterans, and their dependents are at risk as well.

‘‘Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer,’’ says Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University. Clapp, who works for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues, says life in the military can mean exposure to a witch’s brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

Just a moment about the triple-negative breast cancer, when I saw firsthand a very wonderful professional in my community go very quickly, first at the diagnosis and then the short-term survival that she experienced.

TNBC is a term used to describe breast cancer whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

So what does that mean? TNBC accounts for between 13 and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States. It is a higher grade, onset is younger, is more aggressive, and is likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer do not live more than 5 years after being diagnosed, and it impacts various ethnicities and ethnic groups in a far different way.

We find that African American women are more likely to be diagnosed with large tumors, but it impacts women of all backgrounds, racial backgrounds as well.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this amendment that I have had the privilege of offering in years past. Maybe they also take note of the fact that the amendment would not change the overall level of budget authority, and it would lower the overall level of outlays.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson-Leah amendment.

I add this article into the RECORD, ‘‘A New Drug for Triple Negative Breast Cancers Seems Promising,’’ dated June 5, 2015.
Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, high-lighting the need for a new treatment.

There continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to more focused and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

Depending on its stage of diagnosis, triple negative breast cancer can be extremely aggressive and resistant and metastasize to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

It typically is responsive to chemotherapy, although it can be more difficult to treat because it is unresponsive to the most effective receptor targeted treatments.

Research on effective treatment options for triple negative breast cancer is critically needed to improve the survival rates of women who are diagnosed with the disease. We must also improve upon tests that can detect triple negative breast cancer while it is in its early stages, which could increase survival rates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

From The Inquisitr, June 7, 2015
A New Drug For Triple Negative Breast Cancer Seems Promising—Enzalutamide

Breast cancer. The two words strike fear in nearly everyone’s heart, as, by far, it is the most common cancer that women can get. In fact, one out of every eight women will be diagnosed at some point in their lives. Early detection remains the most important tool we have against fighting breast cancer, but it’s only one tool. Not all tests reliably show all breast cancers in their early stages, and many breast cancers are not detected until they begin to metastasize, or spread to remote locations, which makes them incurable. They can be treated, but it is medically impossible to cure at that point in time, with various metastatic cancers, they appear and they grow, which means more chemo, more radiation, more lost quality of life.

What many people don’t realize is that there are actually several kinds of breast cancer—not all are the same or are treated the same. Many breast cancers have hormone receptors which are considered easier to treat; the ones we have developed therapies for. When biological therapy denies the tumor of the particular hormone that feeds it, the tumor dies.

Triple-negative breast cancer, however, does not respond to hormone or biological therapies—that’s because the tumor does not have those receptors. It also is a particularly aggressive cancer that usually strikes women in their childbearing years and moves quickly to the brain and bones. Lumps, tumors, “Madam, if you please,” chemotherapy, radiation and biologics have been the medical standard, but often with dismal results—the five year prognosis for triple-negative breast cancer is not good.

However, a new drug on the market seems promising in the fight against this disease that takes far too many young women. A drug on the market that has been undergoing clinical trials seems promising—called Enzalutamide—shows promise in a subset of women with advanced triple-negative breast cancer. For women whose tumors express the androgen receptor (approximately 40 percent) the drug shrank or stopped tumor activity.

Enzalutamide is an oral therapy and extremely well tolerated. We are seeing impressive improvements in progression-free survival (PFS) and in the clinical benefit rate. AR by immunohistochemistry is not perfect in predicting who is going to respond. This is not the whole story. We have found that even those with really low AR expression level have had great responses on trials. Combining AR expression with the gene signature has allowed us to enrich for the population that appears to truly benefit from enzalutamide. This is the most exciting data we have had in triple-negative breast cancer and certainly supports moving this therapy forward in development.”

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment. Again, I thank the staff, the chairman, and the ranking member for their commitment to the betterment of the lives of our young men and women in the United States military.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $87,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $732,047,000, to remain available until expended.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $76,680,000, to remain available until expended.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $17,237,724,000, to remain available until expended.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $7,372,047,000, to remain available until expended.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $23,163,152,000, to remain available until expended.

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $15,670,400,000, to remain available until expended.
You don’t have to take my word for it. Air Force leadership has consistently praised the program as an effective national security tool. General Schwartz, the former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said: “ORS is exactly what we need. Innovation and greater efficiency are key.”

Amendment Offered by Mr. Pascrell
Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment with Congressman Rooney, my co-chair on the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force.

Traumatic brain injury continues to be the signature injury among our Nation’s servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 300,000 troops have been deployed with mild TBI since 2000. This number continues to increase as identification and detection methods become more accurate. Despite these staggering figures, there was a decrease of 20 percent from last year’s funding level. Our amendment would restore the same funding level to the TBI program.

The program supports the DOD’s Psychological Health and TBI Center of Excellence in its efforts to educate servicemembers and their families, enhance clinical and management approaches, and facilitate other vital services to best serve the needs of our servicemembers impacted by TBI and psychological health problems.

In recent years, the DOD has made significant strides in improving both in-theater and post-incident assessment and diagnosis, but still more needs to be done in evaluating troops’ ability to return to duty. As it is, we are not living up to our responsibility in caring for servicemembers who have already been diagnosed with TBI. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to use this time to heap compliments upon my colleague from New Jersey who heads up the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force and has been providing that leadership and support, and it is certainly appreciated.

Just for the record, our committee has been very active in supporting this type of work and research. And for the
record, our bill provides $155 million, which includes a plus up of $100 million above the request level of $55 million for traumatic brain injury and psychological health research.

In addition, our bill provides $676 million in operation and maintenance funds for Defense Health Program to care for servicemembers affected by traumatic brain injuries and psychological maladies.

There has been an issue about the slow spend down of some of the money. Of course, here on the floor advocating, as we should, for such an important program, we need to ensure that the bureaucracy gets the money spent. I am sure my colleague from New Jersey would agree that if we are going to put money on the table, let’s make sure they spend it rapidly to address this ever-growing problem which affects so many people who come off the battlefield. I commend the gentleman and support his amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $170,558,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,381,568,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SAVINGS FUND

For National Defense Savings Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1966 (50 U.S.C. App. 174), and for the necessary expenses to maintain, modernize, and operate a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $474,164,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and propellers for shipboard cranes: Provided further, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment that would set aside $1 million for studying a neglected segment of suicides within our Armed Forces. Our brave men and women in uniform risk their lives every day to keep us safe and free, yet they often don’t get the care that they deserve.

While attention has been given to the subject in the past, we have recently seen a need for research that deals with high suicide rates among our female servicemembers and veterans. This week, the Los Angeles Times reported on a recently released study which found female military veterans commit suicide at nearly six times the rate of other women.

This new government research released in the journal of Psychiatric Services went even further, reporting that female veterans between the ages of 18 and 29 are nearly twelve times more likely to commit suicide than nonmilitary women. We need to do better by the women who risk their lives to protect our Nation. We cannot sit idly by while our female servicemembers and veterans suffer in silence.

My amendment would set aside $1 million to study the possible causes for this level of suicides among our women in uniform. Service-related causes like traumatic brain injury and PTSD, in addition to nonservice related factors such as adverse childhood experiences, financial troubles, and other external stressors, must be investigated if we hope to seriously confront this travesty head on.

In addition, according to the VA, the suicide gap between men and women is shrinking. Men typically have higher suicide rates than women. When military service is incorporated, the gap between the two shrinks significantly.

This is a serious problem and one that we don’t know enough about to confront. Until we understand why we are seeing this horrific trend, we cannot help the women who bravely serve.

When we are faced with rising generations where female veterans are twelve times more likely than non-military women to commit suicide, we need to take action. My amendment will conduct a study to understand how we get here, so we can move forward and take real action to address this crisis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, $31,440,009,000; of which $29,489,521,000 shall be for medical care programs; and $1,950,488,000 shall be for education and training programs, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment that would set aside $1 million for studying a neglected segment of suicides within our Armed Forces. Our brave men and women in uniform risk their lives every day to keep us safe and free, yet they often don’t get the care that they deserve.

While attention has been given to the subject in the past, we have recently seen a need for research that deals with high suicide rates among our female servicemembers and veterans. This week, the Los Angeles Times reported on a recently released study which found female military veterans commit suicide at nearly six times the rate of other women.

This new government research released in the journal of Psychiatric Services went even further, reporting that female veterans between the ages of 18 and 29 are nearly twelve times more likely to commit suicide than nonmilitary women. We need to do better by the women who risk their lives to protect our Nation. We cannot sit idly by while our female servicemembers and veterans suffer in silence.

My amendment would set aside $1 million to study the possible causes for this level of suicides among our women in uniform. Service-related causes like traumatic brain injury and PTSD, in addition to nonservice related factors such as adverse childhood experiences, financial troubles, and other external stressors, must be investigated if we hope to seriously confront this travesty head on.

In addition, according to the VA, the suicide gap between men and women is shrinking. Men typically have higher suicide rates than women. When military service is incorporated, the gap between the two shrinks significantly.

This is a serious problem and one that we don’t know enough about to confront. Until we understand why we are seeing this horrific trend, we cannot help the women who bravely serve.

When we are faced with rising generations where female veterans are twelve times more likely than non-military women to commit suicide, we need to take action. My amendment will conduct a study to understand how we get here, so we can move forward and take real action to address this crisis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. App. 1900), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical warfare agents stockpile, $31,440,009,000, of which $139,086,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $50,743,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $21,289,000 for activities on military installations and $29,454,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, to assist state and local governments, to be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2018, of which $2,281,000
shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $579,342,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for required payment, test and evaluation, of which $569,339,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (Including Transfer of Funds)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, $875,298,000, of which $616,811,000 shall be for counter-narcotics support, $131,589,000 shall be for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense, and $147,896,000 shall be for the National Guard counter-drug program: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the certification authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

Office of the Inspector General

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $316,159,000, of which $314,059,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or audit of any contract, grant, or other authority provided under this heading in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $514,000,000.

Intelligence Community Management Account

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $507,923,000.

General Provisions

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for public or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: Provided, That salary increases granted to, or employment of, foreign nationals of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5532 of title 5, United States Code; and provided further, that the Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: Provided further, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in Turkmenistan.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly provided: Provided further, That no more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $4,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense to the Secretary of the Treasury, or to any other Department or agency of the government, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds have been requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not, without the notification to the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: Provided further, That no part of the funds made available in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances of working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such cash accounts as are needed to meet cash disbursements to be made from such funds: Provided, That transfers may be made between such funds: Provided further, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the “Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense” appropriation and the “Shipbuilding and Conversion” appropriation of funds as authorized in the act, and that each such transfer shall be made at a rate in excess of $20,000,000, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer in the congressional budget resolution for the appropriate fiscal year or in the congressional budget message, or in the congressional budget reconciliation act, or in the continuing resolution for the fiscal year in question, or in a report submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the congressional defense committees: Provided further, That no obligations may be incurred against such transfer made pursuant to this Act: Provided further, That no obligations may be incurred against such transfer made pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may be transferred among the fiscal years of such Act, and to any fiscal year in which the amounts appropriated in such Act shall be available, without regard to the manner of such activities otherwise treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: Provided, That no transfer shall be made until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the Congress, in the congressional budget resolution for the fiscal year in question, or in the congressional budget reconciliation act, or in the continuing resolution for the fiscal year in question, has specifically approved such a contract; provided further, That a contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified in writing by the Secretary of Defense at least 30 days in advance of the award of the contract, the transfer shall be treated as an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a major acquisition that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified in writing by the Secretary of Defense at least 30 days in advance of the award of the contract and treated as a multiyear contract: Provided, That a multiyear contract shall be initiated in accordance with the congressional budget resolution for the fiscal year in question, or in the congressional budget reconciliation act, or in the continuing resolution for the fiscal year in question, has specifically approved such a contract; provided further, That a contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified in writing by the Secretary of Defense at least 30 days in advance of the award of the contract, the transfer shall be treated as an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a major acquisition that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified in writing by the Secretary of Defense at least 30 days in advance of the award of the contract and treated as a multiyear contract: Provided, That any part of any appropriation contained in this Act...
shall be available to initiate a multyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability. That no procurement work is obligated under the multyear procurement contract and that the funding requested for the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2017.

(b) As required by section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) civilian personnel at the Department of Army Science and Technology Reinvestment Fund shall be managed on the basis of the Table of Distribution and Allowances, and the management of the workforce strength shall be done in a manner consistent with the budgetary funds available with respect to such Laboratories.

d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

S. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional actions on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

S. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student at a civilian educational institution funded in such fiscal year by the federal government.

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 881 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2382 note), as amended, under the authority of the Secretary of the Army.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

S. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 881 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2382 note), as amended, under the authority of the Secretary of the Army.

S. 8016. None of the funds in this Act shall be available by the Department of Defense or by any Department of Defense components to purchase any weapon system or equipment which is manufactured in the United States from any foreign source.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in the current fiscal year or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carbine rifles, 22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8018. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function from the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region:

Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

S. 8019. None of the funds made available in this Act, $15,000,000 shall be available for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (42 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier that is not an individual, a United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals, defined under section 4221(9) of title 10, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 401): Provided further, That not withstanding section 1006 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

S. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2560(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section:

Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations:

Provided further, That none of the funds available in this Act, not less than $39,500,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(a) $27,400,000 shall be available from “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and military training activities involving youth programs; and

(b) $10,400,000 shall be available from “Air Craft Procurement, Air Force”; and

 SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2560(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section:

Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations:

Provided further, That none of the funds available in this Act, not less than $39,500,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(a) $27,400,000 shall be available from “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and military training activities involving youth programs; and
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SEC. 8017. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in the current fiscal year or any fiscal year hereafter may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carbine rifles, 22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8018. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function from the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region:

Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

S. 8019. None of the funds made available in this Act, $15,000,000 shall be available for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (42 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier that is not an individual, a United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals, defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 401): Provided further, That not withstanding section 1006 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

S. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2560(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section:

Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations:

Provided further, That none of the funds available in this Act, not less than $39,500,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(a) $27,400,000 shall be available from “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and military training activities involving youth programs; and

(b) $10,400,000 shall be available from “Air Craft Procurement, Air Force”; and
(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local governments.

SEC. 8023. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) facility or computer research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a non-profit, not to include corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) None of the funds for the Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid staff or services paid for with defense FFRDCs, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: Provided, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2016 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of a new building or an enhancement of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include corporate participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2016, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: Provided further, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department’s fiscal year 2017 budget request, submit a report presenting the amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by $30,400,000.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for uses other than those described in paragraph (a) of this section, for a purpose under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: Provided, That the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: Provided further, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

SEC. 8025. For the purposes of this Act, the term “congressional defense committees” means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on National Security of Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: Provided, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable terms and costs for both public and private bids: Provided further, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8027. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an international agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States, the Secretary of Defense, by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary’s blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Defense Business Operations Fund obligations from foreign entities in fiscal year 2016. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was prospectively waived under the agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term “Buy American Act” means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.


(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force shall notify the Department of Defense, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and tribes located in the States of Colorado, Minnesota, and Washington, any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of tribes for Head Start or similar entities for fiscal year 2017, subject to the Secretary of Defense by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and tribes located in the States of Colorado, Minnesota, and Washington.

(d) In this section, the term “Indian tribe” means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 108 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an inventory item was not made to the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item funded in an appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2017 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except that funds appropriated for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise made available for the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided further, That funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except that funds appropriated for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise made available for the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided further, That funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except that funds appropriated for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise made available for the Central Intelligence Agency.
year shall remain available until expended:

Provided further, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development, to the Agency’s National Intelligence Program, and to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency for development of a model for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1 et seq.) shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence exploitation systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

Such funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide"; not less than $12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, and the gathering of information, documentation of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for median lands affected from the Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8036. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this section, "Buy American Act" means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a product has been convicted or intentionally affixing a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410C of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

Such none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unlimited number of offers, significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to license or produce products where a specific concern is given financial support: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000 awarded to improve equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been designated by the Secretary, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8038. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to establish a field operating agency of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's position remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of the Navy, after a full evaluation may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate, that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats;

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense; or

(4) an Air Force field operating agency established to administer the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Program and Mortuary Operations for the Department of Defense and authorized Federal entities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by the Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by the contractor exceeds by no more than 10 percent the cost to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization’s related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) $10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(I) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(II) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the Federal employee health benefits plan available by this Act.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (b), (a), or (c) of section 171 of United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract to provide health benefit plans (dual industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O’Day Act (section 853 of title 41, United States Code); or

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 1(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(16)),

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (b) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose of competitive or outsourcing of commercial activities.

(Rescissions)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

(1) "Other Procurement, Army", 2014, $10,000,000; 2015, $8,000,000;

(2) "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", 2014, $6,157,000; 2015, $8,000,000;

(3) "Weapons Procurement, Navy", 2014, $888,000;

(4) "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", 2014, $2,300,000; 2015, $1,200,000; 2016, $1,000,000;

(5) "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", 2014, $12,600,000; 2015, $14,000,000; 2016, $14,000,000;

(6) "Procurement of Weapons, Air Force", 2014, $30,000,000;

(7) "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army", 2015, $30,000,000; 2016, $30,000,000; 2017, $30,000,000;

(8) "Other Procurement, Army", 2015, $10,000,000; 2016, $10,000,000; 2017, $10,000,000;

(9) "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", 2015, $957,000; 2016, $13,422,000;

(10) "Aircraft Procurement, Marine Corps", 2015, $38,906,000;

(11) "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", 2015, $1,000,000; 2016, $2,700,000; 2017, $2,700,000;

(12) "Missile Procurement, Air Force", 2015, $75,000,000; 2016, $75,000,000; 2017, $75,000,000;

(13) "Wartime Procurement, Air Force", 2015, $8,000,000; 2016, $8,000,000; 2017, $8,000,000;

(14) "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", 2015, $232,228,000; 2016, $232,228,000; 2017, $232,228,000;

(15) "Responsible Contractor

SEC. 8041. None of the funds described in this Act may be used to reduce the authorization for military operations (military personnel end strength) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force...
Reserve for the purpose of applying any ad-
ministratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military tech-
nicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that pur-
pose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Mil-
itary Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve personnel and training activities, and other activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Mili-
tary Intelligence Program: Provided, That notthing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appro-
priations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activi-
ties may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropri-
ations law.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domes-
tic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense re-
quirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to ac-
quire the national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8046. In addition to the amounts appro-
priated or otherwise made available under this Act, $4,000,000 is hereby appro-
priated to the Department of Defense: Pro-
vided, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense to which it shall appear that national interest, the Secretary shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: $20,000,000 to the United Service Organiza-
tions; $20,000,000 to the American Red Cross.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certi-
tifies to the congressional defense commit-
tees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire the capability for military security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. Withholding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be responsible for the use of equip-
ment of the National Guard Distance Learn-
ing Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The
Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall est-
ablish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be available for the purpose of equip-
ment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associ-
ed with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection for persons in connection with support and services for required heating facility mod-
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to power our military base in Germany. President after President has urged the removal of this earmark—both Republicans and Democrats—every President since Jimmy Carter and including President Ronald Reagan. Today, we have an opportunity to finally achieve that goal.

I want to thank Mr. McClintock for his leadership in introducing this amendment with me. The passage of this amendment would be proof positive, I think, to Americans back home that Republicans and Democrats can work together to cut wasteful spending. I urge my colleagues to support the Huffman-McClintock amendment.

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

Mr. McClintock. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I don’t support the war on coal that is waged by some of my friends on the left, but I do support the war on waste like this that is needed in our entire Defense budget. That is why our defense spending has been cut in excess of budget caps because, they told our defense spending had been excess of budget caps because, they said, our defense spending had been skewed towards military training and support of high priority Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program requirements and activities, including the training and funding of personnel: Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, testing, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

Mr. Chairman, we have well over 30 other defense installations in Germany and hundreds of thousands of military personnel and their families there. This is a stark reminder of how important is to ensure that our military has a reliable domestic source of energy wherever it is in the world. This may be an unusual circumstance, but I see no reason to change it. I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Huffman. Mr. Chairman, we have well over 30 other defense installations in Germany and hundreds of thousands of military personnel and their families there. The Congress passed the lusaka amendment with me.

This is a commonsense amendment that provides the Pentagon the flexibility to ensure that our military installation operates with a congressionally mandated fuel source like the one we are talking about here. The Kaiserslautern facility is, truly, one of a kind.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert in coal, and I am not an expert in what these men describe as an earmark, but I do know that coal is reliable, that it is cost-effective, that it is domestically produced in the United States and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 Schedule of the United States and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 XI (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Act; and (c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation on the procurement of defense items for sale to a foreign country if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

SEC. 8055. (a) IN GENERAL.—

Mr. Huffman. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" and support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Huffman). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Huffman. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of Rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.
available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by such unit.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights; the extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(d) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(e) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(f) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(g) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(h) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(i) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(j) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(k) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(l) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(m) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(n) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(o) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(p) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(q) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(r) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(s) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(t) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(u) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(v) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(w) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(x) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(y) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.

(z) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that the gross violation of human rights required by extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the gross violation of human rights by such unit to do so.
SEC. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", $388,305,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: Provided, That the amounts transfers shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer the Army’s share of such amounts to the following accounts: Doing Business with the World Program ($254,428,000), suddenly Fund ($13,132,000), and the Reserve component, and estimates of the other operation: Provided, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided, That under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2008:2016, Carrier Replacement Program $121,760,000; (2) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2009:2016, Littoral Combat Ship ($27,600,000); (3) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, CVN Refueling Overhaul Program $22,860,000; (4) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, DDG–51 Destroyer $13,740,000; (5) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, Littoral Combat Ship $5,674,000; (6) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, Amphibious Transport Dock Program $38,733,000; (7) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, Joint High Speed Vessel $22,597,000; and (8) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2013:2016, Joint High Speed Vessel $45,658,000. Provided, That the amounts appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. SEC. 8070. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. SEC. 8071. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. SEC. 8072. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2017 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justifications for the procurement, research and development, and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts: Provided, That these documents shall include a description of the funding for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major or significant change in personnel deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include budget exhibits for OP–5 and OP–32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years. SEC. 8073. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a defense system. SEC. 8074. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to favorable foreign exchange rates, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $1,152,206,000. SEC. 8075. None of the funds appropriated or made available hereunder shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WAFC’s Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: Provided, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform the requirements of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season. SEC. 8076. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: Provided, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333. SEC. 8077. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each such member shall be notified in writing in the expected period during which the member will be mobilized. (b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces. SEC. 8078. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army: Provided further, That authority is to be merged with and available for used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: Provided further, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law. SEC. 8081. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation. SEC. 8082. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation. SEC. 8083. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate, restructure, or realign Army Contracting Command–New Jersey or to make disproportionate personnel reductions at any Army Contracting Command–New Jersey sites without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees. SEC. 8084. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any military training or operation that is not specifically authorized by the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted.] [sec. 8079. Of the amounts provided in this Act for the Counterintelligence Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Co-operation operations, that amount shall be the amount available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of any weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred. (1) under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2008:2016, Carrier Replacement Program $121,760,000; (2) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2009:2016, Littoral Combat Ship Program $27,600,000; (3) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, CVN Refueling Overhaul Program $22,860,000; (4) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, DDG–51 Destroyer $13,740,000; (5) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, Littoral Combat Ship $5,674,000; (6) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, Amphibious Transport Dock Program $38,733,000; (7) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2012:2016, Joint High Speed Vessel $22,597,000; and (8) Under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", 2013:2016, Joint High Speed Vessel $45,658,000. Provided, That the amounts appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. SEC. 8070. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. SEC. 8071. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. SEC. 8072. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2017 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justifications for the procurement, research and development, and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts: Provided, That these documents shall include a description of the funding for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for
for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: \textit{Provided further}, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this paragraph.

\textbf{SEC. 8086.} (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102a(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3204(d)) that—

(1) constitutes a new effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of $10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations, unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102a(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3204(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex to the budget submitted to Congress that year at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted and at least the four dates that the employee or independent contractor performing work related to such contract or subcontract addressed in the report contains proprietary information.

(c) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to make any notification required under section 127a of title 10, United States Code.

\textbf{SEC. 8087.} The Director of National Intelligence, prior to Congress each year, or at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the heads of the intelligence community (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

\textbf{SEC. 8089.} For the purposes of this Act, the term “congressional intelligence committees” means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

\textbf{SEC. 8090.} The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremenal contingency operations costs for Operation Inherent Resolve, Operation Freedom's Sentinel, and any named successor operations, on a monthly basis and any other operation designated by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 127a of title 10, United States Code, on a semi-annual basis in the Cost of War Execution Report in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 ‘Contingency Operations', Annex 1, dated September 2005.

\textbf{SEC. 8091.} Funds appropriated by this Act may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfers to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with section 1706 of title 10, United States Code.

\textbf{SEC. 8092.} (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to the restrictions contained on the section 1706 of title 10, United States Code, on the public Web site of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

\textbf{SEC. 8093.} (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for any Federal agency for amounts in excess of $1,000,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employer or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for any Federal agency for amounts in excess of $10,000,000 for any Federal agency for a contractor agrees not to—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

\textbf{SEC. 8094.} From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to and including $300,000,000 shall be made available to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the purposes of section 1704(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–84: \textit{Provided, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–182: \textit{Provided further, That not less than $50,000,000 of the funds transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.}

\textbf{SEC. 8095.} The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more security executive employees than are specified in the classified annex.

\textbf{SEC. 8096.} Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $100,000,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

\textbf{SEC. 8097.} None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of sections 1661, 1662, or 1663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

\textbf{SEC. 8098.} The Secretary of Defense shall report quarterly the numbers of civilian personnel strengths and,” in accordance with the purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–182: \textit{Provided, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–182: \textit{Provided further, That not less than $50,000,000 of the funds transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.}

\textbf{SEC. 8099.} None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of sections 1661, 1662, or 1663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

\textbf{SEC. 8099.} Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $1,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act to the Director of National Intelligence Program: \textit{Provided, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseeable emergency or national security interests of the United States.}

\textbf{SEC. 8100.} None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act or any other Act may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program or any other Act, from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program or any other Act.
or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—
(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and
(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY
Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. (Mr. HARDY). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

strike section 8100.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered deals with the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. I would suggest to my colleagues that the continued operation of the facility at Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material.

I do regret that the bill and other relevant appropriations acts continue this or any attempts to close Guantanamo by using transfers to the most inhumane facilities and conditions at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The United States Government has transferred approximately 620 detainees from Guantanamo since May of 2002, with 532 transfers occurring during President Bush's administration and slightly in excess of 88 transfers occurring during the current administration.

Nearly 500 defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism have been—and I would emphasize this to my colleagues—successfully convicted in the United States since 2001. Further, there are six detention facilities where Guantanamo Bay detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent of their end capacity.

I would ask my colleagues to adopt this amendment so we could move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTマン), who is a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. WITTマン. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. These important provisions that are already included in the law have been included in the past several appropriations bills for several years running, and there is a reason that they are there. This wording represents a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason. This is debated back and forth in agreement on both sides of the aisle.

Striking provisions would have unknown consequences for a number of U.S. communities, and it is impossible for any of us to know how many detainees might be brought there, where they might be held, and the impacts on communities and facilities that are holding them. It is also impossible to know what the cost might be, so we are asking for this unknown to be pursued without knowing the risks or knowing the costs.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and potentially disastrous. We know former FBI Director Mueller had stated: To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.

The last thing we need today in the face of ISIS is to convert more folks to extremism. The idea of bringing detainees to the United States quickly collapsed as local jurisdictions voiced their strong opposition. We heard that across the United States.

As everyone here is aware, several detainees that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals as appropriate. Any proposal that results in these detainees being sent to the United States for any reason is simply the wrong policy. We have heard this ground time and time and time again.

I therefore oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, let me thank the gentleman for his comments, and may I add emphasis to what he said.

Then thought that people that have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and been involved in the killing of Americans in the Middle East is repugnant and makes all of us angry. That is literally what has happened. We read about it in open sources, and we can speculate because I think sometimes these things are not reported, that a lot of these people that have been released have gone back and actually headed up efforts to ambush our soldiers and seek vengeance. In reality, I am glad these people continue to be locked away.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would simply say that the gentleman from Virginia noted that there is supposition and unknown in the future, and that is certainly correct. What is known is that we are a nation of laws, and our military protects this country so that we can continue to be governed by those laws. I, for one, happen to think that the indefinite detention of any human being without a trial is violative of those laws, and that is a foundational principle of our Nation, and we ought to conduct ourselves accordingly. I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

(a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) of section 8101 of the FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 110-181) or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) of section 8101 of the FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 110-181) for any reason.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modifications of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—
(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and
(2) is—
(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or
(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER
Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

strike section 8101.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would strike the section of the bill restricting the use of funds for closing and modifying facilities in the United States to house prisoners presently at Guantanamo Bay.

The argument for why we should strike this section is straightforward. The detainees at Guantanamo Bay must be brought to justice. Those who are guilty of terrorism need to be tried and punished in a swift and judicious manner. Any detainee who is innocent should, with equal speed and sincerity, be released.

Two cases exemplify this argument and underline the importance of this amendment. The first is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind behind the attack on the United States on 9/11. Since 2006, Mr. Mohammed has been detained at Guantanamo, where he has yet to be tried, convicted, or appropriately punished for his heinous actions. Justice for the victims, for the families who lost loved ones at the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and in Pennsylvania must be carried out. So far, this has not happened.

At the same time, while they haven’t managed to try and convict anyone at Guantanamo, more than 400 terrorists, including the 9/11 conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui, have been tried, convicted, and sentenced in the federal courts in the United States without incident and in a manner befitting the American justice system. No convicted terrorist has ever escaped from a U.S. prison, and no prisoner has ever been compromised or been subject to an attack because of the dangerous persons being held within.

The second case I want to mention is of Mr. Shaker Aamer, which came to my attention in a recent New York Times article. Mr. Aamer was apprehended by a bipartisan group of British members of Parliament. In November 2001, Mr. Aamer, a British permanent resident, was doing charity work in Afghanistan when he was picked up by the Northern Alliance, sold to Americans for a bounty, and taken to Bagram prison before being moved to Guantanamo in February 2002. He was cleared for release by President Bush in 2007 and cleared again by President Obama in 2010. Six different U.S. agencies agreed, including the CIA, the FBI, the Departments of State and Defense, while Prime Minister David Cameron and the House of Commons unaniously have called for Mr. Aamer’s immediate release and transfer to Britain.

So far, this has not happened. Mr. Aamer has never been charged with anything and has twice been cleared for release. Every American agency that has looked at this says that he has not been a terrorist and did not fight against the United States. There is no reason for him to remain in this custodial purgatory; yet he remains a detainee at the Guantanamo Bay facility.

As long as this provision remains in the bill, people like Mr. Aamer, guilty of nothing—not terrorists, not fighters—could be unjustly imprisoned, and people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed who are guilty—probably, we think—of terrorism will not be tried.

For too long, the terrible people in Guantanamo have been facing the consequences of answering to a U.S. court for their horrendous actions, while innocent detainees are denied recourse for continuing their detention.

The United States must not keep people in prison indefinitely for no reason, with no trial. The opponents of this amendment must not share my faith in America’s courts to deliver justice. For hundreds of years, our legal system has kept Americans safe by imprisoning dangerous individuals while protecting those who are innocent of any charges.

Time and time again, Federal courts have successfully proven their ability to convict criminals and terrorists guilty of deadly acts due to this country’s legal process. This amendment represents a return to our founding principles, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law.

Without this amendment, we will continue to hold terrorists and innocents alike, indefinitely and without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for.

We must close this facility, try these people, release the innocent, and restore our national honor.

I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wittman).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in opposition to this amendment.

We see that today, Guantanamo is equipped to hold these detainees. The military tribunals there, if allowed to do so, are able to try these detainees. Again, they were captured under the rules of enemy combatants. Let’s make sure that we are putting them in that situation to be tried as such.

Another element, too, is localities have spoken vocally to say, No, we do not want these detainees here, for a variety reasons. One is they are worried about security there. I know the argument is, Well, the facilities here in the United States can hold them. That is not the single issue. The issue is the communities concern about what the outcomes of this decision are. It is not clear that every one of these detainees will be here today.

We see today radicalization across the United States from outside the United States by forces like ISIS. Think about the opportunity as those detainees are moved here and the notoriety that they will attain and how the press will cover it and that being used in addition to radicalize folks on the side of extremism. That is another issue that I believe needs to be addressed.

Again, GTMO is working. It is detaining these individuals, enemy combatants that have been picked up on the battlefield. It has been, I believe, the determination of this body through an extensive debate that we shouldn’t build facilities here specifically for that purpose and that GTMO is well suited to do the job.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. The continued repetition of untruths does not make them true. Not all these people were captured on the battlefield. Mr. Aamer, whom I referenced, for example, was picked up doing charity work in Afghanistan. He was picked up by a faction of the Northern Alliance, which then sold him for a bounty to the United States. He was not a fighter. He was not on the battlefield. He was a victim of a kidnapping by a foreign faction.

Everyone who has looked at this—President Bush, President Obama, the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, the British Parliament—have said that they were picked up, probably most were. We are told that military tribunals will try these people. Well, Mr. Aamer has been in Guantanamo for 9 years, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed has been in Guantanamo for 15 years. They can’t get their act together. Every time they try to hold military tribunals, there is another legal objection. Federal courts have tried, convicted, and imprisoned 400 terrorists.

We have to do justice. Keeping people in jail indefinitely because we repeat that they were caught on the battlefield, when some were not, hoping for a bounty to the United States, is not American. It is un-American. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Act...
Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual’s country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity except in accordance with section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

 Amendment offered by Mr. Nadler

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Strike section 8102.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the three amendments that have the same purpose. This one would strike the section of the bill that makes it more difficult to transfer Guantanamo detainees to other countries.

I find it surrealistic. We have now debated two amendments tonight, and all we hear in opposition are repeated statements that everyone at Guantanamo is a terrorist—not true—and that everyone in Guantanamo is picked up on the foreign battlefield, fighting—not true. It is demonstrably not true.

These are not debatable propositions. Some of the people in Guantanamo are terrorists. Some of the people in Guantanamo are picked up on the battlefront. Some were not.

I gave you the example of Mr. Aamer, who was picked up by a foreign faction in the Northern Alliance and sold for a bounty because the United States offered a bounty for people who someone claimed was a terrorist. Everyone looked into it and said he wasn’t a terrorist, he wasn’t a combatant; yet he stays in Guantanamo.

It costs us $2 million per prisoner, per year. There are communities in the United States which can handle these trials. I can think of no honest reason why we would not want the terrorists to be tried.

The terrorists cannot be tried by military tribunal; let them try it, but the fact is they haven’t been able to. They have been trying the military tribunals for 10 years now, and they haven’t succeeded in convicting one person. They have had three plea bargains—that is unconscionable—or no convictions, and no trials in the last 8 or 9 years.

The Federal courts are functioning. Why not save money, try the people we think are guilty, get a guilty verdict, put them in maximum-security prisons, and not hold people indefinitely without charge and without trial? That is simply un-American.

Finally, we are engaged in an ideological war. Someone referenced radicalizing people. What radicalizes people more than giving more exposure of the American bad faith and of anti-Islamic sentiments of terrible behavior than Guantanamo? It is a symbol worldwide. It is a radicalizing influence. Our own generals have said that nothing has recruited more enemy soldiers than Guantanamo.

Let’s close it, take care of the people who are there one way or the other, and do justice; I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. I thank the chairman for yielding.

The gentleman from New Jersey raised a good question. He said:

I can think of no honest reason why these terrorists have not been prosecuted in a military tribunal.

I can give him the answer to that. I don’t know if my friend from New York has actually been to Guantanamo Bay, but in 2010, I went there. As the administration came into office, if the gentleman met with the prosecutor at that time, he had assembled a team that had worked for 2 years trying and prosecuting terrorists of the World Trade Center attack.

That prosecutor had gone through a stack of hearings this tall that he had prevailed on. His life had been threatened. His team’s life had been threatened. He told all of us, Democrats and Republicans who went down there, that he would have guilty pleas on all those terrorists within 6 months.

To answer the gentleman as to why that didn’t happen, it is because, when the administration came into office, they canceled that prosecution, took him off the case, disbanded that whole procedure that gives enough constitutional rights to pass judicial muster, but is short of a Federal article III court. That is why 400 terrorists have been convicted in article III Federal courts—and no terrorists—let them be tried properly, and let the innocent be freed.

We can’t simply stand here and say they are all guilty. How do we know that? How do we know that every single one of them is guilty? We know that some are not. By what right do we hold those who are guilty of nothing forever? It is a blot on American justice; it is a blot on our country’s representation, and we should stop it.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

S 8105. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

S 8104. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease, acquire, or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for any agency’s fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance—dated May 24, 2011.

S 8105. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this
or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense, or any other official or officer of the Department of Defense, to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or other agreement, or to make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport or any subsidiary of Rosoboronexport.

(b) Nothing in this section of the Department of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that it is in the vital national security interest of the United States to do so, and certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary’s knowledge:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) the armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) the Russian Federation has ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to a waiver issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and not later than 90 days after the date on which such a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense, the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted with respect to such waiver.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purchase or manufacture of a flag of the United States unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 238a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8108. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government for the direct personal benefit of the President of Pakistan.

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act, and amounts made available, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to local military commanders appointed by the Secretary, or by an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, to provide at their discretion ex gratia payments in amounts consistent with subsection (b) of this section for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces in a foreign country.

(b) An ex gratia payment under this section may be provided only if:

(1) a prospective foreign civilian recipient is determined by the local military commander to be friendly to the United States;

(2) a claim for damages would not be compensable under chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the “Foreign Claims Act”); and

(3) the property damage, personal injury, or death was not caused by action on the part of an enemy.

(c) NATURE OF PAYMENTS.—Any payments provided under subsection (a) shall not be considered an admission or acknowledgement of any legal obligation to compensate for any damage, personal injury, or death.

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines a program under subsection (a) to be appropriate in a particular setting, the amounts of payments, if any, to be provided to civilians determined to have suffered harm incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces, shall be determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary and based on an assessment, which should include consideration of the propriety and prevailing economic conditions.

(e) LEGAL ADVICE.—Local military commanders shall receive legal advice before making ex gratia payments under this section. The legal advisor, under regulations of the Department of Defense, shall advise on whether an ex gratia payment is proper under this section. The legal advisor may provide advice in cases where there are no applicable Department of Defense regulations.

(f) WRITTEN RECORD.—A written record of any ex gratia payment offered or denied shall be kept by the local commander and on a timely basis submitted to the appropriate office in the Department of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(g) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis the efficacy of the ex gratia payment program including the amounts considered, amounts offered, the response from ex gratia payment recipients, and any recommended modifications.

(h) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to provide any new authority to the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense, other than appropriations made for necessary or non-deployed strategic delivery vehicles and non-deployed strategic delivery vehicles and launchers below the levels set forth in the report submitted in accordance with section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8110. The Secretary of Defense shall post grant awards on a public Web site in a searchable format.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Department of Defense may be used to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, Portugal, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on an analysis of requirements, that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund the performance of a flight demonstration team at a location outside of the United States: Provided, That this prohibition applies only if a performance of a flight demonstration team at a location within the United States was canceled during the current fiscal year due to insufficient funds.

SEC. 8113. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to:

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) accrue, store, or access the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States person from a provider of electronic communications services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978: Provided, That the transfer of the funds provided for the purpose of transfer under this Act.

SEC. 8114. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for basic allowance for housing for military personnel, including active-duty, reserve and National Guard personnel, $400,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel of the Army National Guard to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the treaty.

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or divest AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the treaty.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 115, line 2, strike “in fiscal year 2016” and insert “prior to June 30, 2016”.

Page 115, beginning line 7, strike the provision.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, since its establishment, the National Guard has answered the call to defend our Nation and respond in times of crises. They have fought bravely with the Active Component, and continuing to achieve their mission here at home.

At the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, nearly 50 percent of the Army’s total force was a mix of Reservists and members of the National Guard. The Pennsylvania National Guard alone contributed more than 42,000 individual deployments.

Unfortunately, the Army’s Aviation Restructuring Initiative, or ARI, will have devastating impacts on all that the National Guard has achieved. ARI was built in the transfer of all National Guard Apache helicopters to the Active Component, leaving the National Guard less combat-ready.

It will also deprive our Nation of an operational reserve for these aircraft, which is essential to the restructuring of talented aircrews. ARI represents a fundamental shift in the nature and role of the National Guard.

Last year, Congress wisely created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to offer a deliberate approach to addressing the restructuring issues such as ARI. Yet, as it stands now, many of these transfers will be long done before the Commission has
examined the proposal and reported its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, once these transfers begin, it will be all but impossible to reverse them. We need to allow the Commission time to do its work before the Army takes any harmful and irreversible actions.

In the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, the House adopted an amendment to delay some Apache transfers until June 30, 2016. This amendment extends that responsible limitation to all National Guard Apaches, while also taking important steps to ensure continued readiness of the Apache fleet.

Together, these provisions strike a proper balance between safeguarding our national security and preventing any premature Apache transfers. Only this can truly ensure that the irreparable harm is not done to the National Guard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of colleagues who want to speak, so I will be brief.

But I would point out that this amendment, if adopted, will undo last year’s compromise legislation that supported the Army’s critically important Aviation Restructuring Initiative. Part of that compromise was to establish a commission to study the force structure of the United States Army. I believe we should await that report.

The Army has indicated that if they are restricted under the gentleman’s amendment, they would have to inactivate—and I would repeat this—they would have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in States such as New York, Kansas, and Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going on into the remanufacture plant in 2016.

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my good friend, who is also an Apache pilot.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROTHFUS) for the amendment.

This Congress created the National Guard Infrastructure within the Guard.

But more importantly, this imposes on and weakens our national security because the Guard and the Reserve component is the repository for experience in Apache pilots.

When you get tired of flying the Apache, you deploy over and over again on Active Duty but want to continue to serve your country, what do you do? You join the Reserve component. You come to the Guard.

And those pilots have the most experience because they have flown on Active Duty in the Guard for years and years and years. So when they deploy, that is who you want to fly with. That is who units want to fly with because they have the experience.

The operational depth is in the Guard.

It is not that Governors need the Apache; it is that the United States needs the Apache. And should we transfer the Apache because the Army wants to pick on its little brother and can? And that is exactly what is happening here.

I have heard the arguments. I have listened to all the arguments. I have spent 34 years in uniform. None of them make any sense, and they can’t justify any of them. They talk big around this place in all kinds of acronyms that most people don’t understand, but none of it is justified.

I don’t understand why we would do this, why we wouldn’t wait just till February to get the report from a Commission that we sponsored, that we authorized in this body. Why wouldn’t we wait till then?

Why would we transfer the aircraft, and when the Commission comes back and says don’t transfer the aircraft, oh, well, sorry, we already did that. Won’t we look foolish?

But more importantly, isn’t this important for national security to have the experience that when called upon to go fight—and as the gentleman said, make up 50 percent of the force in the fight.

Let’s not do this for all the wrong reasons.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to prohibit funding for any transfer of Apache helicopters from the National Guard to the Active Army.

In committee, Chairman Wilson and I worked very closely to authorize a congressional review no less than 60 days following the Commission’s report release.

And on the House floor, as an amendment to the NDAA, Mr. Palazzo and I thoroughly examined and determined a fixed transfer date of Apaches no later than June 30.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is being used as a backdoor scheme and a delay tactic. This ploy places devastating impacts and potential deactivation of the Army’s Combat Aviation Brigade in States like New York, Kansas, Hawaii, Arizona, and overall Black Hawk modernization in California.

As the Representative of Fort Drum, home of the 10th Mountain Division, any delay would cause this high operational tempo unit to be left without an Aviation Brigade.

Let me be abundantly clear. Any Apache delay will have grave consequences on our Army’s readiness, deployment schedule, and our soldiers’ dwell time. A delay would severely limit the Army’s ability to meet expected operational requirements and place an even greater burden on our Nation’s brave servicemembers.

So, Mr. Chairman, where I think some may be confused I want to clarify. In exchange for Apaches, the National Guard is set to receive fully modernized Black Hawks, which are essential to lift-and-rescue operations and remain critical to a State’s emergency response. Derailing, delaying, or limiting Apache transfers would, therefore, halt this Black Hawk modernization.

This is merely a ploy to prevent our soldiers from receiving the equipment they need to protect American lives and limbs and it is unconscionable. I am appalled that this is even being discussed and will continue to fight for an ontime transfer of the Apaches from the National Guard to the Active Army.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I only have one more speaker left, and it is my understanding that, as a member of the committee, I have the right to close.

The Acting Chairman. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman concludes his remarks.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would just urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this important amendment to prevent the premature transfer of Apaches out of the National Guard until the Commission has had the opportunity to do its work.

This Congress created the National Commission for the very purpose of studying the impact of transfers such as Apaches out of the Guard after spending billions of dollars, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has said.

This was an investment on the part of the taxpayers to build an operational reserve. We should not take this step until the Commission has completed its work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my colleague from...
the Appropriations Committee, to close the debate.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. I will enter into the Record a letter from General Odierno that I received as an official reference the FY15 NDAA, which expressly allows for the transfer of Apaches with no restrictions on additional moves thereafter.

And it says: If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches, or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going in the remanufacture plant in 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2015.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

We are writing to inform you that pending legislation may require the lives of thousands of military family members, harm our industrial base, and cause us to send Soldiers into combat who may not be fully trained and equipped.

Accordingly, as discussed below, to protect our Soldiers and their Families, we request that you continue to support our comprehensive ARI plan.

The FY15 NDAA provisions were based on the following factors, none of which has changed.

- The National Guard Bureau’s (NGB) alternative to ARI proposed the transfer of 72 AH–64 Apaches to the Regular Army.
- The decision to transfer the remaining AH–64Apaches from the NGB to the Regular Army would be resolved based on recommendations by the National Commission on the Future of the Army, and the NGB.
- The GAO and the Office of the Secretary of Defense CAPE would conduct independent reviews of both ARI and the NGB alternative.
- If implemented, the NGB plan would avoid the challenges related to transfer.
- The Army plan is less costly and provides the capabilities necessary to execute the FY15 NDAA.
- The Army’s plan addresses the need to balance the competing needs for force structure and forces required for military operations.
- Should Congress now dismantle this carefully crafted plan, it would not only be disruptive, but also dangerous for our Soldiers.

As you know, several proposed legislative changes to the NGB alternative would, effectively, enable the Army to transfer any or part of the 72 aircraft or require us to count airframes, which were inducted into the remanufacture process in 2014, against the permitted transfers in FY16. The potential impacts of these provisions are stark.

If we are restricted from transferring any portion of the 72 Apaches (24 in October 2015, 24 in January 2016, and 24 in July 2016), or must count aircraft inducted into the remanufacture line as part of that 72, we will have to inactivate one or more of the battalions in New York, Kansas, or Hawaii, as well as drastically reduce the work going into the remanufacture plant in 2016.

Each battalion inactivation will result in the unplanned transfer of approximately 500 Soldiers and 1,000 family members, driven by the absence of the aircraft needed to train the unit.

Up to three Combat Aviation Brigades (CAB) of 2,500 Soldiers each, will become combat ineffective, because they will be inactivated prior to the end of their service lifetime, which is half of their attack capability, thus depriving the entire brigade this crucial capability.

Nearly 30% of the entire Regular Army combat aviation force could be rendered ineffective, leaving only eight fully ready CABs in 2016—compared to the 13 Regular Army CABs that existed prior to the inactivation of two in FY15; it should be noted that the ARNG does not have a single aircraft or unit in this same time frame; we will not be able to meet PACOM requirements for a “no-notice” Korea warfight;

We will have to send Soldiers into combat in Iraq and Afghanistan without the proper training and equipment available from the 25th ID, 1st ID, and 10th Mountain Division; additionally, the remaining Apache Battalions would have to extend the amount of time they are deployed (note, they are already operating at a 1:1.5 deploy to dwell ratio); and

We may have to stop inductions into the AH–64E remanufacture line, because we could not, under certain provisions, process 24 Apaches from the ARNG. Additionally, the remaining 32 Regular Army AH–64Es for a year, which are planned for induction, without the backfill transfer of the 72 Apaches from the ARNG could be too high.

This stoppage could jeopardize a workforce of 4,100 employees in 22 states, including 2,200 in Arizona, 360 in Alabama, 350 in Florida, 263 in California, and lesser numbers in WA, TX, MO, FL, NC, CO, NV, WV, PA, NY, VT, NH, CT, NC, SC, and GA.

We face an unprecedented and unpredictable global environment that continues to play itself out in new ways. Now more than ever, we need a force that provides the capabilities necessary to execute the missions that we know are coming, and the Army’s critically important depth and ability to handle contingencies we cannot predict. An absolutely critical component of our force is our aviation formations, and we must be able to effectivly restructure them to meet current and future demands. Accordingly, we need your support to ensure that the framework created by the FY15 NDAA remains in place. We owe this to our Soldiers, their Families, our industry partners and, most importantly, the American people. Should Congress now dismantle or delay ARI, we jeopardize your Army, and our Nation’s security.

We appreciate your time and thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
Raymond T. Odierno,
General, United States Army,
Chief of Staff.
John M. McHugh,
Secretary of the Army.

Mrs. ROBY. Look, friends and colleagues, we have heard from several Members about the devastating impacts that any delay in ARI would have on our Army.

But let’s take time to revisit why we are here in the first place. We are here because this Congress put the Army in the position to have to make the difficult decisions in the first place. We are here because of a thing called sequestration. And if there has ever been a time for a stronger argument to revisit this so that we can properly fund all of our military across all branches so that they are not put in this box where the Army has to make these tough decisions, now is the time.

We have got to properly fund the United States military. So here we have a letter from a highly respected Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army to Congress saying: If you do this, if you delay these helicopter transfers, you will create a domino effect that will result in the United States of America sending our soldiers to Afghanistan and Iraq who are neither fully trained or in fully equipped.

We have got to do better. We have to do better. And this is the case. Again, I oppose this amendment, and I call on my colleagues to revisit fully funding our military and repealing the sequester.

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

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

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

SNC. 817. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for activities authorized under section 1298 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1621) to initiate support for, or expand support to, the irregular or unconventional forces, groups, or individuals unless the congressional defense committees are notified in
accordance with the direction contained in the classified annex accompanying this Act, not less than 15 days before initiating such support: Provided, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used under such section 1208 for any activity that is not in support of an ongoing military operation being conducted by United States Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibitions in this section if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances and, by not later than 72 hours after making such waiver, notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

SEC. 8118. (a) Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to assess whether the justification and approval requirements under section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–41; 124 Stat. 1445) have, inconsistent with the intent of Congress—

(i) negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department of Defense greater than $20,000,000;

(ii) discouraged agencies from awarding contracts greater than $20,000,000 to covered entities; and

(iii) been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

(b) The Comptroller General shall analyze and report to the congressional defense committees on the sufficiency of the Department’s report in addressing the requirements; review the extent to which section 811 has negatively impacted the ability of covered entities to be awarded sole-source contracts with the Department, discouraged agencies from awarding contracts, or been misconstrued and/or inconsistently implemented.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 4 and 5 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

SEC. 8120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any A-10 aircraft, or to disestablish any units of the active or reserve component associated with such aircraft.

SEC. 8121. Of the funds provided for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defensewide,” not less than $2,800,000 shall be used to support the Department’s activities related to the implementation of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (Public Law 113–101; 31 U.S.C. 6101 note) and to support the implementation of a uniform procurement instrument identifier as described in subpart 4.16 of Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, to include changes in business processes, work force, or information technology.

SEC. 8122. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be transferred to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Strike section 8122.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia and a member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has already been supported by 375 Members of this House; yet this amendment has, 90 percent of the House. It is rare to find an amendment to an appropriation bill that has such bipartisan support: yet this amendment has.

This is an amendment not put in just me, but by my good friend Mr. COURTNEY, by Mr. WITTMAN, by Mr. LANGEVIN, by Mr. ROGERS, by Ms. DELAURÉ—three HASC subcommittee chairmen, two HASC ranking members, and a Defense appropriator. It is an amendment that is supported by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

It is rare to find such different groups in support, the Navy League, the United Auto Workers, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, AFL-CIO; yet this amendment has that support.

The reason these planets are all aligning in this rare configuration is because it is also rare—in fact, once every other generation—that we have to build something like the Ohio class submarine; yet it falls upon this generation.

In 4 years, we will begin the procurement. In 6 years, we will start construction of 12 ships—they call boats—that will carry 70 percent of the nuclear deterrence of this country—$92 billion.

The national sea-based deterrence fund we formed last year helps us prepare for that in advance, instead of waiting until the night before to come up with $32 billion. It transfers $1.4 billion into a fund and allows the Department of Defense to use other moneys, a rare thing for the government to actually prepare in advance, instead of waiting until the last minute to prepare. It will help to purchase in bulk and save perhaps millions, maybe even billions of dollars.

Now, I know there are voices that say—this is an amendment not put in by this gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and I not only serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and provide its leadership, but we have also supported this program on Energy and Water, which is the other part of the package.

With respect, the gentleman from Virginia’s amendment proposes to strike a provision of the bill, prohibits the transfer of funds to the national sea-based deterrence fund, a reserve established but not funded last year in the NDAA.

We recognize this submarine will be expensive; however, the national sea-based deterrence fund will not make the submarine any less expensive, and it will not increase resources available to the department.

This Congress has an important responsibility to provide resources to all of our military services and the intelligence community. Under the structure of this special fund, the Secretary of Defense has the authority to divert dollars into this new fund from the Army, Marines, Air Force, Special Forces, missile defense, ISR, and other types of essential programs. This is the wrong approach. It removes, further more, congressional oversight from the Secretary of Defense.

Secondly, if the President determines the Ohio class replacement is a must-fund platform, then the Navy should buy it, just as it has every other submarine in its inventory that our committee has supported. Establishing a special fund to pay for the submarine is an attempt to have other military services pay for what is a Navy responsibility.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, could I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt for a second the sincerity of the chairman and the ranking member and their support for the Ohio replacement program of Defense.

This chart, which the Navy produced, showing the 30-year shipbuilding plan, if we fully fund the Ohio class program,
Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reaffirm that this is a national priority, and I would urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is where reality comes into play. We talked about this earlier. Having a fund that is set up does not evade the responsibility of providing the long-term funding.

All of these things in the Department of Defense are priorities, and our friends on the Appropriations Committee have been trying to balance these priorities and have the big picture available to them. I think they have done exactly the right thing. I think this needs to be subsumed within the overall budget. There is no magic money. Having something that subverts the hard work that we ask the Appropriations Committee to do, I think, is the wrong thing to do.

It is not easy to stand up and make this argument, but I appreciate what they have done. They did it last year, and it was appropriate. They have done it this year, and it is appropriate. We have to be able to deal with this in a comprehensive way and not use sleight of hand.

I appreciate what the chair and ranking member have done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I urge my colleagues to join in opposition to the amendment in the strongest possible terms. I certainly respect the position of my colleagues on the other side of this argument, but I do remind my colleagues that the CBO estimates that this program is going to cost somewhere between $102 and $107 billion.

You are absolutely correct. This is a very expensive program, and we ought to be very, very careful. Given the tremendous financial resources that we will be required to modernize or replace the U.S. nuclear delivery systems and weapons over the next two decades, it is imperative that Congress begin to make tough decisions now and not set up segregated funds.

Unfortunately, this fund is a means to avoid those tough decisions. Firstly, the fund in no way solves the problem of where are we going to get the money. It is not going to make the next generation of ballistic missile submarines any cheaper. It simply shifts the burden for their construction from the Department of the Navy to the entire Department of Defense.

I categorically disagree with the amendment's sponsor relative to this replacement program and the suggestion that it should exist outside the existing Navy shipbuilding account.

The sponsors are correct that the funding for that shipbuilding account has been relatively flat in recent years. However, if the Ohio class replacement and the 300-ship Navy are priorities of this Nation and consistent with our national defense strategy, then we ought to pay for both, in a transparent manner, by increasing the resources in the shipbuilding account and not resort to setting up independent funds.

Further, the sponsors indicate that this is a national priority, and I would not argue that point. These systems play a very important role in our nuclear deterrence, so do our long-range bombers and the weapons that they carry.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, long-range bombers also provide protection for this country as well as the weapons they carry. I think they qualify as national asset distinctions. Should we then set up funds for these programs?

Let's think about other priorities within the Department. Should we set up a fund for the Army's 82nd Airborne? Should we set up a fund for the Air Force combat command? They are very deserving. Should we set up a fund for the special Marine Air-Ground Task Force? They are very deserving.

Another concern that I have is it really expands and transfers authority to the Secretary of Defense. The last time I looked, we have a constitutional responsibility to make decisions ourselves.
The fact is we already have a segregated fund that has drawn a lot of attention to this bill that is called the overseas contingency operations fund. Should we start picking between services now as to which one should receive special treatment? Should we then pick programs within particular services? I think not.

Again, I strongly oppose the amendment and am pleased to join with the chairman in opposition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Can I request how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers have made my point for me. Mr. BLUMENAUER made the same arguments 4 weeks ago. It was defeated by 375 votes.

The last gentleman that spoke said it is $102 billion. The question is whether we wait until the night before to come up with a balance that we wait now and make sure we have it. This is a national priority. I hope we will pass this amendment and build these ships.

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

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

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8121. None of the funds provided in this Act for the T-AO(X) program shall be used to fund a new contract that provides for the acquisition of the following components unless those components are manufactured in the United States: Auxiliary equipment (including pumps) for shipboard services; propulsion equipment (including engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

SEC. 8124. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for military personnel pay, including active duty, reserve and National Guard pay, $700,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts: Provided, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8125. The amounts appropriated in title II of this Act are hereby reduced by $359,000,000 to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds as follows:

(1) From "Operation and Maintenance, Army", $138,000,000;

(2) From "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide", $221,292,000.

SEC. 8126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to lower than anticipated fuel prices, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $814,000,000.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the end strength levels for the Army National Guard of the United States below the levels specified for the Army Guard of the United States in subtitle B of title IV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291): Provided, That this section shall continue in effect through the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 8128. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140, 42 U.S.C. 1712).

TITLE IX

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", $5,604,070,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", $1,643,136,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", $2,376,955,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army", $24,662,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", $12,685,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", $3,393,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", $18,710,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army", $166,015,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", $2,828,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", $18,910,604,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $80,000,000)".

Page 123, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $80,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) uses the global war on terrorism funds for the Army operations and maintenance to provide $80 million in the same account for hard body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program.

Now, every warfighter deployed or scheduled to be deployed deserves to be provided with the most advanced and the lightest hard body armor. The amendment will ensure that the deployed soldiers are provided with the modern body armor they need. Presently, this bill provides no funds for the Army hard body armor.

This amendment will also help to ensure that the industrial base producing the specialized boron carbide powder, fabricating ceramic plates, and producing finished hard body armor can stay in business and sustain production of the lifesaving soldier protection equipment.

The body armor industry is in crisis, and that puts our troops at risk.

Last year, the House and Senate appropriated $80 million to the Army for industrial preparedness body armor.
All four congressional defense committees explicitly directed the Army to ensure that the industrial base is able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor.

Despite this clear and explicit direction, the Army has completely ignored Congress over and over again, failing to maintain the body armor industrial base has put a vital industry at risk and is causing layoffs among very specialized employees, which puts the entire industry at risk.

There is no doubt that our troops deserve modern, lightweight body armor that requires a strong, reliable, and fully capable industrial base.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Baine), my good friend, my colleague on this issue.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her leadership on this issue and partnership in supporting this important and critical mission of our military. That the United States warfighter in combat has the most advanced, lightweight body armor available to protect that soldier in the field against the enemy, and we must act now to make sure that the U.S. Army does what is the intent of the Congress.

As the gentlewoman pointed out, despite the fact that Congress has been clear on this matter, despite the fact that report language for both the FY15 and FY16 Defense Appropriations recognizes the importance of lightweight body armor protecting soldiers in combat, we encouraged the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the body armor industrial base was able to continue the development and manufacture of more advanced body armor by implementing the body armor modernization through a replenishment program.

Despite all of that, despite the articulation of the clear will of this body, the Army has not used and deployed the funds appropriated properly, and the Department of Defense was at odds because the Army did not deploy the resources appropriated until, or expressed the intent of, not deploying those resources until the end of the fiscal year.

What this amendment will do is make sure that congressional intent is honored, make sure that the armor industrial base is properly maintained, and most importantly and most critically, when our men and women are called into combat to defend liberty and freedom, that we give them the tools that they need to keep them safe and carry out their mission with victory around them.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, this $80 million is to provide body armor for the Soldier Protection System Vital Torso Protection equipment program. I ask for Members’ support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but, in fact, I support the amendment put forward by Mr. Poe of Texas.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her amendment, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky for his strong advocacy.

Supporting our industrial base is a strong priority of mine and our committee. The amendment is a good idea. It sends another message to the bureaucracy that we mean what we say.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCollum).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Poe of Texas

Mr. Poe of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy" (including transfer of funds), $6,747,313,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps:

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,871,834,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to sections 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Operation and Maintenance, Air Force:

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", $10,790,200,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to sections 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide:

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", $7,559,131,000: Provided, That the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,280,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, for the purpose of reimbursing key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including, access, provided to United States military and civilian operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military and civilian operations in Afghanistan to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: Provided further, That these funds may be used to support the Government of Jordan, in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense may determine, to maintain the ability of the Jordanian armed forces to maintain security along the border between Jordan and Syria, upon 15 days prior written notification to the congressional defense committees of the amount and the nature of the expenses to be reimbursed: Provided further, That not to exceed $15,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be approved or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided further, That the authority in the preceding proviso may only be used for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, up to $30,000,000 shall be for Operation Observant Compass: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to sections 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Amendment offered by Mr. Poe of Texas

Mr. Poe of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consue.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts aid to Pakistan in half. Pakistan is the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call our allies.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts aid to Pakistan in half. Pakistan is the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call our allies.

Before Obama bin Laden met his maker in 2011 in one of the greatest U.S. military raids ever conducted, bin Laden was living in plain sight in a bustling military town. To think that the most senior leader of the Pakistani Government did not know that he was there requires, as Secretary Clinton said, "the willing suspension of disbelief."
Pakistan has already received over $30 billion of our money since 2002. After 13 years of giving Pakistan more and more money, it is time to do something different. My amendment simply cuts the money we give Pakistan in half. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. I certainly understand the gentleman’s passion, and at times, I share some of the same concerns he stated in his remarks. Just to put a little perspective on it, the coalition support fund allows the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support, including access, specialized training to personnel, procurement and provision of supplies and equipment provided by that nation in connection with the U.S. military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom. Receipts for reimbursements are submitted by cooperating nations and are fully vetted by the Pentagon and follow strict criteria to meet the standard for reimbursement, and all payments are made in full prior to notification to Congress, so there is a notification to Congress.

Regarding Pakistan, the coalition support fund remains a critical tool to enable Pakistan to effectively deal with future challenges emerging from the U.S. drawdown. At times, I wonder whether we are withdrawing. It is also a cost-effective tool, some would say, for the U.S. to remain engaged in the region. I know all too well that our relationship with Pakistan is an uncomfortable one; I feel it, but these funds are sent to reimburse Pakistan for actions to protect our interests.

These reimbursements are made to maintain some 180 Pakistani forces along 1,600 miles of border between Pakistan and Afghanistan to deter cross-border conflict, movement, and counterterrorism counterinsurgency operations throughout the FATA, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas. The focus of this core level is against TTP, an al Qaeda-allied organization that conducts regional terrorist and insurgent attacks. Nearly 28,000 militants were killed, injured, or arrested due to these operations. Pakistan itself hasn’t got much press—has suffered a lot of casualties themselves, about 5,000, while attempting to secure this treacherous border.

Continued support of the deployment of the Pakistan Armed Forces in FATA and other areas in the future is needed for the long-term stability of the area. I must oppose the amendment, although I understand the passion with which the gentleman has made his argument because I think it is in our long-term interest to have this relationship.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and would acknowledge the gentleman from Texas’s legitimate concern. I would associate myself with the chairman’s remark, but make one important addition, and that is the chairman has been adamant that we be very, very careful about our relationship with Pakistan, and the bill recognizes difficulties we face.

I would draw the Member’s attention to section 9015 that prohibits funds to Pakistan if the government is engaged in activities that present a concern to the government of the United States. I appreciate that the chairman insisted on that language. That is included in the bill.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee.

Pakistan cannot be trusted. They lie about the reimbursements. They have not met the criteria that the ranking member has talked about the last 4 years, and they got the money anyway. They are playing us, Mr. Chairman, and we pay them; and they use that money to hurt us, to hurt Americans.

This amendment says: we are cutting the money in half because of your prior conduct that shows you can’t be trusted.

That is all this amendment does.

I would hope Members of Congress would send a message to Pakistan: we are not going to pay you to hate us and pay you to kill us; we are going to cut the money off.

And that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was ordered. The Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve”, $124,559,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve”, $34,187,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve”, $3,455,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE Reserve

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve”, $225,350,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY National Guard

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, $160,845,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL Guard

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, $239,660,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the “Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund”, $2,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That such funds shall be available to provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support, or receive counterterrorism and antipersonnel response activities pursuant to section 1534 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘‘Buck’’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall transfer the funds provided herein to other appropriations provided for in this Act to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and subject to the same authorities and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That the funds available under this heading are an ‘‘emergency’’ fund account. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WAlberg, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with Ms. Esty of Connecticut, Mr. Cohen of Tennessee, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, and Mr. Cicilline of Rhode Island that works to assure the appropriate use of American taxpayer dollars in Afghanistan.

This amendment is in keeping with the clear position of the House, as we have voted numerous times in a bipartisan fashion to limit funds for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund, a program which has been poorly run and is lacking in oversight.

The gentleman would specifically strike the language which allows $50 million in funds for the Afghanistan security forces fund to be redirected toward the Afghanistan infrastructure fund account.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has provided $1.3 billion to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund since it was created in 2011. However, funds have been voted to be spent solely on Afghan security forces, and more than 55 percent of the AIF funds remain to be expended.

Additionally, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, has repeatedly found that DOD has experienced challenges in executing large infrastructure projects and that many projects underway are behind schedule and face serious cost overruns. SIGAR’s audits have also found that we have inadequate sustainment plans and that projects lack an identifiable counterinsurgency benefit. SIGAR has also expressed reservations about the Afghans’ ability to even operate and maintain these energy projects upon completion.

Now, it is my understanding that DOD requested this repurposing of funds because the budget authority on previously authorized funds is about to expire. We know what we authorized to the congressional defense committees. I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.
Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman. I share the gentleman’s deep concern over the tax dollars that have been, if you would, wasted—is probably the most polite term I can think of—in some of the infrastructure investment in Afghanistan and would not in any way applaud the waste.

The gentleman mentions the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. He and his office have been in mine, the chairman’s, the committee, and there is no question that the gentleman makes a very, very important point about making sure that those funds we are spending, despite the best of intentions, be spent carefully.

I would note to my colleagues that we do have within somewhat recent time, the last year or so since August, a new government in place in Afghanistan. The administration has made a decision to maintain troop levels at their current position given that change. I mean, if you would, after all of the loss of life, the suffering, and loss of treasury for the last 14 years, to give that nation one last good chance.

I rise in opposition, essentially, to do that for Afghanistan and to give them that last good chance for these few remaining significant projects.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the sentiments of Mr. VISCLOSKY about some of the concerns and some of the reports that have been issued by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. It should be worrisome. A hell of a lot of money has been wasted.

I do think there are some projects that need to be completed. One that comes to mind is the Kandahar bridging solution, the plan to bring electric power to Kandahar. It ends in 3 months. We need to continue that investment. This was a top counterinsurgency priority. Most road projects are completed. The second is the Kajaki Dam has less than a year’s work remaining and will supply renewable electric power to the grid.

These are elements of stability that sometimes get lost in reports of empty buildings where there are no occupants and no electricity. I think we need to continue to give a helping hand to the Afghan people because, if they don’t have an economy, then they are not going to have any national security. They need a stable economy, and some of these projects near completion need to be continued.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the words, the sentiments, the compassion of both my colleagues; but this is an issue that we have addressed for quite some time. It is not new.

I am as concerned about our administration’s encouragement of the Defense Department to provide funds to the Afghan military to purchase equipment as I am about the misappropriation of $400 million of the $715 million in this year’s assistance. This was a top priority, and this Administration knew it.

The Acting Chairman. I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting Chairman. Pursuant to the gentleman’s request, and the gentleman’s request for a recorded vote, the question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Page 162, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $715,000,000)”.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting Chairman. Pursuant to the gentleman’s request, the question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Acting Chairman. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that prior to providing assistance to elements of the armed forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including the Iraqi National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 114-260; 128 Stat. 2308), to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, services, and other aid, in support of Iraq’s counterterrorism efforts, to include preventing and disrupting foreign terrorist organizations and to provide assistance to the Iraqi government and security forces designated to receive such assistance, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense determines.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting Chairman. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 324, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced to $0)”.

Page 324, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $115,000,000)”.

The Acting Chairman. Pursuant to the gentleman’s request, the question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting Chairman. Pursuant to the gentleman’s request, the question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by thanking Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY. As everyone knows, a long time ago when everything came up under an open rule, we didn’t see as much of that. I can’t commend both of the gentlemen...
and their committees enough. I wish everybody in America could see how hard they have worked in their committees and here on the House floor. The country should know that there are no two more highly regarded people who are serving in this Chamber than our chairman and our ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that will save us a lot of money and, quite frankly, end a sad chapter in American history. My amendment eliminates funding for the Iraq Train and Equip Program and applies that money to reducing the deficit. The administration, as we all know, is now urging strategic patience with Iraq. The truth is we have had a failed strategy there from the very beginning. The fact is that this is a century-old conflict. The fact is that we have no friends in this conflict. The history of it is clear.

I happened to be up in Tora Bora back in the seventies, and I learned that the Mujahedeen were trained and equipped to fight against the Russians under the notion that the enemy of our enemy is our friend. We were wrong. They morphed into al Qaeda, and they were the people who attacked the World Trade Centers.

Then we supported Saddam Hussein in the war against Iran. We knew he had used chemical weapons, because we had the sales receipts. We had supplied them. After that, we deposed him. Then, the Shiites in Iraq decided the Shiites proceeded to tell all of the Christians and the Jews and the Catholics, "Get out of town, or we will kill you." They shut down all of the synagogues and the Catholic churches.

Then we decided we would have a Sunni awakening. That was supplying arms and weapons to the Sunnis because the Shiites were persecuting them. They ultimately morphed into what we now have as ISIL. Now here we are. We find ourselves fighting the Shitites and we are supporting the Shiites in Iraq. We are not sure if we are for them or against them in Syria.

The simple truth is that we have been on every side of this conflict. We really have no friends in this conflict. Inevitably, our goodwill, our good intentions have resulted in the arms and the weapons, as Judge Posz just said, ending up in the hands of our enemies, and they use them against us.

The fact is we have spent $3 trillion on this conflict. Think about that—$3 trillion. For $1 trillion of that, we could have graduated debt free every kid in America from college and vocational school. Just think about it. We could have built our transportation and infrastructure system in this country. For another $1 trillion, we could have given the Americans a tax break.

Mr. Chairman, instead of 13 years of war, the administration now admits that we have no strategy. The Secretary of Defense admits that the Iraqi Army has no will to fight ISIL. When they took over Ramadi, all they did was growl at them, and they ran like rabbits. They left their Humvees, and they left their tanks, and they left all of their weapons, and we resupplied ISIL, once again, to use those weapons against us. The weapons we have supplied and those people who have trained have ended up in enemy hands time and time again and have been used against us.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, you know the old definition of insanity is repeating the same behavior, is repeating the same behavior over and over and expecting some different result. To paraphrase the old Serenity Prayer, let me say, Mr. President and colleagues: Let us change what we have the power, the wisdom, and the courage to do before we bankrupt this country.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I share quite a lot of the gentleman's views. I have said on a number of occasions, when you put the Defense bill forward, sometimes you have to support things that the Commander in Chief and the President want that you are highly dubious about. You have to be conflicted about this Train and Equip. At times, I think the enemy is doing a better job of training and equipping their own than we are, and, at times, it has been pretty deplorable. I want the gentleman to know I do support this effort. Let me just put some meat on the bones to, maybe, even make his point but, in reality, tell a little truth about the program.

The Iraq Train and Equip Program provides about $715 million in both funding and authority to assist military and other forces associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces, with a national security mission to counter ISIL. We do know in the overall mix—and the gentleman from Minnesota knows it—there are some good guys over there. Of course, a lot of the good guys have been taken over by the Quds Force and the Iranians to the south, but, in reality, we have some good real allies in the north with the Kurds, so I haven't given up on all parts of Iraq.

I think we need to continue to support the program. Evidently, our President does as well. We are sending 400 more advisers over to, shall we say, set up a new base camp in Ramadi in Anbar province to sort of respond to a huge crisis there when that city was taken over. I would hate to abandon the people of Iraq without giving it one more try.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's motivation in offering this. In a sense, the three of us are agreed given the skepticism that has been expressed here today.

I would also add that I do believe this institution needs to have a resolution that defines with some specificity what our projection of force should be as to the disposition of our military personnel and assets. Certainly, I am grievously disappointed for those countries in that region in their lack of clarity and purpose. Also, in using, if you would, a religious theme, I was taught that we should have hope in the future, and my concern is, if we cease this training program for those who want a change in government, for those who want to do the right thing in Syria, they will lose what shred of hope still exists.

Principally, for that reason, I join with the chairman in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I do appreciate the gentleman's inspiration.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In reclaiming my time, I have a few other comments.

Mr. Chairman, I said I do work on behalf of the President of the United States and our Commander in Chief, and I have to say I have concerns about our continued investment in Pakistan. We debated that. We have had talk about the Afghan infrastructure fund, which has been troubled with projects, and this is an ongoing area which has not been trouble free. Yet it is interesting that nobody from the White House, since the budget was introduced, has reached out to us or the House relative to defending these programs.

I think the people of these countries deserve protection and support, but it is interesting that we carry the water on these issues and on many other issues on this committee. Do we get any reinforcements? Actually, our entire bill has been put together for all of our military services without any assistance from those military services to get us across the finish line. I think it is remarkable. The standoffishness—the ambivalence—about working with us, I think, is a total disgrace.

I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and he certainly knows more about my sentiments publicly that I have expressed in the past.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by
Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start tonight by saying that my mother is gravely ill in Florida this evening, and I can’t be with her, but I want her to know that I am with her right now, and I am always with her.

We all want to end U.S. involvement in conflicts where there is no long-term strategy, no vision of success in the end, and the disproportional sacrifice of our brave military personnel. Mr. Chairman. U.S. involvement against ISIS in Syria fits this characterization. The administration even admits that there is no comprehensive strategy in place.

Therefore, by amendment, we are proposing to defund U.S. support for the Syrian rebels and move the funds to the spending reduction account.

Last September, Congress allocated $500 million to train and arm Syrian rebels. This program, however, is fraught with uncertainty, and the launch of the program has been less than impressive. Of the 15,000 Syrian rebels we planned to train and equip over a 3-year period, so far, only about 400 have been vetted and deemed ready. Meanwhile, other Syrian rebels have either disappeared from the battlefield or have defected to extremist factions, and ISIS has expanded its ground forces, its operations, and its territories. Other jihadist factions in Syria are also gaining strength, and the Assad regime continues its atrocities.

The civil war in Syria has resulted in 220,000 Syrian deaths and in 11.5 million people—over half the population—displaced within Syria. The U.S. continues to provide, by far, the bulk of the military might, most of its air power. It is hard to imagine defeating ISIS without substantial ground forces to combat it at this point.

The Defense Appropriations bill includes $600 million for arms to the Syrian rebels as part of this needed boots-on-the-ground.

But whatever the number of Syrian rebels we ultimately introduce into the battlefield, they alone, I believe, are unlikely to turn the tide. Nor are these rebels expected to end the Assad government, even though that, too, is one of our stated goals.

History has shown that when we arm untested and difficult-to-vet rebel forces, the weapons we provide too often wind up being aimed at our U.S. troops. I am told that the last time our country bought a substantial number of war materials from the Balkans, the weapons went to the Serbs and the Serbs to the Albanians.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to join my colleague. I have enormous respect for the chairman and the ranking member’s good and noble intentions, but, again, the fact is we have no friends in these conflicts. The weapons that we send inevitably are being used against us. I was here during the Vietnam war conflict, and the arguments that we heard then for continuing this involvement is to somehow make something good out of what hasn’t been quite so good, and we finally ended that conflict by cutting off the funds for it. That is how we are going to end our wars of choice in the Middle East, wars of choice that are bankrupting this country and costly in blood and treasury.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey recognition for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure, on behalf of everybody on the floor, we extend to Mr. Clawson our sympathy and hope that his mother will recover. I am sure if she has the ability to be watching the television tonight, she is already very proud of his courageous remarks on the floor.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Heartfelt thanks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the sentiment of the amendment, the complex issue—that is an overstatement—with multifaceted policy ramifications that really can’t be fully debated in 5 or 10 minutes. The situation in Syria remains highly complicated and complex, and poses imminent threats to the United States and our allied interests, particularly Israel, Jordan, and Iraq.

Recognizing congressional concerns regarding potential U.S. military involvement in Syria, our bill appropriately deems the title IX that I talked about several hours ago to train and equip Syrians. It also further prohibits the introduction
of U.S. military forces into hostilities in Syria except in accordance with the War Powers Act.

However, this amendment, in my judgment, goes too far, for it attempts to tie the U.S. Government’s hands in navigating the complicated situation we—incorrectly, I believe—have evolved in Syria.

This amendment would do nothing to stop the arming of the Syrian opposition. What this amendment would do is remove the possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstances, even if such engagement would be in the best interests of the United States or allies. Even at this rate, the U.S. is paying just a portion of the costs.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky), the ranking member, for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. Visclosky. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to express my best wishes for the gentleman’s mother. It is hard to oppose a gentleman who went to Purdue University, I know he is a very smart individual. I have my other colleague here from Minnesota.

I have spoken to our colleagues on the previous amendment. I think people understand my position. I simply would like to give my advice to the chairman and emphasize, this is a very tough problem, and we ought to maintain as large a degree of flexibility as we can. I appreciate the chairman’s remarks and associate myself with them.

Mr. Frelinghuysen. I urge a no vote on this amendment, but I certainly understand the sentiments behind it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Nolan. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Clerk will read. The Clerk reads as follows:

PROCUREMENT

ARIA CHAIR.

For an additional amount for Aircraft Procurement, Army, $756,073,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army”, $572,735,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $451,640,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, $105,459,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF SPACE PROTECTION SYSTEMS, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Space Procurement, Navy”, $727,742,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.
For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, $2,177,947,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: Provided, That such amounts are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 9002. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $3,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 9003. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $3,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense in this title. Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to this section and each transfer shall be subject to the terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 9004. Supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction associated with construction projects funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance or the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” provided in this Act and any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of $500,000 or more, shall be reported to the congressional defense committees monthly, and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in any other provision of law, to fund the Congress’ Emergency Responce Program in Afghanistan: Provided further, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available under any other provision of law, to fund the Congress’ Emergency Responce Program in Afghanistan: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 45 days after the end of each quarter, report to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to any other provision of law for any such purpose or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through this provision of law.

SEC. 9007. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the payment of all in-house Government services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9009. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the constitutional military stationing restrictions promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other
Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done on New York on December 10, 1948):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code,
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(1) (a) The Secretary of Defense shall: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 15 days prior to obligations incurred under any heading, notify the congressional defense committees of the authorizations and disbursements of the provisions of this Act that the Secretary of Defense has incurred under any heading, notify the congressional defense committees of the authorizations and disbursements of the provisions of this Act.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall certify to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has incurred under any heading, notify the congressional defense committees of the authorizations and disbursements of the provisions of this Act.
Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is very simple. It makes it so the Secretary of Defense cannot waive the conditions that are in the bill on giving money to Pakistan. Since Congress has put conditions on our aid to Pakistan because Pakistan, frankly, can’t be trusted. In 2011, Pakistan tipped off terrorists who had IED factories that the U.S. Government knew where they were. Pakistani of the Haqqani network before the Pakistani military went to the tribal areas last year.

We didn’t tell Pakistan before we launched the raid that killed Osama bin Laden because, according to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, “We just can’t trust them.”

This bill puts seven conditions on our aid to Pakistan. They are good conditions. Earlier this evening, about an hour ago, the ranking member mentioned these conditions for aid to Pakistan. They are common sense things like, if Pakistan wants our money, it shouldn’t support terrorist activity against the United States—imagine that—or the Pakistani Government should dismantle the IED factories run by terrorists in Pakistan. These IED factories have killed many of our troops.

Here is the problem. Each year, we put conditions on our aid. The bill also gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to give the money to Pakistan even if Pakistan doesn’t meet those conditions, and this year is no exception. Once again, in this bill, we give the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the conditions Congress puts in the bill.

Four of the last 5 years, Pakistan has failed to meet the conditions Congress has imposed on this type of legislation, and then the Secretary of Defense went ahead and gave the waiver, thus giving the money to Pakistan anyway.

The administration has never given Pakistan money because it failed to meet our conditions—conditions set by Congress—normal, commonsense conditions like: you don't get this money unless you meet these conditions.

This amendment does one simple thing. It says: you meet the conditions, or you get no money from the United States; you don’t give money to terrorists, or you get no money from the United States.

It does not allow the Secretary of Defense to waive Congress’ conditions and give the money anyway.

That is what this legislation does. I would ask that the House support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. This amendment would strike, as he said, the waiver that is used by the Secretary of Defense and also the Secretary of State. I think it would affect our national security.

We need the cooperation of the Pakistanis. If we don’t have any, we lose insight into certain things that those who would do our country harm. I oppose this amendment as potentially damaging to our national security, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chair for yielding, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Again, I am not unsympathetic to the position the gentleman has raised, but I do not think we are in a very difficult relationship, that we restrain our flexibility to meet the moment.

For that reason, I join the chairman in his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank both the ranking member and the chairman for their comments and their work on this legislation.

My amendment says, to quote the chairman earlier, “We mean what we say.” We say as a Congress that, if we are going to give American money to Pakistan to help us, they can’t do certain things with that money. They can’t support terrorism. They can’t allow IEDs to be built that are used to kill Americans. These conditions are commonsense, good ideas.

In the past, we have done this before. If we mean what we say, then we should require these conditions before we give Pakistan American money; but the law has allowed that Secretary of Defense to waive Congress’ conditions and give them our money anyway.

Pakistan has proven they didn’t meet the conditions in 4 years of the last 5. They got the money anyway because the Secretary waived the rule of law or waived our common sense.

This bill does something very simple. It says: Congress says there are certain rules to get American money; you follow the rules, or you don’t get the money. Nobody can waive the conditions and give you a pass and give you American money anyway.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Vacating Demand for Recorded Vote on Amendment Offered by Mr. Rothfus

Mr. ROThFUS. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for the work that he has done on this. I understand that I had an amendment earlier today. There has been on-going discussion about that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the bill, and that the amendment be disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will re-designate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

SEC. 9016. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act, $500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to the operations and maintenance, military personnel, and procurement accounts, to improve the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities of the Department of Defense: Provided, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That not later than 30 days prior to exercising the transfer authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committee of the Congress—normal, consistent with the proposed uses of these funds: Provided further, That the funds provided in this section may not be transferred to any program, project, or activity specifically limited or denied by this Act: Provided further, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(I) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: Provided further, That the transfer authority to be exercised under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

SEC. 9017. In addition to amounts appropriated in title II or otherwise made available in this Act, $2,500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and
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