

BERNIE SANDERS, and AL FRANKEN called the SANE Act, the Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures Act. It would cut \$100 billion over the next 10 years from our bloated nuclear weapons budget.

It is time to stop funding a nuclear weapons budget that threatens to undermine our long-term economic security. We should be funding education, not annihilation. We should be helping people find jobs, not helping to build new nuclear weapons. We should be curing diseases, not creating new instruments of death.

Even within our own budget, the Department of Defense should be prioritizing higher pay for marines, not more Minutemen missiles. Somewhere, Dr. Strangelove is smiling from the grave while millions of American families struggle to meet the daily budget they have to balance.

I am a cosponsor of the Reed amendment to stop any increase in this so-called OCO account until the Budget Control Act caps for both defense and nondefense spending are lifted equally.

For those who say the cuts to defense spending endanger our security, I say we face a very real type of economic security threat here at home. Millions of seniors worry about an end to Medicare and Medicaid. Millions of students need help to pay for college. Millions of American workers cannot make ends meet on the minimum wage.

I support the Reed amendment. That will keep America truly safe, healthy, and secure.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

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

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Reed amendment No. 1521 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending relief from the spending limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) Modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to ensure criminal background checks of employees of the military child care system and providers of child care services and youth program services for military dependents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3 p.m. will be equally divided between the managers and their designees.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as we consider the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island, I would like to again remind my colleagues that the world is in turmoil. The world has never seen greater crises since the end of World War II, according to people as well respected as Dr. Kissinger.

I repeat my assertion that OCO was not the right or best way to do business. The worst way to do business is to have an authorization that will eliminate our ability to defend this Nation and the men and women who serve it.

I urge my colleagues to read in this weekend's New York Times "The Global Struggle to Respond to the Worst Refugee Crisis in Generations."

Eleven million people were uprooted by violence last year, most propelled by conflict in Syria, Iraq, Ukraine and Afghanistan. Conflict and extreme poverty have also pushed tens of thousands out of parts of sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia. . . . the worst migration crisis since World War II, according to the United Nations.

That is what is going on in the world, and we are worried about how we are going to defend the Nation with priorities that are dramatically strewn and unfair.

"Islamic State attacks government office on western fringe of Baghdad." That was yesterday.

Three militants disguised in military uniform killed at least eight people in a local government office in Amiriya al-Falluja in

western Iraq on Tuesday, in an attack claimed by Islamic State.

"The U.S. Army's main Web site is down—and the Syrian Electronic Army is claiming credit."

The Syrian Electronic Army hacked the official Web site for the U.S. Army, a Twitter account apparently associated with the hacktivist group claimed Monday. The site was down in the afternoon, while screenshots posted on the social network by the group purported to show messages of support for beleaguered Syrian President Bashar al-Assad on the site earlier in the day.

That was from the Washington Post, June 8 at 4:53 p.m.

The World: "Islamic State seizes power plant near Libyan city of Sirte."

Islamic State militants have seized a power plant west of the Libyan city of Sirte which supplies central and western parts of the country with electricity, the group and a military source said on Tuesday.

"The plant . . . was taken," Islamic State said in a message on social media, adding that the capture of the plant meant that the militants had driven their enemies out of the entire city.

Libya descending into chaos and ISIS extending its influence.

The Washington Post, June 6: "Libyan gains may offer ISIS a base for new attacks."

Misurata, Libya—As the Islamic State scores new victories in Syria and Iraq, its affiliate in Libya is also on the offensive, consolidating control of Moammar Gaddafi's former home town and staging a bomb attack on a major city, Misurata.

The Islamic State's growth could further destabilize a country already suffering from a devastating civil war. And Libya could offer the extremists a new base from which to launch attacks elsewhere in North America.

That was from the Washington Post.

FOX News, June 9: "ISIS captures 88 Eritrean Christians in Libya, US official confirms."

The ISIS terror group kidnapped 88 Eritrean Christians from a people-smugglers' caravan in Libya last week, a U.S. defense official confirmed Monday.

The Washington Post: "What is at stake in Ukraine if Russia continues its onslaught."

Ukraine is fighting a war on two fronts. The one you see on television is taking place in the east of our country, where thousands of Russian troops are engaged in an armed aggression against Ukraine's territorial integrity, including the illegal annexation of Crimea.

This is a piece that is important, by the Prime Minister of Ukraine, Arseniy Yatsenyuk.

The Wall Street Journal: "President Obama admits his anti-ISIS strategy isn't 'complete.'"

President Obama doesn't give many press conferences at home, so sometimes his most revealing media moments come when he's button-holed abroad. Witness his answer Monday in Austria to a question about Iraq.

Mr. Obama offered a startling explanation for why the war against Islamic State isn't going so well: His strategy still isn't up and running.

"We don't yet have a complete strategy because it requires commitments on the part of the Iraqis, as well, about how recruitment takes place, how that training takes place. And so

the details of that are not yet worked out," Mr. Obama said.

We still do not have a strategy to try to counter the Islamic State or ISIS.

The quote continues:

Wow. Islamic State, or ISIS, took control of Mosul a year ago, and it beheaded two Americans for all the world to see last summer. Mr. Obama announced his anti-ISIS strategy in a September speech, promising to "degrade" and "destroy" the self-styled caliphate.

Nine months later here we are: ISIS has overrun Ramadi, a gateway to Baghdad, the grand alliance that Mr. Obama promised barely exists, the Kurds in the north are fretting publicly about the lack of weapons to forestall a major ISIS assault, the U.S. bombing campaign is hesitant, and now Mr. Obama tells us the training of Iraqis is barely under way.

I will skip through some of these because I know my colleagues are waiting to speak.

The Associated Press: "Activists: Syrian air raids kill 49 in northwestern village."

Government airstrikes on a northwestern Syrian village Monday killed at least 49 people and left survivors screaming in anguish as they pulled bodies from the rubble, according to activists and videos of the chaotic aftermath.

The Local Coordination Committees said two air raids on the village of Janoudiyeh in Idlib province killed 60 people and wounded others. The Britain-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights said the air raid killed 49 people, including six children. It said the death toll could rise as some people are still missing.

The Associated Press June 6 headline: "Houthi rebels fire Scud missile from Yemen into Saudi Arabia."

BloombergView, by Eli Lake: "Iran Spends Billions to Prop Up Assad."

Iran is spending billions of dollars a year to prop up the Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, according to the U.N.'s envoy to Syria and other outside experts. These estimates are far higher than what the Barack Obama administration, busy negotiating a nuclear deal with the Tehran government, has implied Iran spends on its policy to destabilize the Middle East.

By the way, I will add to that, Iranians are basically even taking over Cabinet positions in the Bashar al-Assad government.

This is a report dated June 5: "Report: China Dispatching Surveillance Vessels Off Hawaii."

China has begun dispatching surveillance vessels off the coast of Hawaii in response to the Navy's monitoring activities of disputed islands in the South China Sea. . . . The purported surveillance comes on the heels of raised tensions between China and the United States late last month. . . .

This from the June 7 edition of the Financial Times: "US struggles for strategy to contain China's island-building."

China's efforts to dredge new land on remote coral atolls in the South China Sea have left the US struggling to come up with a response.

For Washington, Chinese land-creation has helped make allies of former adversaries now fearful of military domination by an assertive China. The latest example was the trip to Vietnam last week by Ashton Carter, US

defence secretary, who pledged US patrol craft to the Vietnamese navy.

But there is a limit to how far countries in the region are willing to present a united front to China, which has reclaimed 2,000 acres of land in the past 18 months, far outstripping all other claimants combined, according to Mr. Carter. The Obama administration is also unsure about how strongly it should push back against what US officials see as a long-term Chinese plan to control the region's waters.

Finally, this is an article that is in Politico today:

Actually, the United States does have a strategy to fight the Islamic State, a State Department spokesman says.

"The president was referring yesterday to a specific plan to improve the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, and the Pentagon is working on that plan right now. But absolutely, we have a strategy," Kirby said Tuesday on MSNBC's "Morning Joe."

I would be overjoyed to have a complete strategy and that plan presented to Congress and the American people. It would be a wonderful event. The fact is they have no strategy or policy and the world is on fire, and here we are trying to pass an amendment which would deprive the men and women who are serving the means and wherewithal to defend this Nation.

I hope my colleagues will strongly reject the amendment that will be pending before this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator MIKULSKI, Senator MERKLEY, Senator UDALL, Senator LEAHY, Senator DONNELLY, Senator BOXER, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator BOOKER, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator CARDIN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator PETERS as cosponsors of the Reed amendment No. 1521 to H.R. 1735.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my amendment No. 1521 to fence all funding above \$50.9 billion in the account for overseas contingency operations until budget caps on both defense and nondefense have been raised. My amendment specifically recognizes the need for these resources, but it objects to the way this OCO fund is being used as a way to circumvent the Budget Control Act. It does so, I think, on a very sound ground that over the long run will be beneficial to the Department of Defense and to everyone who is engaged in the defense of the United States.

We debate and vote on many issues in the Senate. While all of the issues are important, occasionally we must face an issue that could truly change the course of our Nation because the consequences of our actions are often not known for years. The votes may be very difficult when they are taken, but they are very important.

One example of such an issue is Iraq. Thirteen years ago, the majority of the body—79 Senators from both parties—voted to go to war in Iraq. I did not

vote in favor of the war. In fact, I spoke against it. I think the outcome could have been very different back then if we had more of a debate about the true costs and the long-term costs, the thousands of lives lost, and the countless wounded—some with invisible scars—if we had thought the United States would be on a war footing for over a decade and American taxpayers would be on the hook for trillions of dollars and that we would perhaps even contribute by our actions to new threats we are facing today.

Back then it was implied and sometimes stated that opposing the Iraq war meant you didn't support the troops or were weak on national security. I think the intervening years have shown that to be inaccurate.

We are hearing echoes of that rhetoric again: If you don't support this version of the NDAA, then you don't support the troops or terms like "taking this bill hostage." That is just not the case.

Since 2005, Senate Republicans voted against cloture on the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, 10 times, and over that same period, they cast votes against final passage of the NDAA on the Senate floor 8 times. Sometimes it was because of policy differences, such as ending "don't ask, don't tell." Other times it was over something like gas prices at the pump or other issues. But I don't think anyone has ever done it to be unpatriotic.

We can't change history, but we can certainly learn from it. We can't see into the future, but we know we must plan for it, and we must pay for it by making strategic investments today. This debate really boils down to this: What is the most effective way to provide for our national defense? I don't think inflating the overseas contingency operations, OCO, is the way to go because it complicates rather than helps the Pentagon's budgetary problems. It doesn't allow the military to effectively plan for the future.

We need to replace the senseless sequester with a balanced approach that keeps America safe and strong at home and abroad. When it comes to the defense budget, Congress should adhere to the same standards of honesty, transparency, and discipline that we demand for our troops. But right now there is a serious disconnect in the OCO mechanism of this bill, and Congress needs to step up and fix it.

The President's fiscal year 2016 budget request for defense was \$38 billion above the 2011 Budget Control Act, the BCA—their spending caps. The President requested this \$38 billion be authorized and appropriated as part of the annual base budget so they could be part of the Defense Department's funding, not just for 1 year, as OCO is, but in the budget for an indefinite period of time.

The request also contained \$50.9 billion for the OCO account, meaning funding for truly war-related expenses and not enduring base budget requirements. However, this bill, following the

lead of the majority's budget resolution, does not address the BCA's damaging impacts on defense and non-defense. Instead, it turns to a gimmick.

This bill initially transferred \$39 billion from the base budget request by the President to the OCO budget, leaving a base budget conveniently below the BCA levels in order to avoid triggering automatic reductions for sequestration. The funding shifted to OCO is for enduring requirements of military services, not direct war-related costs and not those costs generated in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. It includes flying hours for aircraft, steaming days for ships and submarines, and all training that supports the "National Military Strategy." These are not appropriate OCO expenses. These are the expenses of the Department of Defense facing the long-term challenges and maintaining the long-term capabilities of the U.S. defense forces.

Some have said we should avoid subjecting defense spending to the budget control caps through this OCO approach for a year while a deal to revise or eliminate the BCA caps is negotiated. I couldn't disagree more, because if we used this approach—this gimmick—for 1 year, it would be easier to do it next year and the year after and the year after that, ensuring an enduring imbalance between security and domestic spending. Using OCO in this way is completely counter to the intent of the BCA, the Budget Control Act.

The BCA imposed steep cuts to defense and nondefense spending to force a bipartisan compromise. This approach unilaterally reneges on that bipartisan approach. Rather than generating momentum for a permanent solution to sequestration, this approach essentially exempts defense spending from the BCA caps and releases all pressure to find a solution that provides similarly for domestic spending priorities.

The President's defense budget request placed the needed funding in the base where it should be and provided for the OCO funds for contingencies overseas that exist today. The budget resolution and the bill before us met the President's request for overall funding. This is not a question of whether the President asked for a certain amount of money and my Republican colleagues are asking for more. What they did is essentially say: We are not going to technically—and I emphasize "technically"—violate the BCA account. We are just going to move more money into OCO. So we can stand up with a straight face and say: Well, BCA applies across the whole board. Every government agency is subject to the same tight limits that the Budget Control Act imposes. But, of course, the truth is that through the use of OCO those limits don't apply to the Department of Defense.

It is particularly startling when you look at the President's request for do-

mestic agencies. He asks for \$37 billion for all of the other domestic agencies above the BCA cap. Without that money they are going to have a very difficult—indeed, perhaps impossible—challenge of meeting the basic needs of the American public—needs that every colleague in this Chamber recognizes. Some might disagree with them, but they recognize that we need to support education, as we have done for decades through the Title I Program. We need to support people—our seniors, particularly—through senior housing programs. In every State, in every community, that has to be done. But if we follow this path, it will be harder and harder for nondefense agencies to do this.

What we have created is a huge loophole through the BCA for defense. Again, let me remind you, the President and my colleagues on the other side are not arguing about the resources necessary for defense. They have picked the same number. But what they have done on the other side is funded that—not straightforwardly, not recognizing that we have to deal with this—instead by using this gimmick.

If it remains in the bill, I believe this approach will be a magnet for non-defense spending in future years. Not only will we become addicted to OCO spending, many interesting things will find their way into the OCO account.

For example, in fiscal year 1992 Congress added funds to the Defense bill for breast cancer research. At the time, spending was subject to statutory caps under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This is the follow-on to the Graham-Rudman-Hollings act of 1985. What we had done was to establish caps on discretionary domestic spending, but there were no similar caps on the other side. That is precisely what the effect of this proposal is today.

The initial funding led to the establishment of the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs or CDMRP. Every Senator is familiar with this important program. I would suspect every Senator has stood and said: Yes, that research on breast cancer is so important; that research on other diseases is so critical and so important. It has strong bipartisan support.

Each fiscal year Congress authorizes and appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to the CDMRP for cutting-edge and critically essential medical research areas. In fact, since 1992, CDMRP funding has received over \$13 billion. While this program is funded through the Defense bill, and the program is managed by the Army, the Department of Defense does not execute any of the money itself. It is a competitive grant process, and proposals are subjected to stringent peer and programmatic review criteria. DOD acts as a passthrough because, back then, the only way you could get this done was because there were no caps effectively on defense spending. I would sug-

gest that is going to repeat itself over and over if we start on this path.

That is why we can look today and say we have these pressing crises all across the globe, and it is true. But if we go down this path, we will see these types of developments. Again, I am a strong supporter of medical research. These programs have saved countless lives. I will support the funding in this bill. I think it is a way that we have established to deal with these programs. But we should recognize that it came about not because it was the most logical place to put medical research funding, but it was a budgetary precedent, just like this approach today, and it will be replicated.

Looking forward 10 years, I would suggest that you will see lots of meritorious programs that bear less and less connectivity to our overseas operations included in OCO, if that is the way we choose to get around the BCA. And that is what this bill is doing.

There is another point I would like to add. Moving this funding from the base budget to OCO has no impact on reducing the deficit. OCO and emergency funding are outside budget caps for a reason. They are for the costs of ongoing military operations or responding to other unforeseen events such as natural disasters. To suddenly ignore the true purpose of OCO and to treat it as a budgetary gimmick or slush fund to skirt the BCA is an unacceptable use for this important tool for our warfighters.

Just to highlight how this OCO approach skews defense spending, consider the amount of OCO in relation to the number of deployed troops. You can ask someone on the street: Are these overseas funds used to support our forces overseas? There has to be some relationship between the number of our forces overseas and our OCO spending. Well, let's see. In 2008, at the height of our Nation's troop commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, there were 187,000 troops deployed. We spent approximately \$1 million in OCO funding for every servicemember deployed to those countries. Under this bill, we would expend approximately \$9 million in OCO for every servicemember who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, roughly 9,930 military personnel. We are doing a lot more than spending for OCO in this bill—deliberately a lot more. We are doing what we used to do and what we should do in the base budget of the Department of Defense.

It circumvents the law, the BCA. It is not fiscally responsible, and it is not an honest accounting to the American public. If years ago, with 187,000 troops, our OCO costs were about \$1 million per troop and now we are at \$9 million, something is askew.

Adding the funds to OCO does not solve—and in some cases complicates—the DOD's budgetary problems.

As Army Chief of Staff General Odierno said:

OCO has limits and it has restrictions and it has very strict rules that have to be followed. And so if we're inhibited by that, it

might not help us. What might happen at the end of the year, we have a bunch of money we hand back because we are not able to spend it.

The defense budget needs to be based on a long-term military strategy, which requires the DOD to focus on at least 5 years in the future. A 1-year plus-up to OCO does not provide DOD with the certainty and stability it needs when building a 5-year budget. As General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified, “we need to fix the base budget . . . we won’t have the certainty we need,” if there is a year-by-year OCO fix. Defense Secretary Carter added that raising OCO does not allow the Department of Defense to plan “efficiently or strategically.”

Adding funds to OCO is a managerially unsound approach to what should be a multiyear budget process. As the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army General Allyn said:

The current restrictions on the employment of OCO will not allow it to be a gap-filler that is currently being proffered to offset the reduction in our base budget that is driven by the current proposals that are before Congress. In order to meet the needs of our Army, it must have greater flexibility . . . it must be less restrictive and must enable us to sustain and modernize as we go forward.

This instability undermines the morale of our troops and their families, who want to know their futures are planned for more than 1 year at a time, and the confidence of the defense industry partners that we want to rely on to provide the best technologies available to our troops.

Abuse of OCO in this massive way risks undermining support for a critical mechanism used to fund the incremental increased costs of overseas conflicts. We have to have a disciplined system for estimating the cost and funding the employment of a trained and ready force.

The administration has indicated that legislation implementing the majority’s budget framework will be subject to veto. As Secretary Carter has said, this approach is “clearly a road to nowhere. I say this because President Obama has already made clear that he won’t accept a budget that locks in sequestration going forward, as this approach does, and he won’t accept a budget that severs the vital link between our national security and our economic security.”

When we talk about national security, true national security requires that non-DOD departments and agencies also receive relief from BCA caps. The Pentagon simply cannot meet the complex set of national security challenges without the help of other government departments and agencies, including State, Justice and Homeland Security. In the Armed Services Committee, we have heard testimony on the essential role of other government agencies in ensuring that our national defense remains strong. The Defense Department’s share of the burden

would surely grow if these agencies are not adequately funded as well.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the Department of Defense and other civilian departments and agencies that contribute to our national security. It has to be recognized that a truly whole-of-government approach requires more than just a strong DOD.

The BCA caps are based on a misnomer—that discretionary spending is divided into security and nonsecurity spending. But Members need to be clear: Essential national security functions are performed by government agencies and departments other than the Defense Department.

According to the Commander of the U.S. Southern Command, General Kelly:

We do not and cannot do this mission alone. Our strong partnerships with the U.S. interagency—especially with the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Departments of Treasury and State—are integral to our efforts to ensure the forward defense of the U.S. homeland.

Retired Marine Corps General Mattis said: “If you don’t fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.” General Mattis’ point is perhaps best illustrated in the administration’s nine lines of effort to counter the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL, which 83 percent of Americans think is the No. 1 threat to the United States. Of the administration’s nine lines of effort, only two—which are security and intelligence—fall squarely within the responsibilities of the Department of Defense and intelligence community. The remaining seven elements of our counter-ISIL strategy rely heavily on civilian departments and agencies.

For example, No. 1 is supporting effective governance in Iraq. No amount of military assistance to the Government of Iraq will be effective in countering the ISIL threat in Iraq if the Abadi government does not govern in a more transparent and inclusive manner that gives Sunnis hope that they will participate politically in Iraq’s future. We need our diplomatic and political experts in the State Department to engage with Shia, Sunni, Kurd, and minority communities in Iraq to promote and build reconciliation in Iraq and build the political unity among the Iraqi people needed to defeat ISIL. That is not strictly a Defense Department issue.

No. 2, we have to build partner capacity. The coalition is building the capabilities and capacity of our foreign partners in the region to wage a long-term campaign against ISIL. While the efforts to build the capacity of the Iraqi security forces and some other foreign partners are funded by the Defense Department, the State Department and USAID are also responsible for billions of dollars in similar activities and across a broader spectrum of activities. Under the Republican plan, none of the State and USAID programs

will be plussed-up. Their unwillingness to address this gap is a threat to our Nation’s efforts to combat ISIL.

No. 3, we have to disrupt ISIL’s finances. ISIL’s expansion has given it access to significant and diverse sources of funding. Countering ISIL’s financing will require the State Department and the Treasury Department to work with their foreign partners and the banking sector to ensure that our counter-ISIL sanctions regime is implemented and enforced. These State Department and Treasury Department efforts are deemed to be nonsecurity activities under the BCA caps and, under the Republican approach, our efforts to disrupt the finances of ISIL may be hampered. It is also notable that the Office of Foreign Assets Control and the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence in the Treasury Department are also characterized as nonsecurity activities under the BCA caps.

The Republican funding strategy not only means that our counter-ISIL efforts will be hampered, so too will our efforts to impose effective sanctions against Iran, Sudan, and individuals who support their illicit activities also be affected.

We have to continually expose the true and brutal nature of ISIL. Our strategic communication plan against ISIL requires a truly whole government effort, including the State Department, Voice of America, and USAID. The Republican approach to funding our strategic communication strategy is a part-of-government plan, not a whole-of-government plan.

We have to disrupt the flow of foreign fighters. They are the lifeblood of ISIL. Yet key components of the Department of Homeland Security would be facing cuts under the Republican budget proposal, undermining efforts to disrupt the flow of foreign fighters to Syria and Iraq. Without the efforts of our diplomats prodding our foreign partners to pass laws or more effectively enforce the laws on their books, the efforts of the coalition to stem the flow of foreign fighters will never be successful.

My colleague Senator McCain pointed out the huge refugee crisis. Again, our first agency typically to respond to refugees is USAID—the United States Agency for International Development—and other State Department agencies. We will not be able to effectively deal with that issue if those budget caps are imposed on USAID and other agencies. Those refugee camps are one of the breeding grounds for the foreign fighters who flow back into the conflict zone.

Unless we adopt a much broader approach, unless we do something other than simply plus-up defense, we will not achieve true national security. Of course we have to protect the homeland. While a small portion of the Department of Homeland Security is considered security related, under the BCA, the vast majority of the Department falls under the nonsecurity BCA

cap. This further demonstrates that the Republican plan is a misnomer. It is an effort to play a game of smoke and mirrors with the American public. The agents at the Department of Homeland Security who are on guard, the DEA agents who pick up intelligence about threats to the Nation—all of them vitally contribute to our national security, but they will be treated distinctly different than our military if we adopt the approach that is included in this Defense authorization bill.

I talked about the refugee crisis. Virtually none of the activities that support our humanitarian efforts in the region are considered security activities. Military commanders routinely tell us that the efforts of State, USAID, the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance are critical to our broader security efforts. This is particularly true from a counter-ISIL campaign.

Again, those refugees who are flooding into the countries adjacent to Syria and to Iraq have to be dealt with not only on humanitarian grounds but also as potential sources of foreign fighters. That is going to require a whole-of-government approach, not simply using OCO to beef up our defense spending. Taken together, the Republican plan could compromise our broader campaign against ISIL and deprive significant elements of our government of the resources needed to do the job to protect the American people.

The men and women of our military volunteer to protect this Nation and are overseas fighting for our ideals, including good education, economic opportunity, and safe communities. Efforts to support all of those goals will be hampered unless civilian departments and agencies also receive relief from the BCA caps.

I had the privilege of commanding a paratrooper company at Fort Bragg, NC. We fought for many reasons, including to give people a chance in this country—not just to protect them from a foreign threat but to give them real opportunities here.

By the way, our servicemembers and their families rely on many of the services provided by non-DOD departments and agencies. For example, the Department of Education administers Impact Aid to local school districts, where children of servicemembers go to learn. The Department of Agriculture supports the School Lunch Program, from which troops and their children and their families benefit. The National Institutes of Health supports lifesaving medical research, including by contributing to advanced efforts on traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress, and suicide prevention. The Department of Health and Human Services runs Medicare, which provides health care for retirees and disabled individuals, and Medicaid, which provides services to parents, including military parents with children with special needs.

Failing to provide BCA cap relief to non-DOD departments and agencies

would also shortchange veterans who receive employment services, transition assistance, and housing and homelessness support.

Not only does this approach fail to support, potentially, our servicemen through schooling and through other aspects, our national security is also inherently tied to our economic security. Secretary Carter made this very clear. He said the approach that is being proposed disregards “the enduring, long-term connection between our nation’s security and many other factors. Factors like scientific R&D to keep our technological edge, education of a future all-volunteer military force, and the general economic strength of our country.”

Where will we get the soldiers of the future who have the skills and the training and the expertise if we are underinvesting in the basic education for all of our citizens?

My amendment would keep the pressure on for a permanent solution to the BCA caps and sequestration by requiring that the BCA caps be eliminated or increased in proportionally equal amounts for both security and non-security spending before the additional OCO funds are available for obligation or expenditure.

Let me again emphasize that we are not taking away these funds. We simply say what I think makes a great deal of sense: Until we develop an approach to BCA that allows us to provide for a comprehensive defense of the Nation and to invest in the economic health of the Nation, then these funds will be reserved. Once we do that, then automatically all of the funding that is included in this bill will become available to the Department of Defense.

We have heard colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk for years now about the need to resolve the BCA, to end sequestration. Every uniformed servicemember who came forward, every chief of service said their No. 1 priority was to end sequestration, end the BCA. This bill does not do it; it sidesteps the issue. We can no longer sidestep the issue. We have to engage on this issue. I think we have to move promptly and thoroughly and thoughtfully forward to resolve the BCA.

The legislation I have proposed recognizes the need for these resources but also recognizes the overarching issue: Unless we are able to effectively modify or eliminate the BCA, our comprehensive national security will be threatened, our economic progress will be threatened, and our aspirations for the country could be thwarted.

My amendment seeks to implement, by the way, a sense-of-the Senate that is already in the bill, and it clearly states that sequestration relief should include equal defense and nondefense relief. We have made—and I commend the chairman for this—a statement—without an effective means of implementation. It is a statement, an aspirational goal, that we should fix BCA and relieve defense and nondefense spend-

ing. I think that is an important statement, but my amendment makes sure we go further and provide an action to do this.

I believe very strongly in this amendment. I believe it is relevant to the consideration of this bill. I believe it goes to the heart of the most important questions we face in the country today: How do we provide for the comprehensive defense of the Nation? How do we invest in our people so that we will continue to be strong? I think if we do not provide this type of mechanism to start this discussion on the BCA and hopefully promptly complete it, then we will be missing not only a historic opportunity, we will be locking ourselves into a road that will leave us less secure in the future, less productive, and less strong as a nation.

Let me remind people that the stated purpose of the bill is “to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense.” We have to begin this appropriations process by recognizing that the BCA will not help us going forward, and we must move to modify or repeal it.

With that, I will close simply by saying again that if we continue these caps going forward, it will harm our military readiness. Our national defense should be based upon long-term needs. They should be reflected in a transparent, forthright budget that puts the money in the base, provides contingency funds for true contingencies overseas but does not turn things upside down and make our contingency funding really the heart of the bill in so many respects.

We have to work together. We have to make sure every Federal agency can benefit because every Federal agency contributes to the country. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, to begin this dialogue, and to move forward, the sooner the better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, how does the budget fund defense? That is what we are talking about. The balanced budget resolution recently approved by Congress recognizes the responsibility that the Federal Government has to defend the Nation while recognizing the threats our overspending and growing debt pose to our national security. That is why the balanced budget approved by Congress last month makes national defense a priority and provides for the maximum allowable defense funding under current law.

Let me say that again. The budget provides for the maximum allowable defense funding under current law. That current law is a law which was signed by this President and provides vital support for our military personnel and their families, the readiness of our Armed Forces, and the modernization of critical platforms.

Does anybody deny that this is a critical time? With the increasing number

of threats around the world, our total defense spending level should reflect our commitment to keeping America safe and ensuring that our military personnel are prepared to tackle all challenges. While we have troops in harm's way, we need to do all we can to protect them. Given the global threat environment, the funding approach taken by the Senator from Arizona and the Armed Services Committee, which was bipartisan, ensures that the men and women of our Armed Forces have the resources they need to confront an increasingly complex and dangerous security environment.

Is sequestration a threat to our military? If appropriated at the levels provided by the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, the defense budget would not face indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, while it provides for the needs we are reviewing right now. People have a chance to amend the needs right now. If they think there is something in there that is not needed, they can amend it—they can try to amend it. There should be justification for what they want.

This bill puts us on a path to spend \$612 billion on defense this year. This is the same overall amount that was requested by the President earlier this year. Numerous officials at the Pentagon have made it clear that they see this funding level as the bare minimum budget needed to execute our defense strategy. So why are some Senators concerned about the level of budgetary resources this bill provides to the Department of Defense? They simply do not like the use of the overseas contingency operations funding, the OCO.

It is important to note that those not familiar with the Budget Control Act—that is not the budget; that is the Budget Control Act. It was passed with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Obama back in August of 2011. It established a discretionary spending cap, but it also allowed for certain cap adjustments. The BCA caps can be adjusted for emergencies, disasters, program integrity initiatives, and OCO.

Yes. That is in the Budget Control Act, the Budget Control Act passed August 2011 and signed by President Obama. Those are the four ways you can adjust the budget caps without forcing sequestration. Now, in the case of OCO—overseas contingency operations—funding, both Congress and the President have to agree that the funding should be designated in that manner. Therefore, the OCO funding in this bill will only occur if Congress appropriates it and the President agrees to it in the future. I would hope that when the President and his advisers said this is the overall level of funding they needed for defense, they meant it. But only time and the appropriations process will tell.

Did the budget account for OCO spending? While there is no requirement to offset OCO spending, when we

addressed the issue in our budget resolution, we accounted for every single dollar of OCO we assumed would be spent. Even with these OCO levels, the budget resolution still met its overall goal of balancing within 10 years. Let me repeat that. We accounted for every single dollar of OCO that we assumed would be spent. Even with these OCO levels, the budget resolution still met its overall goal of balancing within 10 years.

It is good to see my colleague so concerned about the deficit, and I look forward to working with him to fully implement our balanced budget. This will ensure that we can get our Nation's fiscal house in order while providing resources needed for our national defense.

Unfortunately, the concern expressed over providing OCO funding doesn't seem to be centered on the fiscal concerns because even most critics support the need for more defense money. No, their concerns are based on the demand to increase nondefense discretionary spending on a dollar-for-dollar basis with defense spending. But the only way to do this in the short term is by raising taxes on hard-working American families. Defense is making its case and has made its case. Nondefense has not.

Do we really need to increase the caps? If we want to increase nondefense spending, Congress should take a closer look at what we are actually funding. Last year, we provided nearly \$293.5 billion for more than 260 authorizations that have expired. Yes, we have 260 authorizations. That is where Congress says this is what we ought to be spending our money on.

They expired, and we are still spending money on them—\$293.5 billion a year. Usually, we talk about over 10 years here. That would practically balance the budget by itself over a 10-year period. Those are programs we need to take a look at. Those are programs that have expired. Some of those programs expired as long ago as 1983, but we are still spending money on them every year. That means we have been paying for some of these expired programs for more than 30 years, and it is not just the length of time these programs have overstayed their welcome, the funds we allocated to them every year are more than what the law called for in those authorizations when passed. In some cases, that means we are spending as much as four times what the bill allowed.

Savings usually are found in the spending details, but Congress hasn't examined the details in some time, except on defense. We do the Defense authorization every year. These others, well, I mentioned one of them expired in 1983, some in 1987. I mentioned it is 260 authorizations. It affects 1,200 programs. Do you think in 1,200 programs for \$293 billion a year we couldn't find \$38 billion to match what we are doing in defense? We ought to be ashamed if we can't.

It is time for Congress to take a look at these programs and decide if they are even worth funding anymore. After all, a project not worth doing well should not be worth doing at that time all. But how would committees know if they haven't looked at these programs in years? How would they know if they don't have a way to measure how well the programs are working?

Were defense and nondefense spending treated equally under the BCA under the budget caps? The insistence that any change to the discretionary changes be based on dollar limits for both categories of spending fails to take into account the different treatment each took under the budget caps, the BCA.

Defense spending, which makes up less than one-fifth of all government spending, received less than half of the reductions in the BCA. Defense spending also faced more budgetary pressure than nondefense spending because it is largely discretionary. Nondefense spending was able to distribute its BCA reductions over a larger amount of accounts and over a larger portion of mandatory programs. That provides a fudge factor.

The continued insistence on tying both defense and nondefense spending together has left only the approach taken by this bill to fund the defense at the President's level.

We know from the administration that the President's advisers are recommending he veto this bill. We also know some of my colleagues are considering blocking appropriations bills this year to force a government shutdown.

Every bill should stand on its own for justification. No one is arguing the need for national defense. What they are actually arguing is the need for the nondefense increases. This is an attempt to leverage defense programming to get nondefense, which I mentioned the 260 programs, \$293.5 billion a year that has expired—so they want this OCO to be replaced with a deal.

What we are supposed to do in Congress is legislate, not deal make. But that is what is being proposed. Let's make a deal. Now, if they step back and look at the facts laid out today, hopefully, they can move away from this brinkmanship and realize the path they are on only leads to more uncertainty for the men and women in our Armed Forces. Strengthening our national defense and providing for the brave men and women of our military should be something both sides agree on.

So what is the future of the BCA caps? It is time both parties get serious about addressing our Nation's chronic overspending. We know some on both sides want the caps from the Budget Control Act changed—but at what price for our Nation and the hard-working taxpayers? Without any changes to the BCA structure, just raising these budget caps without increasing the debt in the short-term

would require increasing taxes. That is why we asked for the extra year to be able to work on this whole thing.

If Congress is serious about addressing the challenges of the Budget Control Act, it has to first start by tackling its addiction to overspending and once again become good fiscal stewards of the taxes paid by each and every hard-working American.

Of course, if the administration would stop overregulating, the economy would grow, and in a short time we would have more revenue without raising taxes. Yes, that is what both the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget—one works for Congress and one works for the President—said; that if we could just raise the economy by 1 percent a year, CBO says that would provide \$300 billion. The President's office says that would provide \$400 billion in taxes.

We are receiving more tax revenue right now than we have in the history of the United States, but we spend more than that. Of the amounts that we get to make a decision on, we are spending almost 50 percent more than what we take in. We can't continue to do that. We can't continue to afford the interest on the debt if we keep doing that.

Americans are working harder than everyone to make ends meet. Shouldn't their elected officials be doing the same thing? By tackling these issues honestly and directly, we can help ensure that our Nation is safe and secure by investing in America's Armed Forces while also maintaining fiscal discipline.

On a related note, the Senate Budget Committee has produced an indepth analysis of defense spending and the OCO funding provision as part of our June budget bulletin, which was published today. People interested in learning more can do so by going to our Web site: budget.senate.gov or contact on [twitter@budgetbulletin](https://twitter.com/budgetbulletin).

I close with some words from today's paper from the Casper Star-Tribune editorial:

Many of the servicemen and servicewomen returning from faraway battlefields—Vietnam or any other place of conflict—have seen horrible, unspeakable things. They've been courageous in the face of death and destruction. Some gave up a relatively easy, safe life to travel far from home and fight for what we as a nation believe the world should be, or could be, someday. That kind of commitment doesn't come without pain or sacrifice—immense pain and sacrifice, in some cases.

None of that has anything to do with politics. Politics is the arena of our elected leaders, not our troops, and it's both necessary and patriotic for us as voters to evaluate those leaders' decisions and actions and speak out against the ones we disagree with. That's democracy and dissent.

But our troops are our representatives on the ground. We must not use our vaunted system of democracy as a tool to inflict pain on this brave group of people. They're not obligated to support our leaders' political ideologies any more than the rest of us, but uniquely, they have made it their responsi-

bility to represent our treasured way of life at home and abroad in pursuit of a better, more peaceful world. And after they do that, they deserve the thanks of a grateful nation.

That's how it should have been in the 1970s. That's how it is now. We must make it our responsibility to ensure that this is how it will always be.

We have a crucial decision to make on funding our national defense. I don't think it should be held hostage to other budget concerns. Each of those should stand on their own. Each of those should review all of the things under their jurisdiction. I ask for you to defeat the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my friend from Wyoming for his remarks. I don't always agree with him, but he is sincere, thoughtful, and puts every effort into coming up with a decision he believes is right, so we appreciate that very much.

I also thank my colleague from Rhode Island, our ranking member on Armed Services, who has laid out in very careful terms why the amendment, the Reed amendment, is so important. I thank him. He has also, like my friend from Wyoming, been assiduous, diligent, and careful in his work on the Armed Services Committee, and I thank him for offering this amendment.

We have come to the floor with a very simple message for our Republican colleagues, and it is articulated in this amendment. If you want to make America strong by replacing the harsh and arbitrary automatic cuts in this budget as we do, then you have to do it in a way that makes sure we will have a strong military abroad and the things we need to be strong and secure at home as well.

That means equally replacing cuts to both defense and domestic budgets—\$1 for defense, \$1 for the middle class—in the hopes that they can raise their income levels, and it can be easier for others who are not yet in the middle class to reach. That is what the amendment would require.

The truth is, the way the Republicans have put this bill together signals a poor approach to both major areas of our budget. It locks in the sequester cuts for our men and women in uniform, instead using the OCO, essentially a wartime account, as a one-time gimmick to make up for shortfalls. That is a bad idea.

Using the OCO account to pay for our troops, maintain and operate our military or purchase weapons that will keep us safe is a terrible mistake. Why is that? It is 1-year funding. You have to do a plan for 3 years. You have to build a submarine that takes 4 or 5 years.

I talk to defense contractors. I talk to military leaders. They can't do it 1 year at a time. It doesn't make sense. Our military families need stability and support. They need to know that programs that benefit them—suicide

prevention, sexual assault—will be fully funded when other defense priorities come back into the base budget for future years. Under OCO, these things could get squeezed out. Our military brass needs to know that the weapons systems they are relying on 4 years from now—but being paid out of OCO this year—can be funded and finished. So our military doesn't deserve budget gimmicks, they deserve real support.

What my friends on the other side of the aisle have done with this OCO increase is a budgetary sleight of hand—a half-hearted attempt to fund the Defense Department while leaving key, middle-class programs behind. Our Defense Department gets budget workarounds and exceptions, while hard-working families must continue to feel the harsh cuts imposed by sequestration. That is a double standard because we need both for a strong America. We need a strong military, and we need a strong middle class. To choose one over the other—and do it by budgetary sleight of hand—is nothing anyone can be proud of, in my opinion.

So regardless of what happens with NDAA this month, one thing should be absolutely clear to my Republican friends—and I see our ranking member of Appropriations who has led this fight on the floor. Democrats will not vote to put a defense appropriations bill on the floor that uses accounting trickery or budgetary gimmicks to fund our troops. We will not vote to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill or any appropriations bill until our colleagues from the other side of the aisle have sat down at the table and figured out with us how we are going to properly fund the Defense Department and the key priorities that help families, fuel economic growth—in short, keeping us safe and strong both at home and abroad.

We simply cannot and will not move forward with one acceptable bill at a time on the appropriations side until we are able to sit down and reach an agreement that replaces cuts equally for our military and our domestic needs.

This amendment requires that balance. That is why I salute the Senator from Rhode Island, my dear friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services for putting it together. It says that the extra money in OCO cannot be used unless we give equal or greater relief to domestic programs that help the middle class.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about escaping the senseless, obtuse budget cuts imposed by the sequester and their use of OCO, admittedly a gimmick—they are admitting that is the case, that we have to do more and go above sequestration for military and average families—they will wholeheartedly support the Jack Reed amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED. Characteristic of him, it is a thoughtful solution to a very serious problem related to the funding of our national security needs.

I would like to support and salute Senator REED for his outstanding job. Many don't realize that Senator JACK REED is a graduate of West Point. He served in the U.S. military, bringing that breadth of his considerable background to additional public service, both in the House and now in the Senate. He is the ranking member on the defense authorization committee and also serves in great capacity on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Now, let us talk about the Reed amendment and the funding for the Department of Defense. I want to be very clear. I do want to support funding for the national security of the United States of America. We take an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic, and we must uphold that oath not only with lip service but with real money in the real Federal checkbook. We need to do it in a way that doesn't use gimmicks or smoke and mirrors to end sequester or to finesse or do a shell deal behind the budget caps.

Remember, we passed a bill that does have significant budget caps. But the way to deal with that problem is not to cap the Department of Defense but to be honest about what it takes to fund national security. The Reed amendment does that. It makes clear that the Department of Defense should receive \$38 billion, but in its base budget to take care of the troops, to protect the troops while they protect us, to make sure they have the right gear, the right equipment, the right technology, and also the right intelligence to be able to do their job. The Reed amendment also looks out for military families. It does what we need to do.

Only when there is a new budget agreement that increases the defense budget as well as the budget for domestic programs will we be able to solve the problem that is facing us.

Now, what our generals have told us is we cannot meet our defense needs with the current budget caps. They also say: Senator—this is General Dempsey, and this is General Odierno, who spoke so well at the funeral of the Vice President's son on Saturday; these men have devoted their lives to the defense of our country and to have the best military in the world—don't give us sequester. Instead of figuring out how to fight terrorism, we have to figure out how to fight the stupidity of Congress.

Now, they do not use those words; I am using those words. When we instituted sequester, it was a technique to force us to make the tough decisions. We keep hiding behind the technique. We need to change that. The bill we have now raises funding for something called the overseas contingency fund

by \$38 billion, but it uses it to fund activities that should be in the base bill rather than the war cost it was intended for. Essentially, it is a budget gimmick.

What is the overseas contingency fund? It was meant to be a line item where we could actually see what war costs us. In Afghanistan and Iraq it was kind of commingled through a lot of the other items related to defense, but we didn't know the actual cost of the war. OCO is meant for war. It is not meant to be a way to avoid the budget caps. Instead of just raising the caps and funding DOD at the needed level, this bill uses this gimmick, so nothing about it is really in the national interest.

Our military leaders tell us: No. 1, get rid of sequester. No. 2, you must increase the base bill.

Defense budgeting cannot be done on a year-to-year basis. It must be multiyear because it is for the planning of procurement for them to have the best weapons systems. It is recruitment and training and sustaining of the military and their personnel needs.

Defense Secretary Ash Carter said: "Our defense industry partners, too, need stability and longer-term plans, not end-of-year crises." GEN Dan Allyn, Army Vice Chief of Staff, said: "OCO does not give you the predictable funding to be able to plan the force we are going to need."

I want to make another point. The defense of the United States doesn't lie only with DOD. That is our warfighting machine. But we have other programs that are related to national security that come out of domestic discretionary spending that are shortchanged and are shrinking and, quite frankly, I am concerned about it.

What am I talking about? In order to have national security, you need to have a State Department. You need to have a State Department to do the kind of work that involves diplomacy. That involves working with nations around the world and the needs of these nations and also to engage in important negotiations such as we have now ongoing on the Iran nuclear. That is not done by generals. That is done by diplomats. You need to have a Department of State. Look at what happened in Benghazi, where there is so much focus on this. While they are focusing—and we should focus—on Benghazi, we appropriators are focusing on embassy security. Embassy security is funded through the Department of State and funded by discretionary spending. If you want to protect Americans overseas, you have to have embassy security. You have to have a Department of State.

Then we have the Department of Homeland Security. Look at all the cyber attacks on us right at this minute. We need to have a cyber component to defense, but we need to have the cyber defense strategy at the Department of Homeland Security. Even our military is being hacked. Insurance

programs are being hacked. People in the United States are having important information about their health records, their Social Security numbers, and so on being stolen. We need to have a robust Department of Homeland Security. They have a program called Einstein that is supposed to do it, but we don't have to be Einsteins to know that in order to protect America we also have to protect the Department of Homeland Security.

Then of course there are the promises made and promises kept. There is the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies. We must fund our promises made to our veterans. That is out of discretionary spending. That is not out of defense. But the infrastructure for our military, our military bases here in our own country, come out of military construction.

I don't want to sound as if I am defending government programs. That is not what I am here to do. I am here to defend the Nation and defend it the right way. We need to be able to put money in the Federal checkbook that funds our Department of Defense without gimmicks, without sleight of hand, without finessing or playing dodge ball. We have to play hard ball with the terrorists and others who have predatory intent against the United States.

We have to be Team U.S.A. not only on the sports field but on this playing field right here on the floor of Congress. Let us work together. Let us get a new budget agreement. Let us solve the problems. Let us end sequester. Let us work together to be able to do it. I believe a big step forward would be supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED. I ask, in the interest of national security, that we vote for the Reed amendment and that we go to the budget. Let's go to the negotiating table and come up with a real framework to fund the compelling needs of our Nation, and let's do it, Team U.S.A.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:41 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

AMENDMENT NO. 1486

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this Chamber is currently having a very important debate about our national security priorities, including the authorized funding levels for our Nation's Armed Forces. But I would like to