

be hunting looked a lot more like pheasants.

Donald and his brother William both served in Vietnam at the same time. The brothers inquired about Donald's leaving Vietnam since they were both serving, but they were advised to wait until William's discharge. They were able to spend Christmas of 1966 together. That was the last time William saw Donald.

In May, Donald was wounded, and he died in July as a result of those wounds. The family is extremely grateful to Wanda Nielson of Rugby for co-ordinating efforts for the military to fly Donald's mother to the Philippines to be with Donald at the time of his death.

JOHN JOYCE

John Joyce, a Minot native, was born on November 15, 1944. He served in the Marine Corps, Kilo Company, 3rd Battalion, 26th Marines. John died on April 17, 1969. He was 24 years old.

John was one of four children and enjoyed playing sports in his free time. In addition to playing football, basketball, and track, John left a legacy of being an excellent baseball player. He played baseball for Minot State University and for Northern Arizona University. In 2001, he was inducted into the Minot Baseball Hall of Fame.

After college John became a teacher and coach for a year in Montana. He then enlisted in the Marines and served in Vietnam. One of John's best friends, Jan Olson, who taught with John and also served in Vietnam, said this about John: "Inch for inch, pound for pound, he was the toughest man I ever knew and he was also the nicest man."

About 6 weeks after his death, John was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for his heroic actions. His Bronze Star citation describes John putting himself in the line of fire while defending his platoon with a grenade launcher and then carrying a wounded companion to a covered position.

Ronald Jensen is a Marine who served under John in Vietnam. Ronald's 2003 book, titled "Tail End Charlie," describes John like this:

He was a great guy, no questions about it. He helped everybody, always in the front, and he saved me. He was most liked by his men. He saved a lot of lives over there.

WILLIAM "BILL" KRISTJANSON

William "Bill" Kristjanson was born October 13, 1943, and was from Inkster. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. His unit's nickname was the Black Scarves. Bill died on February 26, 1970. He was 26 years old. He was the only child born to Sig and Frances Kristjanson.

He attended elementary school in Conway and high school in Inkster. In 1967, Bill graduated from the University of North Dakota. He also attended the University of Michigan and the University of Oslo in Norway. Bill's pride and interest in his father's Icelandic heritage inspired him to tour Iceland after graduating from UND.

In 1968, Bill was drafted into the Army. In Vietnam, he was involved in

both ground and air combat. About 5 months after arriving in Vietnam, Bill was promoted from private first class to sergeant on the battlefield.

On February 11, Bill was injured when the vehicle he was riding in overturned. About 2 weeks later, he died in a military hospital in Japan. The ten medals the Army awarded him, both before and after his death, demonstrate that Bill was a heroic soldier the Army valued greatly.

PATRICK MCCABE

Patrick McCabe was from Bismarck, and he was born on July 20, 1924. He served in the Army as a master sergeant. Patrick died May 6, 1968, at the age of 43.

He came from a family dedicated to serving our country. Four of the six boys in his family served in the military, and all three of Patrick's sons followed in his footsteps and joined the military. Two of his sons served in Vietnam after Patrick's death—Mark as a medic in the Marines and Scott as an Air Force pilot. Patrick's third son, David, served in the Air Force for over 20 years.

Patrick's daughter, Kathy, said that her dad was a good man who helped anyone who needed it. Her dad loved his country and felt like the Army was his family.

Patrick served in World War II and two tours of duty in Vietnam. He volunteered to return to Vietnam and died during his second tour of duty.

We tell these stories because we cannot ever forget that every life matters. I am always struck by imagining what these young men would have been had they been allowed to grow up, whom these young men could have been when they were grandfathers and whom they would have taken fishing or hunting or taught how to play football. But these lives were given in sacrifice to their country and in sacrifice so that all of us can live in freedom, and we must never forget, during this period of commemoration of the Vietnam war, those people who gave the ultimate sacrifice, those people who were killed in action in Vietnam.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act. I rise in support to move this bill forward and the amendments that many of us in this body want to have heard, debated, and voted on.

I also rise in opposition to obstruction—obstruction to this bill, obstruction to the key issues of national defense for our country. Make no mistake, there is obstruction going on, on the Senate floor right now, with regard to this important bill.

A little bit of background here: This bill, the NDAA, came out of the Senate Armed Services Committee after a lot of hard work, bipartisan work, by all the members of the committee. We worked together to include over 185 amendments. Almost all of these were bipartisan amendments.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about voting against the bill because they did not like the way it was funded, even though our committee had nothing to do with the funding. But at the end of the day, after much debate in the committee, we worked and passed a strong, important, reform-oriented bipartisan NDAA by a vote of 22 to 4. That is bipartisan.

I thank the chairman of that committee Senator McCAIN and the ranking member Senator REED on their great leadership in getting this committee to work so closely together to move the bill forward.

As part of the Armed Services Committee, just 2 weeks ago, I had the distinct honor of traveling with both of them to Vietnam and to Singapore for an important Defense Ministry conference. It was a huge honor for me as a new Member of the body to travel with JOHN McCAIN and JACK REED—two veterans who have sacrificed a lot for their country—to Vietnam and other places. They did a fantastic job on this bill.

Then, this bill came to the floor and it all stopped. Everything came to a halt. There are over 500 amendments of Senators who want to move forward on a bipartisan basis to try to improve this bill. We have gotten to barely a trickle—barely a trickle—and nothing has happened. For 2 weeks we have been on this bill and nothing has happened after the great work we did in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

What is going on here? It is the same obstructionist playbook that my colleagues and particularly the minority leader used for the last few years, and the American people have rejected it. They rejected it last November, and they rejected it when they realized this body had only 14 rollcall votes on amendments during the entire year of 2014. That is not how this body is supposed to work. Nobody on either side of the aisle wants this body to work that way. It is certainly not how it is supposed to work when it comes to the defense of our Nation and the critical bill to take care of our men and women in uniform. Yet, the minority leader said this bill is a waste of time. I will repeat that. The National Defense Authorization Act, one of the most important things we do in this body, is "a waste of time."

I understand that the parties have ideological differences, and that is certainly the way it should be. That is the

way it has been since the founding of our great Nation. But if leaders on the other side of the aisle believe that protecting the country, taking care of the men and women in uniform, and keeping our promises to them is a waste of time, then we don't belong to different parties, we belong in different universes. In this world, in this universe, in the U.S. Senate, our most important job is to protect this country and to take care of the men and women who so courageously serve our country. It is not a waste of time to be doing that. It is the most important thing we were sent here to do.

We took an oath. We pledged to solemnly swear to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That is what this bill does, and that is what we—Members on both sides—are trying to do in terms of improving it with amendments, but none of those are moving. None of those are moving, and that is a shame.

One of the things we tried to address in the bill is the serious threats and challenges our Nation faces.

At the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing we had several weeks ago, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said:

The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the second world war.

We know what they are—the growth and brutality of ISIS, a rising China, Iran on the verge of obtaining a nuclear weapon. The largest state sponsor of terrorism is possibly on the verge of gaining a nuclear weapon, and a resurgent Russia has invaded the sovereign territory of another country. It is the first time since World War II in the heart of Europe.

So at this time we not only have obstruction on the other side of the aisle from the leader there, the President of the United States is threatening to veto the NDAA. I am not sure they are reading about what is going on in the world. I am not sure they recognize the critical importance of this bill. And to threaten to veto this bill, and therefore what—we are going to stop? No. We are going to do our duty, and we will put this on the President's desk, and we will see if he vetoes it when the United States faces this huge array of challenges.

Let me talk about one of those challenges for a few minutes. It is an important area. As a Senator from Alaska, it is certainly an important area for me. It is the Arctic and the increasing militarization of the Arctic by Russia.

Earlier this year, Russia began a 5-day Arctic war exercise that included 38,000 troops, 50 surface warships, in addition to submarines, and 110 aircraft in the Arctic. And the Russians are not being shy about their ambitions in the Arctic. President Putin has said he wants to build 13 new airfields and add four new Russian combat brigades in the Arctic. He is going to stand up a

new Arctic command, and he is going to add several new icebreakers to their already robust fleet.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee talked about this. He talked about what the Russians are doing in the Arctic. There is no mystery here. As a matter of fact, today there was an outstanding article in the Wall Street Journal entitled “The New Cold War’s Arctic Front,” with the subtitle “Putin is militarizing one of the world’s coldest, most remote regions.” Well, in my State, this is home. America is an Arctic nation because of Alaska.

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

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

[The Wall Street Journal, Jun. 9, 2015]

THE NEW COLD WAR’S ARTIC FRONT

(By Sohrab Ahmari)

HELSINKI.—G-7 leaders gathering in Bavaria on Monday vowed to extend sanctions if Russia doesn’t dial back its aggression against Ukraine. Previous sanctions haven’t deterred Kremlin land-grabs, and the question now isn’t if Russian President Vladimir Putin will strike again but whom he’ll target next. Mr. Putin considers Europe’s eastern periphery, stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, part of Russia’s imperial inheritance.

Yet in recent years the Russian leader has also turned his attention northward, to the Arctic, militarizing one of the world’s coldest, most remote regions. Here in Finland, one of eight Arctic states, the Russian menace next door looms large.

“That is a tough nut to crack, to know exactly what the Russians want,” newly appointed Finnish Foreign Minister Timo Soini says. “But I’m sure they know. Because they are masters of chess, and if something is on the loose they will take it”—a variation on the old proverb that “a Cossack will take whatever is not fixed to the ground.”

There is much that “is not fixed to the ground” already in the Arctic, and more every year. Climate change is transforming the High North. By 2030, the Northern Sea Route (NSR) from the Kara Strait to the Pacific will have nine weeks of open water, according to the U.S. Navy, up from two in 2012. The NSR is a 35% to 60% shorter passage between European ports and East Asia than the Suez or Panama routes, according to the Arctic Council. The Northwest Passage, which connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans via the Canadian Arctic Archipelago, will have five weeks of open water by 2030, up from zero in 2012. It represents a 25% shorter passage between Rotterdam and Seattle than non-Arctic routes, according to a NATO Parliamentary Assembly study published in March. As with other claims about the climate, these aren’t universally accepted prognostications.

These changes have implications not just for trade but also for the ability to exploit the vast energy resources beneath the Arctic. Energy fields in the region have to date produced some 40 billion barrels of oil and 1,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates the region also holds 13% of the world’s undiscovered conventional oil, a third of the world’s undiscovered conventional gas and a fifth of the world’s undiscovered natural-gas liquids.

No wonder Moscow has been racing to reopen old Soviet bases on its territory across

the Arctic and develop new ones. Mr. Putin wants by the end of 2015 to have 14 operational airfields in the Arctic, according to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and he has increased Russia’s special-forces presence in the region by 30%.

“In the Arctic area they have twofold objectives,” says a senior official at the Finnish Defense Ministry. “To secure the Northern Sea Route and [exploit] the energy-resources potential. And they are increasing their ability to surveil that part of the world, to refurbish their abilities for the air force and the Northern Fleet. They are exercising their ability to move their airborne troops from the central part of Russia to the north.”

The Russian buildup in the region is made worse by the fact that Moscow makes no effort to be a good neighbor. The Kremlin’s propensity for holding unannounced exercises in the region can only be a deliberate attempt to provoke. The senior official voices the concern that the Kremlin might use yet another such drill “as deployment for a real operation”—which is considerably less paranoid than it sounds given Mr. Putin’s record.

Russian warplanes have violated Finnish airspace as recently as August, and pro-Kremlin media have also launched a systematic propaganda campaign against Finland. “They are writing things about us and our defense forces that are not from this world,” says the senior official, such as the yarn that the Finnish government removes children from ethnic-Russian Finnish families for adoption by gay couples in the U.S.

Another Defense Ministry official says that he finds it hard to view as spontaneous “one of their pro-Putin demonstrations with crowds shouting ‘Thank you, Putin! You gave us Crimea. Now give us Poland and Finland.’”

Despite such developments, the possibility of conflict here might seem distant for now. But it poses troubling questions about the West’s readiness in the Arctic-security race. So far there has been plenty of Allied strategizing, including a 2013 White House paper on Arctic strategy heavy on climate-change alarmism but offering little by way of real mobilization. Russia still has the world’s largest fleet of icebreakers, many of them nuclear-powered. Washington, by contrast, fields just one heavy icebreaker, the Coast Guard’s aging Polar Star.

For the Finns, the Kremlin menace raises another touchy issue: their nonmembership in NATO. The April election that sent Mr. Soini to the Foreign Ministry and the centrist Juha Sipilä into the premiership relegated Alexander Stubb, an uncommonly pro-NATO Finnish prime minister, to the Finance Ministry in the new government. Mr. Soini, who leads the right-wing populist True Finns party, has denounced Mr. Stubb in the past as a “radical market liberal NATO hawk.” But now in government, Mr. Soini strikes more nuanced notes that belie his party’s anti-Atlanticist reputation.

“If we think that the paradigm [in the region] is going to be changed,” he says, “there is no hesitation that we will do it,” meaning join NATO. He adds: “Whatever the system or situation in Russia we have to cope, and we have some experience with them. And they also respect us. They know our history. . . . We want to be independent and free.”

Mr. SULLIVAN. The writer of this article talks about what is at stake and about what the Russians are doing in the Arctic.

Here is a map. It is a little small, but it shows Russia’s Arctic push and the dramatic increase of airbases, operational infrastructure all around the

Arctic, and the different exercises. We know that it is an important place—transportation, natural resources. This is a critical area.

Our leaders are taking notice, our military leaders. ADM Bill Gortney with the U.S. Northern Command stated: “Russian heavy bombers flew more out-of-area patrols in 2014 than in any year since the Cold War.”

Secretary of Defense Carter just 2 months ago said: “The Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States, both strategically and economically in the future—it’s fair to say that we’re late to the recognition of that.”

This is why the NDAA is so important. Congress heard this testimony. The Senate Armed Services Committee heard this testimony. We have been following what has been happening in the Arctic, and we have acted. The NDAA has provisions to start to address the challenges we see in the Arctic. It certainly is focused on making sure the Arctic remains a peaceful and stable place, but it also starts to focus the leadership of our military on the Arctic, and that is important.

There is language in the NDAA which was unanimously voted on in the committee—it is very bipartisan—that requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report that updates the U.S. military strategy in the Arctic and requires a military operations plan to be described for the protection and security of our interest in the Arctic. It lays out what the issues are, what the threats are, and what the Russians are doing in the Arctic.

President Putin is certainly going to be watching, and maybe he is taking notice that we are noticing, and that is one reason why this is an important bill.

As we can see here, today’s Wall Street Journal article talked about President Putin moving forward and possibly having the ability to send airborne troops and airborne brigades to the Arctic. Yet, right now, our own U.S. Army is thinking about removing the only airborne brigade in the Arctic. That is not good strategy.

That is why we need this bill. We need to set the direction in terms of strategy and to make sure we are not making strategic mistakes as the Russians move forward in the Arctic and we start looking at reducing our capabilities there. Weakness is provocative, and if anyone knows that, it is President Putin. We need to show strength, and that is why we need to pass this bill.

Finally, I want to talk briefly about an amendment I wanted to offer. I am still trying to get it offered as part of the NDAA. As I mentioned, there is a lineup of hundreds of amendments. Unfortunately, the leader on the other side of the aisle doesn’t want to move them. This is one of those amendments. It is a very bipartisan amendment. If it were allowed to come to the floor, it would probably pass over-

whelmingly. It is a simple amendment. All it does is ask the President to follow the law when it comes to raising the pay of members of our military. It is a simple amendment.

The law States that our servicemembers are entitled to get a larger pay increase—not much, but when there is a pay increase, they should get a slightly larger pay increase than their civilian counterparts. That is the current law. My amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that when giving a pay increase to members of the Department of Defense, military and civilian, that the President simply needs to follow the law.

I want to emphasize something as somebody who has served in the military and is still serving in the Reserves. Our civilian DOD employees and members do a superb job. They are patriotic, they work hard, and they deeply respect the members of the military with whom they serve. I have seen this throughout my entire career.

The current law, however, recognizes the unique sacrifices our servicemembers make wearing the uniform of our country and mandates a half-a-percent greater pay increase when there is a pay increase for our men and women in uniform. Right now, the President is not abiding by that law. It is simple. He needs to do it. My amendment would request and focus on this issue, and I think we could probably get 100 Senators to vote for it.

What is the origin of this law and the intent behind it? It is simple. It recognizes the unique sacrifices our men and women in the military make. These sacrifices are well known to the American people. They include long hours and serious, difficult separations from family. Of course, they include the risk of combat when our troops are deployed overseas in combat zones. It includes hardship to families. When our troops are deployed, they miss weddings, birthdays, first communions. It even takes training into account because the members of the military don’t work on a 9-to-5 basis.

I will give one example. I had the great opportunity to head out to the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, CA. It is one of the great training bases in our country—one of the great training places in the world. I was there to watch the training of the 1st Stryker Brigade, which is based in Fairbanks, AK. They were out there for a month deployment and training hard. They were not punching a clock 9 to 5; they were training around the clock every day.

I happened to be out there on Super Bowl Sunday. The vast majority of Americans were enjoying the Super Bowl, as they should have been. They were having fun, going to parties, watching the game, drinking Coke, Pepsi, and a little beer. But there were some Americans who were out in the middle of Fort Irwin in the desert training. They were not watching the Super Bowl; they were training to

make sure that when their country next called them up, they would be ready to protect our Nation. That is the reason this law states that we treat our military members a little bit different than other members of the Department of Defense.

That is all my amendment would do, but unfortunately, this one, like dozens, if not hundreds, is not going to be heard—at least for the time being—because the minority leader on the other side is trying to bring back the way they used to run the Senate last year and the year before and the year before that.

We know. We heard the stories. Last year, again, there were 14 amendments that were brought to the floor for a rollcall vote in 2014. They essentially shut down the greatest deliberative body in the world. We have heard the stories of how the previous majority leader used his position to block consideration of amendments more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined, and now we are doing it on a bill that relates to the national security of our Nation and the critical issue of taking care of the men and women in uniform.

I hope we can move through this. I hope we can get to regular order. I hope this body can take up amendments such as mine—commonsense, bipartisan amendments that are going to keep our Nation safer, take care of our troops and their families, and give the American people faith that we are doing the job they sent us here to do. That is my hope.

We are already doing it under the new majority leader. We voted on almost 200 amendments already this year, but right now we are stuck on one of the most important bills this body will consider for the entire year. It is a shame. We need to get unstuck.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SECTION 3112 OF S. CON. RES. 11

Mr. HATCH. On March 27, 2015, the Senate functioned properly by adopting S. Con. Res. 11 on the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 2016.

Section 3112 of that budget resolution contains a specification of procedures governing cost estimates for what is defined to be “major legislation” as defined in section 3112(c)(1).

I wish to provide a few comments to clarify that section of the budget resolution, and I understand that my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Finance Committee Ranking Member