

gap that had to be filled by taking money from elsewhere because of rising fuel costs.

This willingness to not look at all American homegrown energy and security is simply wrongheaded. And the idea that it costs more to do this—it costs \$83 billion more to protect shipping oil coming from overseas.

I ask my colleagues to resist this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I agree with my colleagues, three of whom have served in the military and understand the need for this.

This is an investment. This is an investment in alternatives. If we are tied to oil, tied to fossil fuels, and have no alternative—right now they are cheap, but then they go up in costs. And they are also far more difficult to get into the field, as Mr. GIBSON pointed out. This is an investment to give us the alternatives that we need.

Nothing is more important to the success of a military—past the people who serve—than the ability to get the fuel they need, whatever form it comes in. This is an investment in developing much-needed alternatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, the fact that this amendment requires the military to choose the most cost-effective energy source allows the military to spend its money on those priorities, rather than on energy.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of its secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON CARRYING OUT CERTAIN AUTHORITIES RELATING TO CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to carry out the provisions described in subsection (b).

(b) PROVISIONS.—The provisions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b)(iii), and 6(c) of Executive Order 13653 (78 Fed. Reg. 66817, relating to preparing the United States for the impacts of climate change).

(2) Sections 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15(b) of Executive Order 13693 (80 Fed. Reg. 15869, relating to planning for Federal sustainability in the next decade).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents scarce dollars from being wasted to fund two of President Obama's executive orders regarding climate change and green energy. These are dollars that should go to the readiness of our Armed Forces.

A similar amendment has already been adopted by voice vote for the past 2 years during House floor consideration of the Defense appropriations bills.

My amendment is supported by 28 outside organizations, including the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Americans for Prosperity, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and many others.

These executive orders require the Department of Defense to squander—squander—precious defense dollars by incorporating climate change bureaucracies into its acquisition and military operations and to waste money on green energy projects. EPA bureaucrats and other political appointees are directing our military commanders on how to run their installations and procure green weapons, which undermines ongoing acquisition reforms in the NDAA. These activities are simply not the mission of the U.S. military.

Regarding DOD's energy policy, decisions by installation commanders and DOD personnel need to be driven by requirements for actual cost-effectiveness, readiness, not arbitrary and inflexible green energy quotas and CO₂ benchmarks. My amendment does not prevent the DOD from considering renewable energy projects where it makes sense. But these decisions should not be driven by these mandates.

Take, for example, the Naval Station Norfolk, where the solar array cost the

Navy \$21 million but only provided 2 percent of the base's electricity. According to the Inspector General's Office, it will take 447 years for the savings to pay the cost of the project. However, solar panels usually only last about 25 years.

These mandates are diverting limited military resources to Solyndra-style boondoggles while sacrificing our military's readiness, modernization, and end strength. In a time of declining defense budgets, we need to ensure that every dollar spent goes directly to support the lethality of our Armed Forces.

Again, my amendment is similar to repeated efforts by the House to prevent national security dollars from being wasted to advance the President's onerous green energy and climate change requirements. So I ask that the House continue that opposition to this nondefense agenda by supporting my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

In January of this year, the Pentagon issued a directive saying: "The Department of Defense must be able to adapt current and future operations to address the impacts of climate change in order to maintain an effective and efficient U.S. military."

This followed a DOD report to Congress released last July that said: "Climate change is an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows, and conflicts over basic resources such as food and water . . . and the scope, scale, and intensity of these impacts are projected to increase."

From 2006 to 2010, Syria experienced overwhelming refugee flows that DOD characterized as a climate-related security risk creating negative effects on human security and requiring DOD involvement and resources.

In 2014, the Pentagon reported that the impacts of climate change may increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions, while at the same time undermining the capacity of our domestic installation to support training activities.

The readiness of our military depends on being able to train and equip the most advanced force in the world, but the threat of rising sea levels from escalating temperatures and melting ice caps could put dozens of military installations at risk.

San Diego is home to the largest concentration of military forces in the world. With seven military installations in my district alone, rising sea levels, drought, and finding reliable energy sources all pose challenges. San Diego military installations are investing in energy security and increasing

water and energy efficiency. We should not undermine those efforts.

This amendment is an attempt by top politicians to prevent the Department of Defense, which is tasked with maintaining a strong military, keeping all Americans safe, and protecting our global interests from addressing what they call an urgent and growing threat to our own national security. But national defense is not about politics or ideology. It is about security, readiness, and continuing to field the most dynamic and effective military in the world. We cannot have that if we ignore science and the concerns of the brightest military minds in the United States of America.

I oppose this reckless amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I would respond, first of all, by saying I think we all see the reports. If you are on Armed Services, you hear our generals talk about how our readiness is in dire straits, that we can't respond to the challenges around the world.

At a time like this, why would we want to pay 5 or 10 times the nominal amount for fuel? It makes no sense.

To my colleague who wants to argue climate change: fine, we can argue that. But this is not the place to debate that.

You see, my amendment allows for the Department of Defense to do whatever is best for our Armed Forces. Whether you agree with climate change or not, it doesn't matter. All we say is let's free up the DOD, our Armed Forces, and our generals to do the right thing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration issued two critical executive orders directing Federal agencies to take responsibility for anticipating and responding to the effects of climate change.

This amendment that is being proposed would block the Department of Defense from undertaking that effort. The amendment is ill-advised. It doesn't protect and prepare the American people for the impacts of climate change, and it won't help our military operate in a new security environment created by climate change.

Climate change poses a significant security threat to the United States and the world at large. But don't take it from me. Our Nation's military leaders are saying we need to prepare for this new threat. The proponents of this amendment should listen to the military experts, not the special interest

polluters that benefit from climate denial and the status quo.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have been frustrated that the Republican majority has refused to hold serious hearings on the urgent problem of climate change, so Democrats on that committee went to Annapolis in my State to hold a climate change field forum.

We heard testimony from Vice Admiral Ted Carter, the Superintendent of the Naval Academy. He told us that our future military leaders are learning about the science of climate change and the national security consequences that stem from it. He testified that because the Naval Academy sits on the waters of the Chesapeake Bay, they have several projects in motion to address sea level rise and the increased regularity of flooding. They are retrofitting older buildings and building new facilities that double as seawalls to protect the campus.

Vice Admiral Carter also told harrowing stories of sailing aircraft carriers in between two massive hurricanes and equipment that short-circuited in waters with surface temperatures in excess of 100 degrees.

Certainly my colleagues on the Republican side would not deny that these are consequential problems. Leaders like Admiral Carter cannot afford the luxury of ideological climate denial. He is taking the right steps to address climate change. We should support him and our other military leaders. Unfortunately, this amendment would do the opposite. For that reason, I urge its defeat.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, again, my amendment is not a debate about climate change, regardless of where you fall on that issue. All this does is free up DOD to make the vital important decisions on that, instead of handcuffing it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, actually, it precisely does handcuff them by telling them how to make their decisions, saying they can't make a decision based on their belief that needs for alternatives to fossil fuels are important. If we don't wish to handcuff them, don't offer an amendment telling them that they have to spend their money in a certain way. That is exactly what this amendment does.

Again, there are multiple reasons for making these investments in alternative energy. I will return to one that was raised by Mr. GIBSON.

Out in the field, you need multiple different sources of energy. If you can get a situation where you have properly developed solar power or thermal power and you can use that on the spot where you are at, instead of relying on trucks to bring in diesel or gasoline, you are saving lives.

This is an investment in making our military more prepared. What this amendment does is it restricts the ability of the Department of Defense to

make that investment. If you don't want to restrict them, don't restrict them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the ranking member, all my amendment does is holds the status quo before these two executive orders; and that is, the commanders in the field and the generals at the Pentagon can do whatever is best for the military, whether or not it has to do with saving money or spending more money on alternative forms of energy.

My amendment frees them up. It does not restrict them in any way.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 7004, insert the following:

SEC. 7005. RETURN OF CERTAIN LANDS AT FORT WINGATE TO THE ORIGINAL INHABITANTS ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Return of Certain Lands At Fort Wingate to The Original Inhabitants Act".

(b) **DIVISION AND TREATMENT OF LANDS OF FORMER FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY, NEW MEXICO, TO BENEFIT THE ZUNI TRIBE AND NAVAJO NATION.**—

(1) **IMMEDIATE TRUST ON BEHALF OF ZUNI TRIBE; EXCEPTION.**—Subject to valid existing rights and to easements reserved pursuant to subsection (c), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity depicted in dark blue on the map titled "The Fort Wingate Depot Activity Negotiated Property Division April 2016" (in this section referred to as the "Map") and transferred to the Secretary of the Interior are to be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the Zuni Tribe as part of the Zuni Reservation, unless the Zuni Tribe otherwise elects under clause (ii) of paragraph (3)(C) to have the parcel conveyed to it in Restricted Fee Status.

(2) **IMMEDIATE TRUST ON BEHALF OF THE NAVAJO NATION; EXCEPTION.**—Subject to valid existing rights and to easements reserved pursuant to subsection (c), all right, title,

and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity depicted in dark green on the Map and transferred to the Secretary of the Interior are to be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the Navajo Nation as part of the Navajo Reservation, unless the Navajo Nation otherwise elects under clause (ii) of paragraph (3)(C) to have the parcel conveyed to it in Restricted Fee Status.

(3) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFER AND TRUST; RESTRICTED FEE STATUS ALTERNATIVE.—

(A) TRANSFER UPON COMPLETION OF REMEDIATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the New Mexico Environment Department, notifies the Secretary of the Interior that remediation of a parcel of land of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity has been completed consistent with subsection (d), the Secretary of the Army shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over the parcel to the Secretary of the Interior.

(B) NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFER.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Army transfers administrative jurisdiction over a parcel of land of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Interior shall notify the Zuni Tribe and Navajo Nation of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the parcel.

(C) TRUST OR RESTRICTED FEE STATUS.—

(i) TRUST.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary of the Interior shall hold each parcel of land of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity transferred under subparagraph (A) in trust—

(I) for the Zuni Tribe, in the case of land depicted in blue on the Map; or

(II) for the Navajo Nation, in the case of land depicted in green on the Map.

(ii) RESTRICTED FEE STATUS.—In lieu of having a parcel of land held in trust under clause (i), the Zuni Tribe, with respect to land depicted in blue on the Map, and the Navajo Nation, with respect to land depicted in green on the Map, may elect to have the Secretary of the Interior convey the parcel or any portion of the parcel to it in restricted fee status.

(iii) NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Zuni Tribe or the Navajo Nation receives notice under subparagraph (B) of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over a parcel of land of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity, the Zuni Tribe or the Navajo Nation shall notify the Secretary of the Interior of an election under clause (ii) for conveyance of the parcel or any portion of the parcel in restricted fee status.

(iv) CONVEYANCE.—As soon as practicable after receipt of a notice from the Zuni Tribe or the Navajo Nation under clause (iii), but in no case later than 6 months after receipt of the notice, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, in restricted fee status, the parcel of land of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity covered by the notice to the Zuni Tribe or the Navajo Nation, as the case may be.

(v) RESTRICTED FEE STATUS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section only, the term “restricted fee status”, with respect to land conveyed under clause (iv), means that the land so conveyed—

(I) shall be owned in fee by the Indian tribe to whom the land is conveyed;

(II) shall be part of the Indian tribe’s Reservation and expressly made subject to the jurisdiction of the Indian Tribe;

(III) shall not be sold by the Indian tribe without the consent of Congress;

(IV) shall not be subject to taxation by a State or local government other than the government of the Indian tribe; and

(V) shall not be subject to any provision of law providing for the review or approval by the Secretary of the Interior before an Indian tribe may use the land for any purpose, directly or through agreement with another party.

(4) SURVEY AND BOUNDARY REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(i) provide for the survey of lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity taken into trust for the Zuni Tribe or the Navajo Nation or conveyed in restricted fee status for the Zuni Tribe or the Navajo Nation under paragraph (1), (2), or (3); and

(ii) establish legal boundaries based on the Map as parcels are taken into trust or conveyed in restricted fee status.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Zuni Tribe and the Navajo Nation to determine their priorities regarding the order in which parcels should be surveyed and, to the greatest extent feasible, the Secretary shall follow these priorities.

(5) RELATION TO CERTAIN REGULATIONS.—Part 151 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply to taking lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity into trust under paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

(6) FORT WINGATE LAUNCH COMPLEX LAND STATUS.—Upon certification by the Secretary of Defense that the area generally depicted as “Fort Wingate Launch Complex” on the Map is no longer required for military purposes and can be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) the areas generally depicted as “FWLC A” and “FWLC B” on the Map shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the Zuni Tribe in accordance with this subsection; and

(B) the areas generally depicted as “FWLC C” and “FWLC D” on the Map shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the Navajo Nation in accordance with this subsection.

(c) RETENTION OF NECESSARY EASEMENTS AND ACCESS.—

(1) TREATMENT OF EXISTING EASEMENTS, PERMIT RIGHTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity held in trust or conveyed in restricted fee status pursuant to subsection (b) shall be held in trust with easements, permit rights, and rights-of-way, and access associated with such easements, permit rights, and rights-of-way, of any applicable utility service provider in existence or for which an application is pending for existing facilities at the time of the conveyance or change to trust status, including the right to upgrade applicable utility services recognized and preserved, in perpetuity and without the right of revocation (except as provided in subparagraph (B)).

(B) TERMINATION.—An easement, permit right, or right-of-way recognized and preserved under subparagraph (A) shall terminate only—

(i) on the relocation of an applicable utility service referred to in subparagraph (A), but only with respect to that portion of the utility facilities that are relocated; or

(ii) with the consent of the holder of the easement, permit right, or right-of-way.

(C) ADDITIONAL EASEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall grant to a utility service provider, without consideration, such additional easements across lands held in trust or conveyed in restricted fee status pursuant to subsection (b) as the Secretary considers necessary to accommodate the relocation or reconnection of a utility service existing on the date of enactment of this section.

(2) ACCESS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE ACTIONS.—The lands of Former Fort Wingate

Depot Activity held in trust or conveyed in restricted fee status pursuant to subsection (b) shall be subject to reserved access by the United States as the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior determine are reasonably required to permit access to lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity for administrative and environmental response purposes. The Secretary of the Army shall provide to the governments of the Zuni Tribe and the Navajo Nation written copies of all access reservations under this subsection.

(3) SHARED ACCESS.—

(A) PARCEL 1 SHARED CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS ACCESS.—In the case of the lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity depicted as Parcel 1 on the Map, the lands shall be held in trust subject to a shared easement for cultural and religious purposes only. Both the Zuni Tribe and the Navajo Nation shall have unhindered access to their respective cultural and religious sites within Parcel 1. Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Zuni Tribe and the Navajo Nation shall exchange detailed information to document the existence of cultural and religious sites within Parcel 1 for the purpose of carrying out this subparagraph. The information shall also be provided to the Secretary of the Interior.

(B) OTHER SHARED ACCESS.—Subject to the written consent of both the Zuni Tribe and the Navajo Nation, the Secretary of the Interior may facilitate shared access to other lands held in trust or restricted fee status pursuant to subsection (b), including, but not limited to, religious and cultural sites.

(4) I-40 FRONTAGE ROAD ENTRANCE.—The access road for the Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity, which originates at the frontage road for Interstate 40 and leads to the parcel of the Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity depicted as “administration area” on the Map, shall be held in common by the Zuni Tribe and Navajo Nation to provide for equal access to Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity.

(5) COMPATIBILITY WITH DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.—The lands of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity held in trust or conveyed in restricted fee status pursuant to subsection (b) shall be subject to reservations by the United States as the Secretary of Defense determines are reasonably required to permit access to lands of the Fort Wingate launch complex for administrative, test operations, and launch operations purposes. The Secretary of Defense shall provide the governments of the Zuni Tribe and the Navajo Nation written copies of all reservations under this paragraph.

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as alleviating, altering, or affecting the responsibility of the United States for cleanup and remediation of Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

(e) PROHIBITION ON GAMING.—Any real property of the Former Fort Wingate Depot Activity and all other real property subject to this section shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, in January of 1993, the BRAC Commission closed

Fort Wingate in New Mexico. Fort Wingate was destined and designated to go to two tribes, equitably divided between the two—the Navajo Nation and the Zunis.

During the past 12 years, I have been involved in negotiations back and forth between the tribes. The lands were occupied ancestrally by both tribes. There have been many long, ongoing discussions between all of the parties. We have gotten signatures in the past from different members of the Navajo government. We currently have a letter dated May 16, 2016, in which it states that it is the opinion of the Navajo Nation that the land division and the terms developed between the two tribes would provide a solution to the land division.

All we are asking is that the agreed-upon maps be distributed in accordance with the terms, signed by the speaker of the Navajo Nation and the Zunis. That is the purpose of this amendment today. It is a fairly simple distribution according to the provisions that are listed in the BRAC ruling of January 1993.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment in its current form and at this particular time.

This amendment, as it has been pointed out, directly impacts two federally recognized tribal nations: the Navajo Nation and the Zuni Pueblo Nation in New Mexico.

They have been working with the Department of Defense to resolve the disposition of this excess Federal land. The Navajo is one of the tribes that would receive the land in transfer, and it is opposed to some of the language that is still occurring in this amendment. The Pearce amendment, unfortunately, claims a provision that would require a right-of-way in perpetuity to the Navajo, and the Navajo agrees, it is my understanding, to work toward some of the land transfer.

I ask the gentleman: Are they aware that the Navajo doesn't agree in having this land transfer go in perpetuity and that it would like to work something else out?

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, that is a provision that I, personally, did not put into the bill. It came from the committee of jurisdiction, the Natural Resources Committee. They insisted on it because it is prevailing language under the law.

The objection in the letter from the Navajo, which I was just showing the gentlewoman previously, describes that, and the language reads that they have so far failed to acquire a new

right-of-way with the U.S. Army and now have come to Congress to address their error.

What has happened is that the right-of-way has yielded, and the language here was language that has previously been set up by the committee in order to address this.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, there is some disagreement as to how this language should be structured. I don't think we should be pushing through something that the Navajo Nation now finds controversial but that wasn't controversial when working with the Department of Defense and making sure that they had the right-of-way and access to the land.

It is a sovereign nation. There are only 10 minutes of debate. There seems to be a little bit of uncertainty as to where the Navajo Nation is coming down on the particular language that the gentleman has. I do not fault the gentleman for bringing the language forward, as Chairman BISHOP has changed from what the original conversation had been between the sovereign nation and the Department of Defense by putting the perpetuity in it.

I believe we should respect the right of sovereignty of the tribe, and I believe at this time we should defeat the amendment. I would like to work with the gentleman to come up with language that is acceptable both for the Department of Defense and the two tribal nations. They were so very close. I would like to make that happen.

Mr. PEARCE. Again, addressing the gentlewoman, those are the subjects that Mr. LUJÁN and I have agreed that we would work on in conference. I think that we are more than willing to accommodate, but to stall this out now—this is the last vehicle this year. Literally, we are out of time. I would gladly accept the gentlewoman's help in the conference committee, and I want to resolve this. Again, I have been working on it for 12 years. We go and we get the signatures. It has been very arduous on the parts of all, and I understand the difficulty when you have aboriginal lands.

Again, when I look at the language, it is language that was previously established in the Ho-Chunk Nation distribution. The language literally is set in precedent, and the committee explains to us there is not much option there; but I am more than willing to work on the issue with the gentlewoman.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARCE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I look forward to working with the gentleman. I am sure we can come up with an accommodation that will make everyone satisfied.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, what we are trying to do is put into the hands of two Indian nations land that has been designated for

them since 1993. I think that all parties just want it to be done in the right fashion. We are so close at this point that I would really appreciate the fact that we put it in this bill, that we include it, and move it into the conference. I am certain that with the Senator's input, they will be listening to the same concerns as the gentlewoman is listening to.

Again, I appreciate the help of Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LUJÁN—all of those parties—and both Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman BISHOP.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, in closing, again, I just appreciate the consideration by the gentlewoman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 4, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 30, and 31 printed in House Report No. 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

Page 372, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 1014. UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS TRAINING MISSIONS.

The Secretary of Defense shall coordinate unmanned aerial systems training missions along the southern border of the United States in order to support the Department of Homeland Security's counter-narcotic trafficking efforts.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

In section 522, page 120, strike lines 9 through 19, and insert the following:

Section 701(i) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(3) In the event that two members of the armed forces who are married to each other adopt a child in a qualifying child adoption, the two members shall be allowed a total of at least 36 days of leave under this subsection, to be shared between the two members. The Secretary concerned shall permit the transfer of such leave between the two members to accommodate individual family circumstances.”

In section 529, page 130, strike lines 9 through 20.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. COSTELLO OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. REPORT ON EXTENDING PROTECTIONS FOR STUDENT LOANS FOR ACTIVE DUTY BORROWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the information, assistance, and efforts to support and inform

active duty members of the Armed Forces with respect to the rights and resources available under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) regarding student loans. The report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of the coordination and information sharing between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Education regarding the eligibility of members, and requests by members, to apply the interest rate limitation under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act with respect to existing Federal and private student loans.

(2) The number of such members with student loans who elect to have the maximum interest rates set in accordance with such Act.

(3) The number of such members whose student loans have an interest rate that exceeds such maximum rate.

(4) Methods by which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Education can automate the process by which members with student loans elect to have the maximum interest rates set in accordance with such Act.

(5) A discussion of the effectiveness of such Act in providing protection to members of the Armed Forces with respect to student loans.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the follow:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Page 173, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 599A. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN REIMBURSEMENTS OF MEDICAL EXPENSES AND OTHER PAYMENTS FROM DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL INCOME WITH RESPECT TO PENSIONS FOR VETERANS AND SURVIVING SPOUSES AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1503(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (12) as paragraphs (7) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph (6):

“(6) payments regarding reimbursements of any kind (including insurance settlement payments) for medical expenses resulting from any accident, theft, loss, or casualty loss (as defined by the Secretary), but the amount excluded under this clause shall not exceed the costs of medical care provided to the victim of the accident, theft, loss, or casualty loss.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS.

(a) RATES OF REIMBURSEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In furnishing applied behavior analysis under the TRICARE program to individuals described in paragraph (2) during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and ending on December 31, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the reimbursement rates for providers of applied behavior analysis are not less than the rates that were in effect on March 31, 2016.

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—Individuals described in this paragraph are individuals who are covered beneficiaries (as defined in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code) by reason of being a member or former member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the reserve components thereof, or a dependent of such a member or former member.

(b) ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the completion of the Department of Defense Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs shall conduct an analysis to—

(A) use data gathered during the demonstration to set future reimbursement rates for providers of applied behavior analysis under the TRICARE program; and

(B) review comparative commercial insurance claims for purposes of setting such future rates, including by—

(i) conducting an analysis of the comparative total of commercial insurance claims billed for applied behavior analysis; and

(ii) reviewing any covered beneficiary limitations on access to applied behavior analysis services at various military installations throughout the United States.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The Assistant Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the analysis conducted under paragraph (1).

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for Private Sector Care is hereby increased by \$32,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Line 300) is hereby reduced by \$32,000,000.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that amounts should be appropriated for behavioral health treatment of TRICARE beneficiaries, including pursuant to this section, in a manner to ensure the appropriate and equitable access to such treatment by all such beneficiaries.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to fund a Secretariat or any other international organization established to support the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty, to sustain domestic prosecutions based on any charge related to the Treaty, or to implement the Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty and implementing legislation for the Treaty has been enacted into law.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Department of Defense from assisting foreign countries in bringing their laws, regulations, and practices related to export control up to United States standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 603, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 1523. CODIFICATION OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET CRITERIA.

The Secretary of Defense shall implement the following criteria in requests for overseas contingency operations:

(1) Geographic Area Covered – For theater of operations for non-classified war overseas contingency operations funding, the geographic areas in which combat or direct combat support operations occur are: Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, the Horn of Africa, Persian Gulf and Gulf nations, Arabian Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Philippines, and other countries on a case-by-case basis.

(2) Permitted Inclusions in the Overseas Contingency Operation Budget

(A) Major Equipment

(i) Replacement of losses that have occurred but only for items not already programmed for replacement in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP), but not including accelerations, which must be made in the base budget.

(ii) Replacement or repair to original capability (to upgraded capability if that is currently available) of equipment returning from theater. The replacement may be a similar end item if the original item is no longer in production. Incremental cost of non-war related upgrades, if made, should be included in the base.

(iii) Purchase of specialized, theater-specific equipment.

(iv) Funding for major equipment must be obligated within 12 months.

(B) Ground Equipment Replacement

(i) For combat losses and returning equipment that is not economical to repair, the replacement of equipment may be given to coalition partners, if consistent with approved policy.

(ii) In-theater stocks above customary equipping levels on a case-by-case basis.

(C) Equipment Modifications

(i) Operationally-required modifications to equipment used in theater or in direct support of combat operations and that is not already programmed in FYDP.

(ii) Funding for equipment modifications must be able to be obligated in 12 months.

(D) Munitions

(i) Replenishment of munitions expended in combat operations in theater.

(ii) Training ammunition for theater-unique training events.

(iii) While forecasted expenditures are not permitted, a case-by-case assessment for munitions where existing stocks are insufficient to sustain theater combat operations.

(E) Aircraft Replacement

(i) Combat losses by accident that occur in the theater of operations.

(ii) Combat losses by enemy action that occur in the theater of operations.

(F) Military Construction

(i) Facilities and infrastructure in the theater of operations in direct support of combat operations. The level of construction should be the minimum to meet operational requirements.

(ii) At non-enduring locations, facilities and infrastructure for temporary use.

(iii) At enduring locations, facilities and infrastructure for temporary use.

(iv) At enduring locations, construction requirements must be tied to surge operations or major changes in operational requirements and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

(G) Research and development projects for combat operations in these specific theaters that can be delivered in 12 months.

(H) Operations

(i) Direct War costs:

(I) Transport of personnel, equipment, and supplies to, from and within the theater of operations.

(II) Deployment-specific training and preparation for unites and personnel (military and civilian) to assume their directed missions as defined in the orders for deployment into the theater of operations.

(i) Within the theater, the incremental costs above the funding programmed in the base budget to:

(I) Support commanders in the conduct of their directed missions (to include Emergency Response Programs).

(II) Build and maintain temporary facilities.

(III) Provide food, fuel, supplies, contracted services and other support.

(IV) Cover the operational costs of coalition partners supporting US military missions, as mutually agreed.

(iii) Indirect war costs incurred outside the theater of operations will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

(I) Health

(i) Short-term care directly related to combat.

(ii) Infrastructure that is only to be used during the current conflict.

(J) Personnel

(i) Incremental special pays and allowances for Service members and civilians deployed to a combat zone.

(ii) Incremental pay, special pays and allowances for Reserve Component personnel mobilized to support war missions.

(K) Special Operations Command

(i) Operations that meet the criteria in this guidance.

(ii) Equipment that meets the criteria in this guidance.

(L) Prepositioned Supplies and equipment for resetting in-theater stocks of supplies and equipment to pre-war levels.

(M) Security force funding to train, equip, and sustain Iraqi and Afghan military and police forces.

(N) Fuel

(i) War fuel costs and funding to ensure that logistical support to combat operations is not degraded due to cash losses in the Department of Defense's baseline fuel program.

(ii) Enough of any base fuel shortfall attributable to fuel price increases to maintain sufficient on-hand cash for the Defense Working Capital Funds to cover seven days disbursements.

(3) Excluded items from Overseas Contingency Funding that must be funded from the base budget

(A) Training vehicles, aircraft, ammunition, and simulators, but not training base stocks of specialized, theater-specific equipment that is required to support combat operations in the theater of operations, and support to deployment-specific training described above.

(B) Acceleration of equipment service life extension programs already in the Future Years Defense Plan.

(C) Base Realignment and Closure projects.

(D) Family support initiatives

(i) Construction of childcare facilities.

(ii) Funding for private-public partnerships to expand military families' access to childcare.

(iii) Support for service members' spouses professional development.

(E) Programs to maintain industrial base capacity including "war-stoppers."

(F) Personnel

(i) Recruiting and retention bonuses to maintain end-strength.

(ii) Basic Pay and the Basic allowances for Housing and Subsistence for permanently authorized end strength.

(iii) Individual augmentees on a case-by-case basis.

(G) Support for the personnel, operations, or the construction or maintenance of facili-

ties, at U.S. Offices of Security Cooperation in theater.

(H) Costs for reconfiguring prepositioned supplies and equipment or for maintaining them.

(4) Special Situations – Items proposed for increases in reprogrammings or as payback for prior reprogrammings must meet the criteria above.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES OF CONNECTICUT

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

SEC. 16 . REPORT ON POLICIES FOR RESPONDING TO MALICIOUS CYBER ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OR UNITED STATES PERSONS BY FOREIGN STATES OR NON-STATE ACTORS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on policies, doctrine, procedures, and authorities governing Department of Defense activities in response to malicious cyber activities carried out against the United States or United States persons by foreign states or non-state actors.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Specific citations to appropriate associated Executive branch and agency directives, guidance, instructions, and other authoritative policy documents.

(2) Descriptions of relevant authorities, rules of engagement, command and control structures, and response plans.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1 . REPORT ON P-8 POSEIDON AIRCRAFT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than October 1, 2017, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding future capabilities for the P-8 Poseidon aircraft.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the P-8 Poseidon aircraft, the following:

(1) A review of possible upgrades by the Navy to the sensors onboard the aircraft, including intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance sensors currently being fielded on Air Force platforms.

(2) An assessment of the ability of the Navy to use long-range multispectral imaging systems onboard the aircraft.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1 . REPORT ON COST OF B-21 AIRCRAFT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the cost of the B-21 aircraft. The report shall include an estimate of the total cost of research, production, and maintenance for the aircraft expressed in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the Sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should work with State and local health officials to prevent human exposure to perfluorinated chemicals.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN OF MAINE

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3 . REPORT ON AVERAGE TRAVEL COSTS OF MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the travel expenses of members of reserve components associated with performing active duty service, active service, full-time National Guard duty, active Guard and Reserve duty, and inactive-duty training, as such terms are defined in section 101(d) of title 10, United States Code. Such report shall include the average annual cost for all travel expenses for a member of a reserve component.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. FARENTHOLD OF TEXAS

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3 . ACCESS TO WIRELESS HIGH-SPEED INTERNET AND NETWORK CONNECTIONS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DEPLOYED OVERSEAS.

Consistent with section 2492a of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense is encouraged to enter into contracts with third-party vendors in order to provide members of the Armed Forces who are deployed overseas at any United States military facility, at which wireless high-speed Internet and network connections are otherwise available, with access to such Internet and network connections without charge.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which is included in here, that encourages the Department of Defense to provide free Wi-Fi access of the Internet to military personnel who are deployed overseas.

Right now our military personnel, in some instances, are required to pay twice as much as a typical American family would pay for access to the Internet. Access to the Internet is a way for our troops to keep their morale high by staying in touch with their families back home by using technology like FaceTime and Skype.

This amendment does not require any expenditure by the military. It merely instructs the military to work towards this goal: to make it available where possible and to indicate that it should be a priority. It doesn't cost anything, but it is a great morale booster, and it should be great for our troops.

I urge my colleagues to support this. Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I speak about the broader bill. Unfortunately, something happened in the Rules Committee yesterday that has been happening far too often in recent years. This was much debated during the debate over the rule, but I didn't have a chance to come and talk about it.

There was an amendment added in committee that overturns an executive

order by the President. The executive order basically says: if you discriminate against the LGBT community, you will not be allowed to get government contracts.

That executive order also had an exception for religious organizations. The amendment that was added in committee—and it is much debated as to what it did or didn't do, but my reading of it is that it dramatically expands that exception and basically increases the ability of defense firms and subcontractors to discriminate against the LGBT community.

The larger problem here is: Why couldn't we vote on it?

It puts our Members in the position of voting for a defense bill that has what we believe to be discriminatory language in it without our even having had the opportunity to have voted to remove that language.

This is something that has happened for the last 3 or 4 years on an increasing basis. It used to be that this was an open rule. With the defense bill, you basically offered an amendment; you had a debate; and you had a chance. Then we started to shrink them down a little bit. Now, in the last couple of years, anything that is inconvenient for the majority to vote on or, even more distressingly, anything that they think will make it inconvenient for us to vote on the bill gets struck.

That is not the way the Rules Committee is supposed to work. They are supposed to give us the opportunity to vote on these amendments. They, again, have narrowly crafted it down to just the amendments that they like. Having this discriminatory provision within the defense bill, in addition to all of the other problems, has forced me to the point at which I am actually going to oppose the bill, which I do not want to do and did not want to do; but I hope, in the future, the Rules Committee will at least give us a chance to vote.

We had a robust debate about the substance of this particular amendment earlier. Again, it is not so much about the substance of the particular amendment. It is about the opportunity for our Members to have a vote. If we could go on record and vote against that amendment on the floor—do our best to strip it out—then at least we are on record. Here, we are simply forced to vote for a defense bill that contains discriminatory language that we do not support.

I hope, in the future, the Rules Committee will stop doing this, will let the democratic process work, will give us the opportunity to vote, accept the outcome of that vote, and move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

My understanding is that the provision that the gentleman refers to is a restatement of religious liberties from the 1964 Civil Rights Act. What that tells me, if he opposes the bill based on

that, is that there are Members who are looking for some excuse to vote against this bill. You can always find one. I can find one myself. I don't think that is the right thing to do, however, for the men and women who serve our Nation.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, each month across our great country, our brave men and women in the National Guard and the Armed Forces Reserves leave their homes and report for duty. Each month they train on the ground and in the air and on the sea so that they are ready at a moment's notice to fight for our freedom. Our guardsmen and reservists often travel long distances to their training sites, and their travel costs often exceed their monthly training pay, which forces them to buy gas, meals, and sometimes hotel rooms out of pocket.

Right now, today, under existing law, if you work for the IRS or the EPA or some other Federal Government agency, you are granted a tax deduction for out-of-pocket travel expenses if you travel beyond 50 miles of your home; but if you are a guardsman or a woman or if you are in the Reserves, you need to travel more than 100 miles to receive the same benefits.

Mr. Chair, this is not fair, and this is not right. I urge everybody to endorse and support my amendment No. 300.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) will control the time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

There was no objection.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chair, for many years, the Air Force used perfluorinated chemicals in its compound for firefighting foam, but in the past few years, very high levels of these PFCs have been discovered in the fish near the former Wurtsmith Air Force Base in Oscoda, Michigan, which is in my district. Tests have revealed the presence of PFCs as well in the groundwater that people who live near the former Air Force base depend upon.

The CDC and the EPA have both said that PFCs can be potentially harmful to people's health, though there is still not clear guidance as to what is a safe level of exposure, especially in the long term; although, there is great concern on this question.

I have asked the Air Force as well as the State of Michigan to provide bottled water to those identified individuals who are living near Wurtsmith whose water may be contaminated by PFCs at least until more research is done on the safety of their water. My amendment would require the Department of Defense to do whatever it can to prevent further exposure to PFCs.

□ 1600

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the amendment to renew the 1-year ban on the Obama administration or any other administration from using any Department of Defense funds to implement the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, a treaty which, by the way, has never been ratified by our Senate.

Specifically, the amendment bans the use of Department of Defense funds for the ATT Secretariat, a body that was created for effectively implementing the ATT according to the treaty's supporters.

Last August, ATT member nations organized the Conference of States Parties to the ATT, a conference in which we did not have a vote and which decided that American taxpayers are now on the hook to pay 22 percent of the expenses of this annual meeting. This taxpayer money would go directly to the ATT Secretariat and become part of its core budget. My amendment prevents these hardworking American taxpayer dollars from flowing into the coffers of those who are working to implement the ATT.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including this in the en bloc amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to stand in support of our Second Amendment and of our Nation's sovereignty and vote in support of this amendment to renew the annual ban on the funding of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, my amendment would exempt reimbursement for medical expenses from the Department of Veterans Affairs calculation of annual income when determining pension eligibility for veterans. This amendment is a version of H.R. 4994, the Veterans Pensions Protection Act, bipartisan legislation endorsed by the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and others.

A few years ago, a disabled veteran and a constituent of mine was struck by a vehicle while crossing the street. After receiving insurance compensation for his injuries, he lost his pension. This is because, under current law, compensation for medical expenses, including insurance settlement payments or reimbursements, are considered income by the VA.

We effectively punish our veterans when they receive these types of compensation after suffering medical emergencies like the one I just outlined. This is, quite simply, wrong. My amendment will rectify this.

I ask the House to support this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PARENTHOLD) to discuss an additional amendment he has.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment that directs our service academies to notify the Members of Congress of acceptees at least 48 hours before publishing the acceptance or letting the acceptee know.

As most Members of this body know, we are actually the interviewing source for the service academies. Young men and women seeking to serve this country attending a service academy apply for a nomination from their Member of Congress, most often go through a very lengthy vetting process, and we develop a relationship with these young men and women.

Historically, the service academies have allowed us to call them and tell them they are accepted and congratulate them. This year, in some instances, the service academies have quit doing that, which was a long-standing practice.

I believe that it is appropriate that those who interview and work so hard to get those young men and women into our service academies should be the ones delivering the news to them rather than them reading it on a Web site or in a piece of mail.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment when it comes before the House.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for the opportunity to offer this amendment, which would be a very straightforward amendment, which simply requires the Department of Defense to report to the Congress on the policies, doctrine, procedures, and authorities, as well as the definitions associated with a cyber attack on the United States.

This is a small step in a larger very, very important effort that Chairman WESTMORELAND and I have been working on for some period of time now to try to bring some clarity to what is, today, kind of the Wild West in the cyber realm. In the kinetic realm, we understand very clearly what an act of war is. We understand our doctrine for responding as such.

In the cyber realm, we don't know exactly when a crime becomes an act of war, how to deal with an asymmetric actor versus a nation-state. It is terribly important that we begin the process, with other nations around the world, of establishing some clarity on these points. That won't help our adversaries, but it will remove uncertainty from the system in this new and very, very important realm.

Again, I thank the leadership of the House Armed Services Committee and hope this amendment will be supported.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time on this en bloc amendment.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the committee for including, en bloc, my amendment No. 59, which is a step to look at common-sense, cost-saving proposals that the United States Navy itself has offered earlier this year that could save as much as \$900 million by consolidating carrier Air Force wings from 10 to 9.

In the fiscal year 2017 budget request, the Navy asked Congress to reallocate their 10th carrier wing into their 9 existing wings, which they feel would boost readiness and save money.

I understand there is reluctance to make what I believe is a strategic, cost-effective move, and that is why I offer my amendment today, directing the Secretary of Defense to offer Congress a study on this issue. As Vice Admiral Michael Shoemaker said: "Restructuring to nine carrier air wings is the most efficient use of those operational forces to meet global requirements."

The study will serve as an important step in realizing a more efficient, capable, cost-effective Navy. I am very encouraged that the committee was willing to include this en bloc today, and I see this as an important first step toward recognizing increased readiness as well as cost savings.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the en bloc amendment, and I appreciate the committee having accepted the amendment dealing with cost accountability for the B-21 bomber. This is a new weapon that has both conventional and nuclear weapons capability.

We are in a situation now where there is tremendous stress on our Defense Department budget with a whole range of weaponry. I think it is more important now than ever that we are able to understand exactly what we are getting into, how much this is going to cost. There is about \$1.4 billion already into this. We ought to be able to know what the total commitment is being made, to be able to have appropriate decisions made by Congress.

I am deeply concerned that the Defense Department, to this point, has resisted giving an appraisal of what the total cost is going to be, somehow fearing that, if the total budget were available, that would give too much information to our adversaries about the weight, size, and range of the plane. I think not. I think the real danger here is that the American public and Congress would know what the costs are. This is not an acceptable approach as we deal with these critical questions.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, that we have full transparency about what the costs are going to be for these massive, expensive, and, in some cases, questionable weapons systems. This is not an argument for or against it. It is

an argument for transparency and being able to know what we are getting into.

The worst of all possible worlds is making commitments and then finding, 5 and 10 years down the line, that we can't follow through on them or they result in cannibalizing other important priorities. I would think that this is one area that we could all agree we need to have this transparency and have this information available.

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, this seems to me to be a priority going forward, given the experience we have had with cost overruns and given how many elements that this committee is trying to juggle. The demands on the committee, I think, are remarkable. It is not a job that I envy. These are hard decisions that are being made.

The Department of Defense can do a favor for themselves and for us by being fully transparent so we know what we should be budgeting for in the future and that they can be held accountable for performance.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about one of the amendments that is in this en bloc package offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY). My understanding of that amendment is that it tries to have a clearer process by which we fund the military, and that is a goal for which I have enormous sympathy.

We clearly need to have more predictable funding for the military. That is true on behalf of our military commanders and all the troops. It is true on behalf of industry. It is true on behalf of budgeting in the government.

I personally also agree we need to do away with the artificial caps that have caused such difficulty for the military in recent years. I also believe that it would be beneficial if administrations did not play political budgetary games.

For example, in this year's budget, the President requests a very low number for Israeli missile defense, knowing full well that the Congress, on a bipartisan basis, is not going to let that go through. We are going to be more responsible. So they are counting on us to have to cut other programs so that we can do what they should have done to begin with. There are all sorts of tactics that are used in developing budgets. There has got to be a better way.

Apparently, some administration political appointees have been urging Members of the House to call the approach in this bill a gimmick. Actually, I have heard that term used a few times on the floor over the last couple of days.

Well, one question I have is: Was it a gimmick in 2008 when, under Democratic majority, this House used exactly the same approach in fully funding the base requirements for the year and then had a bridge fund that allowed the new President to evaluate deployments and the funding and to make adjustments, which President Obama took advantage of? That is what it was intended for. Now, why was it okay then, but it is a gimmick now? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, someone would consider that a double standard.

Would Members rather that we continue to cannibalize aircraft and deny pilots the minimum amount of training they are supposed to get? Are Members content to have class A mishaps continue to go up in service after service, or is the desire to score political points so strong that Members would rather let those trends continue rather than deal with them here in this bill before us?

Mr. Chairman, my point is that I agree there has got to be a better way. But I also believe that we have a choice before us today, and that is whether we fund the training, the maintenance, the end strength, the modernization that starts to fix the problems that I have talked about or we stick with name-calling, we look for excuses to vote “no” and allow those problems to get worse. Lives are at stake.

So while I don't know that I agree with all the particulars of the gentleman from South Carolina's amendment, I think he raises important issues. Therefore, I urge Members to support that amendment as part of this en bloc package and resolve to try to put partisanship and excuses aside and think about the men and women who serve and what is in their best interest.

I urge adoption of the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal contained in subsection (a)—

(1) takes effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) applies with respect to each operation or other action that is being carried out pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force initiated before such effective date.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, first let me just thank the Committee on Rules Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and all of the members of the committee for making this amendment in order.

My amendment is very straightforward. It would, after 90 days of enactment of this act, repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force which Congress passed into law September 14, 2001. When we repeal this 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, Congress would finally be forced to debate and vote on a specific AUMF to address the ISIL threat.

Now, I voted against the 2001 authorization because I believed it opened the door for any President to wage endless war without a congressional debate or a vote, and I believe, quite frankly, that history has borne that out.

I include in the RECORD a new report from the Congressional Research Service.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,

May 11, 2016.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Presidential References to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Publicly Available Executive Actions and Reports to Congress.

From: Matthew Weed, Specialist in Foreign Policy Legislation.

This memorandum was prepared to enable distribution to more than one congressional office.

This memorandum sets out information and analysis concerning presidential references in official notifications and records to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (2001 AUMF; Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. §1541 note), enacted in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, to justify and undertake military and other action. It contains very brief discussions of the relevant provisions of the 2001 AUMF, and the uses of U.S. armed forces connected with 2001 AUMF authority, as well as excerpted language and other information from the notifications.

USE OF MILITARY FORCE AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE IN THE 2001 AUMF

Section 2(a) of the 2001 AUMF authorizes the use of force in response to the September 11 attacks:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international

terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

The 2001 AUMF does not include a specified congressional reporting requirement, but states that the authorization is not intended to supersede any requirement of the War Powers Resolution, which does require congressional reporting for initial and continuing deployments of U.S. armed forces into imminent or ongoing hostilities.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH POLICY CONCERNING UTILIZATION OF 2001 AUMF AUTHORIZATION

Prior to the U.S. military campaign against the Islamic State that began in summer 2014, executive branch officials made statements that included certain interpretations concerning the 2001 AUMF, including the following interpretations:

The 2001 AUMF is primarily an authorization to enter into and prosecute an armed conflict against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

The 2001 AUMF authorizes the President to use military force against Al Qaeda and the Taliban outside Afghanistan, but such uses of force must meet a higher standard of threat to the United States and must use limited, precise methods against specific individual targets rather than general military action against enemy forces.

Because the 2001 AUMF authorizes U.S. involvement in an international armed conflict, the international law of armed conflict informs the authority within the 2001 AUMF. This law permits the use of military force against forces associated with Al Qaeda and the Taliban as co-belligerents; such forces must be operating in some sort of coordination and cooperation with Al Qaeda and/or the Taliban, not just share similar goals, objectives, or ideologies.

According to the Obama Administration, this interpretation of the scope of 2001 AUMF authority fits within the overall framework of presidential power to use military force against those posing a threat to U.S. national security and U.S. interests. In situations where the 2001 AUMF or other relevant legislation does not seem to authorize a given use of military force or related activity, the executive branch will determine whether the President's Article II powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, as interpreted by the executive branch itself, might authorize such actions. In this way, similar U.S. military action to meet U.S. counterterrorism objectives might be interpreted to fall under different authorities, of which the 2001 AUMF is just one, albeit important, example.

RECORDS OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS AND PRESIDENTIAL REPORTING TO CONGRESS REFERRING THE 2001 AUMF

CRS has located 37 relevant occurrences of an official record, disclosed publicly, of presidential reference to the 2001 AUMF in connection with initiating or continuing military or related action (including non-lethal military activities such as detentions and military trials). Of the 37 occurrences, 18 were made during the Bush Administration, and 19 have been made during the Obama Administration. The notifications reference both statutory and constitutional authority for the President to take such action, as well as statutory provisions requiring congressional notification, including reference to provisions in the 2001 AUMF. As will be discussed in detail below, the manner in which Presidents have presented information on military deployments and actions in these notifications, the constitutional and statutory authority for such actions, and the reporting requirements for such actions, have changed over time.

NOTIFICATIONS OF DEPLOYING U.S. ARMED FORCES AND/OR USING MILITARY FORCE INVOLVING REFERENCE TO THE 2001 AUMF

Both President Bush and President Obama have provided formal notifications of military deployments and/or action to Congress at various times since enactment of the 2001 AUMF, referring to that authorization to various degrees and ends. While presidential reports to Congress concerning the use of military force and other activities undertaken by the U.S. armed forces initially provided a fairly simple and straightforward discussion of actions and related authorities, over time these reports became increasingly detailed, complicated, and difficult to decipher with regard to determining applicable presidential authority. At all times, both Presidents have relied primarily on their constitutional Article II powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. In many instances, reference to 2001 AUMF authority has been supplementary and indirect; in only a few cases has a President relied directly on 2001 AUMF authority as justification for a military operation, deployment, or other action. This is not to say that 2001 AUMF authority does not serve as a sole or primary legal basis for military action in any given situation reported in a notification, only that the notification language is susceptible to more than one interpretation when it concerns presidential authority to use to military force or undertake other military action.

Below are provided several tables of information concerning presidential notifications and records of other executive action referencing the 2001 AUMF. Each table provides:

- a date of each notification or record;
- the relevant military activity, location, and/or purpose of such activities, as available;

- the constitutional and statutory authority provided in the notification or record as provided; and

- the reference to applicable reporting requirements precipitating each respective notification or record.

For Tables 1-8, each set out in its own section with accompanying analysis, each table includes a group of notifications that are similar in composition and content. Each subsequent table and section, therefore, denotes a change in composition of the notifications referencing the 2001 AUMF in some way.

Initial Reporting in the Aftermath of the September 11, 2001 Attacks

President Bush's reports to Congress concerning military deployments in the weeks following the September 11, 2001 terror attacks were relatively concise, focusing on the need to address the terrorist threat in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, and the deployments and actions taken in response to such threat. The first notification on September 24, 2001 references deployments to "a number of foreign nations" in the "Central and Pacific Command areas of operations." Major military operations in Afghanistan had not yet commenced. The second notification on October 9, 2001 includes similar information but also notifies Congress of the commencement of combat against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. In these two notifications, President Bush stated that he had taken the actions described pursuant to his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. In both notifications, he referred to the 2001 AUMF as evidencing the continuing support of Congress, but did not specifically state he had taken such action pursuant to 2001 AUMF authority. The President stated in these notifications that he was reporting

on these actions to Congress consistent with both the War Powers Resolution and the 2001 AUMF. It is possible to conclude that reporting action consistent with the 2001 AUMF would mean that the action was considered taken pursuant to 2001 AUMF authority.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to encourage all my colleagues to read this report. It shows that this authorization has, in fact, become that blank check for war. In the more than 14 years since its passage, it has been used 37 times in 14 countries to wage war with little or no congressional oversight. It has been used 18 times by President Bush and 19 times by President Obama.

This report only looks at unclassified incidents. How many other times has it been used without the knowledge of Congress or the American people? Not only has this authorization been used to justify military action thousands of miles away, it has also been used much closer to home to allow warrantless surveillance and wiretaps, indefinite detention practices at GTMO, and targeted killing by drones, including of American citizens. It has also been cited as the authority for the nearly 2-year-long war against ISIL, a war that Congress has never debated, voted on, or specifically authorized.

Mr. Chairman, our brave servicemen and -women continue to be deployed around the world. Whether they are combat troops or not, they are in combat zones. They are risking their lives. Don't we at least owe them our representation in terms of our job to debate and vote on the cost and consequences of the war? I think we owe them that.

If we all agree that ISIL must be degraded and dismantled, then why is Congress missing in action? Every day more bombs fall. We have already lost three brave servicemen. We have already spent more than \$9.6 billion, and we spend an additional \$615,000 per hour.

I know that while we may not share a common position on what the shape of any new AUMF to address ISIL might look like, I know that many of us do agree that the overly broad and almost 15-year-old AUMF represents a major and very concerning deterioration of congressional oversight. That means a lack of involvement and input and voice of the American people.

Let's repeal this blank check and finally, 90 days later, debate and vote on an AUMF to address the ISIL threat.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment which would unilaterally end the fight against ISIS and al Qaeda.

Mr. Chair, ISIS grew out of al Qaeda in Iraq. The President has determined that the 2001 AUMF allows the United States to target ISIS. Both the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs agree that they have full legal authority to combat ISIS, and Congress has supported that view by appropriating funds.

Many Members want to enact a new AUMF to renew the authority to fight ISIS and support our troops, but this amendment fails to do so. We must understand that a new AUMF cannot give President Obama any more authority to fight ISIS than he currently claims. It could give him less. The President asked for less in his proposal. It is clear many want an AUMF that limits the authority of this President and the next President.

The administration still does not have the broad, overarching strategy needed to defeat these radical Islamist terrorists. Once the President provides that strategy, this House can have an informed debate over a new AUMF, but this amendment would leave us with no strategy and no authority. That is irresponsible.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, let me just make one comment before yielding to my colleague from Minnesota.

First, the President has sent over an AUMF. He sent this over 15 months ago. The Speaker yet has to take this Authorization for Use of Military Force up. The President has asked for it. Why don't we do our job? We could at least either bring the one that he sent over, or we need to put our own on the floor.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

I want to just say that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is absolutely wrong when he says there would be a unilateral ending to the struggle against Daesh, or ISIL. The only way that would happen is if we do not take up a new AUMF that would authorize us to take on that battle.

What we need to do is take on our constitutional responsibility. We cannot abdicate it with this out-of-date AUMF that is only tenuously connected to many of the conflicts we see arising today. We have a responsibility under the Constitution, Article I, section 8, to debate and vote, up or down, use of force. We should do that. We should do it now. There is nothing to prevent us from passing a new one or crafting our own or passing the President's unless we abdicate that responsibility.

This allows us to criticize anything the President does and yet, at the same time, never take responsibility for

passing our own AUMF adapted for the moment that we are in. That is not right.

I support the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I will just close by saying my amendment is enacted 90 days after the signing of this law. That means we have 90 days to debate and vote upon an ISIL-specific Authorization for Use of Military Force. We need to do our job. We have a constitutional responsibility to do our job. Unfortunately, Congress is missing in action. We need to do exactly what the American people sent us to do.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, no one can contest the gentlewoman from California's sincerity on this issue. On September 14, 2001, when this House passed the Authorization for the Use of Military Force that she is talking about, 3 days after 3,000 Americans had been murdered on 9/11, the vote in this House was 420-1, and the one person who voted against this AUMF was the gentlewoman from California who offered this amendment. So her sincerity cannot be questioned.

I also, by the way, happen to agree with her that we need to update this AUMF. As a matter of fact, this House passed, twice, provisions that I had authored to update the 2001 AUMF. We passed it in 2011; we passed it in 2012. Unfortunately, the administration says: No, we are opposed to that; the one we have got is just fine. And the Senate took that position, and so it did not get passed into law.

But to say, now, to unilaterally repeal the 2001 AUMF on which the administration is relying for all its counterterrorism activities not only against al Qaeda, but against ISIS and others, to repeal it now, I believe, would be a mistake. There are still real dangers in the world from terrorists. I don't think I need to remind Members of Paris, of Brussels, of San Bernardino, and just today, of Baghdad.

The other point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is I think we all underestimate the catastrophes that have been avoided—in other words, the terrorist plots, what they wanted to do, what they tried to do—that were thwarted. Sometimes they were thwarted just because we were lucky, but a lot of times they were thwarted because of the work of the men and women in the military, the men and women in the intelligence community, the men and women in law enforcement doing a lot of hard work, sacrificing, some of them losing their lives to make sure that we did not have a repeat of the 3,000 people murdered on 9/11.

We owe them, Mr. Chairman, more than just a thank-you. We owe them whatever preparation, whatever equipment, whatever support they need to continue to battle terrorists today.

That is what this bill tries to do: to make sure that we don't send people out in the Middle East to bomb terrorists on airplanes that cannot fly, that cannot be maintained, that we don't wear our pilots and our mechanics out. That is readiness. That is what we are talking about in this bill. That is what we have an obligation in this House to do for them who do so much for us.

I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. As I say, I have tremendous respect for her views and the sincerity with which she holds them. I think it results in a more dangerous world.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 1098. REDUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to subsection (b), the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, and the Administrator for Nuclear Security, shall make such reductions in the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act in such manner as the President considers appropriate to achieve an aggregate reduction of 1 percent of the total amount of funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act. Such reduction shall be in addition to any other reduction of funds required by law.

(b) EXCLUSIONS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall not reduce the amount of funds for the following accounts:

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, this is a very simple amendment. When we look at our country's national security, it is important to make sure that we don't mortgage our national security because fiscal security is an important part of protecting our country.

My amendment would give authority to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to reduce the overall amount of money authorized by this bill by 1 percent. It simply cuts defense spending by 1 percent.

As you know, we spend as much as the rest of the world, combined, on defense. We want to have a strong defense, but of course, as you know, this current authorization exceeds the levels of the Budget Control Act, even with this 1 percent reduction, which is really a compromise. It only reduces it by \$5.5 billion and, in fact, continues to authorize at a level of \$10 billion more than the bipartisan Budget Control Act.

In a bill in which we overfunded multiple accounts and weapons systems above the request level of the military, I think 1 percent is a very reasonable request. It is about \$5.5 billion. It is certainly possible to find these cuts. In fact, they are very likely to occur because, again, if we conform to the Budget Control Act, there would actually be a larger cut than even this humble one that we are offering before you today.

As an example, the bill authorizes \$9.5 billion in nuclear weapons activities alone. We could pass my amendment. Even if we allocated the entire cuts to nuclear weapons, we would still be spending \$4 billion on nuclear weapons. I think the estimate is we would then have enough to destroy the entire world and wipe out life as we know it three times instead of six times. How much is enough?

There are plenty of other programs that we could look at. Of course, it should not be Congress making those decisions in a political manner; it should be the military and the executive. I imagine they would start with accounts that Congress has chosen to overfund.

At some point, we have to stand up for fiscal security and realize that mortgaging our future and our children's future to Saudi Arabia and China does not enhance our national security; it detracts from it.

My amendment is a small first step toward taking a stand against a military budget that we simply cannot afford. We need to reduce our budget deficit. This is a very small and simple way to start. We can make these strategic cuts and, of course, still fully protect our national security and even enhance it.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment and take this modest step toward fiscal responsibility as a compromise between the Budget Control Act levels and the committee authorization levels.

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

□ 1630

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment cuts defense below the President's request, below last year's funding, and below what the last Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said was the lower, ragged edge of what it takes to defend this country.

Let's just put in a little bit of context here. This bill, counting OCO and everything, is a whopping one-half of 1 percent over what we spent last year. One-half of 1 percent. Inflation is supposed to be 2.1 percent. So what it really means is this bill, even in real dollars, is a cut, even as it is.

This bill is 23 percent less than we were spending on defense in real terms in 2010. Mr. Chairman, the world is not 23 percent safer now than it was 6 years ago. And yet the gentleman from Colorado's amendment would cut that even further.

This bill stays within the amount requested by the President. It meets the need for base requirements and provides a bridge fund for deployments, just like Democratic majorities did for the last change of administration. And I think that is the most reasonable response.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. LEE), a cosponsor of this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank Congressman POLIS for yielding time and for his work to ensure that our Nation's fiscal security is secure through this amendment. It is an honor to cosponsor this amendment with him. I want to thank the ranking member also for guiding us through this very difficult bill to make sure that we all know what is included in the bill.

I just have to say, our amendment, I think, would take a modest step in making this bill a lot better to help us rein in the over-the-top, quite frankly, Pentagon spending, while protecting the pay or health benefit accounts of our brave servicemen and -women and their families.

Over the last 15 years, Pentagon spending has ballooned by 50 percent in real terms. Pentagon spending now consumes more than half of the Federal discretionary budget. That is just outrageous.

Recently, The New York Times made this case in their editorial called "A Better, Not Fatter, Defense Budget," which I include for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, May 9, 2016]

A BETTER, NOT FATTER, DEFENSE BUDGET
(By the Editorial Board)

To hear some military commanders and members of Congress talk, the American military is worn out and in desperate need of more money. After more than a decade in Iraq and Afghanistan, they say, troops are lagging in training and new weaponry, which is jeopardizing their ability to defeat the Islamic State and deal with potential conflicts with Russia and China.

While increased funding for some programs may be needed, total military spending, at nearly \$600 billion annually, is not too low. The trouble is, the investment has often yielded poor results, with the Pentagon, Congress and the White House all making bad judgments, playing budget games and falling under the sway of defense industry lobbyists. Current military spending is 50 percent higher in real terms than it was before 9/11, yet the number of active duty and reserve troops is 6 percent smaller.

For nearly a decade after 9/11, the Pentagon had a virtual blank check; the base defense budget rose, in adjusted dollars, from \$378 billion in 1998 to \$600 billion in 2010. As the military fought Al Qaeda and the Taliban, billions of dollars were squandered on unnecessary items, including new weapons that ran late and over budget like the troubled F-35 jet fighter.

The waste and the budget games continue with the House Armed Services Committee approving a \$583 billion total defense authorization bill for 2017 last month that skirts the across-the-board caps imposed by Congress in 2011 on discretionary federal spending.

The caps are supposed to restrain domestic and military spending equally, but defense hawks have insisted on throwing more money at the Pentagon. That doesn't encourage efficiency or wise choices. The panel took \$18 billion from a \$59 billion off-budget account, which has become a slush fund renewed annually to finance the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and other trouble spots, and is not subject to the budget caps, and repurposed that money for use in the \$524 billion base military budget.

The move will underwrite the purchase of more ships, jet fighters, helicopters and other big-ticket weapons that the Pentagon didn't request and will keep the Army from falling below 480,000 active-duty troops. It also means the war account will run out of money next April. Representative Mac Thornberry, the Republican chairman of the committee, apparently assumes the next president will be forced to ask for, and Congress will be forced to approve, more money for the war account. This sleight of hand runs the risk that troops overseas, at some point, could be deprived of some resources, at least temporarily. The full House should reject this maneuver.

Many defense experts, liberals and centrists as well as hawks, agree that more investment is needed in maintenance, training and modernizing aging weapons and equipment. These needs were identified years ago, yet the Pentagon and Congress have chosen to invest in excessively costly high-tech weaponry while deferring maintenance and other operational expenses.

The Pentagon can do with far fewer than the 1,700 F-35s it plans on buying. It should pare back on President Obama's \$1 trillion plan to replace nearly every missile, submarine, aircraft and warhead in the nuclear arsenal. Defense officials recently reported that 22 percent of all military bases will not be needed by 2019. Civilian positions will have to be reduced, while reforms in health care and the military procurement system need to be carried out. All of these changes make good sense, given the savings they would bring. But they are politically unpalatable; base closings, for instance, have been stubbornly resisted in recent years by lawmakers fearful of angering voters by eliminating jobs in communities that are economically dependent on those bases.

Todd Harrison, a defense budget expert with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, says that sustaining the current military force of roughly two million and paying for all the new weapons systems

will cost billions more than Congress has allowed under the budget caps. To maintain sensible troop levels, Congress and the administration need to begin honestly addressing the hard fiscal choices that they have largely been loath to make.

Ms. LEE. The article lists program after program, many of which our generals did not ask for, that have cost taxpayers billions without making us any safer.

Clearly, we also need to audit the Pentagon. That is why I am pleased the House adopted the Burgess-Lee amendment yesterday to require a report on auditability and help keep moving toward auditing the Pentagon. While we were working on that, we should take every opportunity to address Pentagon spending.

The article in The New York Times sets forth: "The waste and the budget games continue with the House Armed Services Committee approving a \$583 billion total defense authorization."

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate the importance of making sure that we are funding defense at the President's request. The FY 2017 request, I think, is minimally adequate, but it is not just me. The administration's own Secretary of the Army Murphy stated that this budget request is minimally adequate and that we are taking a high risk as an Army and as a Nation when the Army is funded at this level. So there is still risk there with this level of funding.

As the chairman pointed out, we live in a more dangerous world today, but we see our Marine Corps and Air Force having to go to aircraft that are museum exhibits to cannibalize parts to bring them in to have a minimally operational cadre of aircraft.

We see this, too, when we talk about only 9 of the 20 B-1 bombers are available today because they are lacking parts and when we have 30 percent or less of our Marine Corps helicopters available because they are lacking parts. We see that, in a squadron of 14 jets, only 3 in the Marine Corps are available because they are lacking parts.

It is irresponsible not to provide to the brave men and women that serve this Nation the things that they need. We are asking them to go into harm's way. We are asking them to do tremendously difficult jobs. We are asking them to maintain safety. Yet we are not providing them the resources necessary.

This amendment would do even more to take away what is already a challenging situation for those brave men and women that are doing a tremendous job and that, as their leaders have said, are being stressed to the breaking point because they do not have the basic resources to keep those aircraft flying, to keep those ships on the

water, to keep those systems necessary to be able to perform the job that we have asked them to do.

We have an obligation as a Nation that, when we ask those brave men and women to go into harm's way, to support them. It is unconscionable when we don't do that, when we have situations like 84 percent of our Marine Corps aircraft are in a nonready status, based on a 10-year average.

So when we talk about taking dollars away, what signal does that send to the brave men and women serving in the military? I think this amendment cuts to the heart of what we must do as a Nation, and that is to rebuild readiness, not degrade readiness.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of programs which Congress has forced spending on the military that even the military has not requested.

As an example, we blocked the Navy from making a sound fiscal decision saving \$900 million to shutter a carrier air wing. There are a dozen more Black Hawk and Apache helicopters than requested by the military to meet our national defense needs. There are two extra V-22 Ospreys that were not requested, 500 extra Javelin missiles above the request, 500 more extra Hydra guided rockets, and 75 extra Sidewinder missiles.

These are just some of the examples of some the low-hanging fruit that we can use to restore military funding to a more fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado raising the issue that he just raised because it gives me the opportunity to affirm that many of the programs he was just mentioning like the Black Hawks, for example, have been requested by many of the Members on his side of the aisle. And they were included in the unfunded requirements list from the Army.

So the way it works is we get all sorts of requests from Members on both sides of the aisle. Each of the services gives us a list of what they would like to have had in the budget request but the administration took out, and then where the two match up as Member priorities and service priorities, that is what these funds are.

It is not that they weren't asked for from the military. It is the military wanted them but OMB took them out. And when you have many Members, particularly on the Black Hawks, the V-22s, the LCS, and a number of the items he just mentioned on his side of the aisle, asking for them as well as the service, then that becomes part of the modernization priority.

Let me just make one other point. In the Black Hawk case specifically, these new Black Hawks will replace helicopters that were built in 1979, for which we cannot get parts, which have

very restricted flight envelopes because of all the restrictions. They can't be repaired. They can't do everything the Army wants them to do.

So the administration did not ask for any. Many Members on the Democratic side asked for some. We put them in here. And that is the way to fix readiness: by replacing a 1979 helicopter with a 2016 helicopter.

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 8, 14, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, and 45 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON MILITARY CONTACT AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense may be used for any bilateral military-to-military contact or cooperation between the Governments of the United States and Cuba until the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, certify to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the Government of Cuba has—

(A) met the requirements and satisfied the factors specified in sections 205 and 206 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6065 and 6066); and

(B) resolved, to the full satisfaction of United States law, all outstanding claims and judgments belonging to United States nationals against the Government of Cuba, including but not limited to claims regarding property confiscated by the Government of Cuba;

(2) the Cuban military and other security forces in Cuba have ceased committing human right abuses, including arbitrary arrests, beatings, and other acts of repudiation, against those who express opposition to the Castro regime, civil rights activists and other citizens of Cuba, as well as all persecution, intimidation, arrest, imprisonment, and assassination of dissidents and members of faith-based organizations;

(3) the Cuban military has ceased providing military intelligence, weapons training, strategic planning, and security logistics to

the military and security forces of Venezuela;

(4) the Government of Cuba no longer demands that the United States relinquish control of Guantanamo Bay, in violation of an international treaty;

(5) the Government of Cuba returns to the United States fugitives wanted by the Department of Justice for crimes committed in the United States; and

(6) the officials of the Cuban military that were indicted in the murder of United States citizens during the shoot down of planes operated by the Brothers to the Rescue humanitarian organization in 1996 are brought to justice.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation on the use of funds under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to—

(1) payments in furtherance of the lease agreement, or other financial transactions necessary for maintenance and improvements of the military base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, including any adjacent areas under the control or possession of the United States;

(2) assistance or support in furtherance of democracy-building efforts for Cuba described in section 109 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6039); or

(3) customary and routine financial transactions necessary for the maintenance, improvements, or regular duties of the United States mission in Havana, including outreach to the pro-democracy opposition.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) BILATERAL MILITARY-TO-MILITARY CONTACT OR COOPERATION.—The term “bilateral military-to-military contact or cooperation” —

(A) means—

(i) reciprocal visits and meetings by high-ranking delegations;

(ii) information sharing, policy consultations, security dialogues or other forms of consultative discussions;

(iii) exchange of military instructors, training personnel, and students;

(iv) defense planning; and

(v) military training or exercises; but

(B) does not include any contact or cooperation that is in support of the United States stability operations.

(3) CUBAN MILITARY.—The term “Cuban military” means—

(A) the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba, the Ministry of the Interior of Cuba, or any subdivision of either such Ministry;

(B) any agency, instrumentality, or other entity that is owned, operated, or controlled by an entity specified in subparagraph (A); or

(C) an individual who is a senior member of the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba or the Ministry of the Interior of Cuba.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to funds described in subsection (a) that are unobligated as of such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS OF FLORIDA

Page 139, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 547. CAREER MILITARY JUSTICE LITIGATION TRACK FOR JUDGE ADVOCATES.

(a) CAREER LITIGATION TRACK REQUIRED.—
 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of each military department shall establish a career military justice litigation track for judge advocates in the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall establish the litigation track required by this section in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the Army and the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, respectively. The Secretary of the Navy shall establish the litigation track in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each career litigation track under this section shall provide for the following:

(1) Assignment and advancement of qualified judge advocates in and through assignments and billets relating to the practice of military justice under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(2) Establishing for each Armed Force the assignments and billets covered by paragraph (1), which shall include trial counsel, defense counsel, military trial judge, military appellate judge, academic instructor, all positions within criminal law offices or divisions of such Armed Force, Special Victims Prosecutor, Victims' Legal Counsel, Special Victims' Counsel, and such other positions as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify.

(3) For judge advocates participating in such litigation track, mechanisms as follows:

(A) To prohibit a judge advocate from more than a total of four years of duty or assignments outside such litigation track

(B) To prohibit any adverse assessment of a judge advocate so participating by reason of such participation in the promotion of officers through grade O-6 (or such higher grade as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify for purposes of such litigation track).

(4) Such additional requirements and qualifications for the litigation track as the Secretary of the military department concerned considers appropriate, including requirements and qualifications that take into account the unique personnel needs and requirement of an Armed Force.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION DEADLINE.—Each Secretary of a military department shall implement the career litigation track required by this section for the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of such Secretary by not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Secretary of a military department shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the progress of such Secretary in implementing the career litigation track required under this section for the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of such Secretary.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF U-2 AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Air Force may be obligated or

expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any U-2 aircraft.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1. BRIEFING ON ACQUISITION STRATEGY FOR GROUND MOBILITY VEHICLE.

(a) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, shall present to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the acquisition strategy for the Ground Mobility Vehicle for use with the Global Response Force.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing under subsection (a) shall include an assessment of—

(1) whether the Ground Mobility Vehicle is a suitable candidate for solutions that would utilize militarized commercial off-the-shelf platforms leveraging existing global automotive supply chains to satisfy requirements and reduce the life-cycle cost of the program;

(2) whether the acquisition strategy meets the focus areas specified in the Better Buying Power initiative of the Secretary of Defense; and

(3) whether including an active safety system like electronic stability control in the Ground Mobility Vehicle, as such system is used on the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle is expected to reduce the risk of vehicle rollover.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1. STANDARDIZATION OF 5.56MM RIFLE AMMUNITION.

(a) REPORT.—If, on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Army and the Marine Corps are each using different variants of 5.56mm rifle ammunition, the Secretary of Defense shall, on such date, submit to the congressional defense committees a report explaining the reasons that the Army and the Marine Corps are using different variants of such ammunition.

(b) STANDARDIZATION REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Army and the Marine Corps are using the same variant of 5.56mm rifle ammunition.

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply in a case in which the Secretary of Defense—

(1) determines that a state of emergency requires the Army and the Marine Corps to use different variants of 5.56mm rifle ammunition; and

(2) certifies to the congressional defense committees that such a determination has been made.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. SYSTEM FOR COMMUNICATING AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS AMMUNITION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall implement a formal process to provide Government agencies outside the Department of Defense with information on the availability of surplus, serviceable ammunition for the purpose of reducing the overall storage and disposal costs related to such ammunition.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES OF VIRGINIA

Page 107, line 20, strike “322,900” and insert “324,615”.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. 6. ACCEPTANCE OF MILITARY STAR CARD AT COMMISSARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that—

(1) commissary stores accept as payment the Military Star Card; and

(2) any financial liability of the United States relating to such acceptance as payment be assumed by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service.

(b) MILITARY STAR CARD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Military Star Card” means a credit card administered under the Exchange Credit Program by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN OF GEORGIA

Page 141, line 17, after “senior military college” insert the following: “and each of the Reserve Officer Training Corps institutions selected for partnership by the cyber institutes at the individual service academies”.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 568. INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 1144(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) Provide information regarding the deduction of disability compensation paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 1175a(h) of this title by reason of voluntary separation pay received by the member.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DESIRABILITY OF SERVICE-WIDE ADOPTION OF GOLD STAR INSTALLATION ACCESS CARD.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of each military department and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating should—

(1) provide for the issuance of a Gold Star Installation Access Card to Gold Star family members who are the survivors of deceased members of the Armed Forces in order to expedite the ability of a Gold Star family member to gain unescorted access to military installations for the purpose of obtaining the on-base services and benefits for which the Gold Star family member is entitled or eligible;

(2) work jointly to ensure that a Gold Star Installation Access Card issued to a Gold Star family member by one Armed Force is accepted for access to military installations of another Armed Force; and

(3) in developing, issuing, and accepting the Gold Star Installation Access Card—

(A) prevent fraud in the procurement or use of the Gold Star Installation Access Card;

(B) limit installation access to those areas that provide the services and benefits for which the Gold Star family member is entitled or eligible; and

(C) ensure that the availability and use of the Gold Star Installation Access Card does

not adversely affect military installation security.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF OHIO

Page 186, after line 25, insert the following new subsection:

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the dependency and indemnity compensation offset under sections 1450(c) of title 10, United States Code. The report shall include the following:

(1) The total number of individuals affected by such offset.

(2) Of the number of individuals covered under paragraph (1), the number who are covered by section 1448(d) of title 10, United States Code, listed by the rank of the deceased member and the current age of the individual.

(3) Of the number of individuals under paragraph (1), the number who are not covered by section 1448(d) of title 10, United States Code, listed by the rank of the deceased member and the current age of the individual.

(4) The average amount of money that is affected by such offset, including the average amounts with respect to—

(A) individuals described in paragraph (2); and

(B) individuals described in paragraph (3).

(5) The number of recipients for the special survivor indemnity allowance under section 1450(m) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 264, line 7, insert “and units” after “members”.

Page 265, after line 8, insert the following:

(3) HIGH RISK VETERANS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall use the results under subsection (c) to provide outreach regarding the available preventative and treatment resources for mental health for enrolled veterans who were deployed with the units identified under this subsection.

Page 265, line 16, insert “and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs” after “Defense”.

Page 265, line 17, insert “and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs” after “Services”.

Page 265, line 18, insert “and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs” after “Services”.

Page 266, strike lines 3 through 6 and insert the following:

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MILITARY SERVICES.—The term “military services” means the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps, including the reserve components thereof.

(2) ENROLLED VETERAN.—The term “enrolled veteran” means a veteran enrolled in the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of title VII (page 273, after line 12), insert the following new section:

SEC. 749. INCREASED COLLABORATION WITH NIH TO COMBAT TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER.

The Office of Health of the Department of Defense shall work in collaboration with the National Institutes of Health to—

(1) identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for triple negative breast cancer; and

(2) provide information useful in biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trials design that will enable both—

(A) triple negative breast cancer patients to be identified earlier in the progression of their disease; and

(B) the development of multiple targeted therapies for the disease.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I am very grateful to Chairman THORNBERRY for allowing me to present this amendment.

Today, I rise in support of my amendment to the NDAA in support of the U-2, known as the Dragon Lady, one of the most successful spy planes ever built. Its unique capabilities have served our Nation’s high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance mission for decades.

What many don’t know is that the U-2 is not a cold war relic. It is still current. The most recent ones were made in the 1980s. U-2s are currently flying more hours today than at any point since the end of the cold war and have been deployed in our ongoing efforts to defeat ISIS.

Flying at an altitude of 70,000 feet, the U-2 is able to reach heights other spy planes cannot. Because the U-2 can reach such extraordinary heights, it is able to use high-tech sensors to increase its ability to collect intelligence.

Other unique features of the U-2 include cloud-piercing radar and interchangeable nose cones. The U-2 can also take incredible high-resolution photographs on a 10,500-foot reel wet film.

My amendment to the NDAA will prevent the Air Force from retiring the U-2. It is absolutely essential to our ability to meet our high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance needs.

In addition to aiding in the fight against ISIS, General Philip Breedlove, NATO’s supreme allied commander and the head of U.S. forces in Europe, called for the use of U-2s in countering the strategic threat posed by Vladimir Putin.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMALFA. General Breedlove said:

“EUCOM needs additional intelligence collection platforms, such as the U-2 or the RC-135, to assist the increased collection requirements in the theatre.”

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I listened to the frustration of the chair-

man describing the process, and I sympathize with that. I have sat and admitted that this committee has one of the most difficult tasks, because as long as we are sort of unhinged here from the reality and the accountability of how they all work out, we will have people make requests for this or the administration will leave something out there, and it is difficult for the committee to try to make sense of reality out of these conflicting requests.

Out of this, I think there is an elephant in the room of an unrealistic, unsustainable, and unnecessary trillion-dollar path we are on for the nuclear triad of bombers, land-based missiles, and the submarines.

These are weapons that we have never used in 71 years. These are weapons that do not help us with the major challenges that vex this committee right now in terms of military readiness, the challenges dealing with ISIS, dealing with encroachment by the Chinese, problems with Russia.

These are weapons that didn’t stop Russian aggression in the Crimea or Ukraine or Chinese encroachment. These are weapons that don’t deter the greatest nuclear threat we face, which is nuclear materials falling into the hands of extremist elements from rogue nations like North Korea or some of our purported friends in Pakistan.

These are the threats that we face. And this muscle-bound nuclear triad that we are going to spend a trillion dollars on does not help us.

There is enough blame, I think, to go around. The administration made an agreement to upgrade and modernize all these nuclear weapons in their effort to get the nonproliferation treaty advanced. I think it was a foolish bargain, an expensive bargain. They are not going to be around to have to deliver on the trillion dollars. They are nibbling around the edges and moving these things forward and leaving the big decisions for the future.

They have actually made it worse by not fighting aggressively for nonproliferation resources to help us keep these materials out of the hands of the extremists and retire nuclear weapons that are floating around the world now.

We have more nuclear weapons than we need, more nuclear weapons than we can use, more nuclear weapons than we can afford. We can debate whether we have enough to destroy the world 3 times, 5 times, or 10 times. What is ironic is that we never have that debate on the floor of the House on how the tradeoffs occur, what the threats to conventional military capacity are, and how they fit into an overall scheme of affairs.

□ 1645

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I suggest this is the least-effective part of our overall

defense inventory. I would hope that, in the future, when maybe we have a new administration willing to turn a page, when we have a Congress that is willing to entertain a broad and robust debate about this critical issue, that we can deal with an effort to rein in this trillion-dollar spending folly that is going to have disastrous effects for our military readiness in the years ahead.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the reason these weapons have not been used since 1945 is that we have had a credible nuclear deterrent. The fastest way to have a more dangerous, destabilized world is for the credibility of that deterrent to erode, and I worry about that.

Secondly, if you look at what is planned with upgrading the weapons and the delivery systems, at no point does it become more than 11 percent of the U.S. defense budget. That is a pretty good investment to make sure that they are not used, and I suggest that it is well worth the investment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today, in cooperation with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) requires a report simply from the Secretary of Defense, detailing the quantity, composition, and lost income of survivors currently affected by the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation offset to the Survivor Benefit Program.

It continues this body's crucial, bipartisan effort to find a feasible solution for the disgraceful way we short-change and penalize our military widows and widowers.

This mandatory offset hurts those who have already given more to freedom than most of us ever will, the life of a spouse.

It hurts women like the Army Sergeant First Class who recently contacted me. She is an Afghan veteran herself, mother of three. Tragically, she also is a Gold Star Wife due to the death of her husband in Iraq in 2004. As a young widow of a servicemember who died as a result of his service, she is not eligible to receive the full amount of her benefits, making the burden of living without her spouse that much more difficult at a time of enormous adjustment for their family. What's more, if she were a Federal civil service survivor, she could receive both benefits.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. If she were a civil service survivor, she could receive both benefits; and if she were over the age of

37, she could receive both benefits. Her husband gave his life for liberty. She is a veteran, too. We must honor their sacrifice as we honor the sacrifice of any other American who dies in service to our Nation, and find a way to fix this awkward offset.

This report will help us better define the situation so we can find just solutions. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), a member of the committee.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my colleague from Florida's amendment to create a Judge Advocate General career litigation track in the Army and the U.S. Air Force.

The legislation provides the Army and Air Force JAG officers with trial and prosecutorial experience that is absolutely critical.

Currently, Army and Air Force JAGs lack experience, as multiple reports have said. As a matter of fact, a shocking 89 percent of military prosecutors only have 10 or fewer contested cases. This inexperience is a disservice to those who seek justice under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Anyone who has suffered a transgression and sexual assault or other crime while serving in the military, quite frankly, deserves the best.

The Navy has implemented this litigation path and is already reaping great results. It is time for the Air Force and the Army to follow suit.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to make clear that my opposition to the bill at this point is not just based on the exclusion of the amendment that would have lifted the discrimination against the LGBT community. That was sort of the last straw.

I was on the fence about this bill from the very beginning because, understand that this bill continues the pattern of the last few years, of putting our defense on a fiscal path to nowhere, a fiscal path towards a cliff of not having the money to fund what needs to be funded because the Budget Control Act remains in place.

Now, the chairman repeatedly says that in 2008, we did this when a new administration was coming in. We only funded half of the overseas contingency operation fund, knowing the supplemental was coming.

There was no Budget Control Act in 2008. The Budget Control Act is in place. Even if we get a supplemental in April—and in this Congress, getting additional money is no guarantee—the Budget Control Act remains in place, and this Congress has shown a complete unwillingness to get rid of it.

So what we are doing by funding all of these programs that some of my colleagues have started, we are funding a defense that we cannot sustain.

I think the best example of this is the military wanted to cut the size of the Marine Corps and the Army. Now, the levels that they wanted to cut them to were levels that no one in the defense community wanted to cut them to, but that was the amount of money that they have available under the Budget Control Act.

As soon as we repeal the Budget Control Act, we will have a lot easier conversation about how to fund defense; but what we are doing to national security right now is we are creating a bow wave that they will not be able to absorb.

When the Budget Control Act kicks in again next year, all of a sudden the Army and the Marine Corps will have to, like that, cut—my numbers may be off a little bit here—30,000 in the Army, 10,000 in the Marine Corps. You can't really do that in any sort of reasonable way. It will be incredibly disruptive to the military, incredibly disruptive to readiness.

Now, I will agree with the chairman that a passionate case can be made for spending more on defense. Heck, if we spent a trillion dollars on defense, a passionate case could be made for spending even more than that when you look at the threat environment. But we have the money we have.

He also cited that, in 2010 numbers, we are now 23 percent below where we are at, and that is true. But we are 23 percent below where we are at because of the 2011 Budget Control Act which, again, this House refuses to repeal.

So instead of dealing with the amount of money that Congress has forced the Department of Defense to deal with, we fantasize that more money will appear, and in that fantasy, we put the military in an impossible situation.

We start all of these programs. There is not the money to finish those programs. And maybe someone can tell me where this money is going to come from, how it is going to magically appear, when we are \$19 trillion in debt—I forget off the top of my head what the deficit is this year, but it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 or \$600 billion—deficits for as far as the eye can see; the Freedom Caucus on the Republican side refusing to spend any more money.

This money is not going to appear. And so what we are going to have is we are going to have a military that has to cut drastically and irresponsibly in the blink of an eye because we refused to let them do it responsibly.

I would urge Members to read Secretary Carter's testimony before the Senate earlier this week or last week where he outlined what a devastating impact this defense bill will have on our national security when the bills that it is charging actually come due.

Now, that is the primary reason to oppose this bill; contemplating swallowing that and hoping that, like last year, we could fix that in conference.

But in addition to that, to have discriminatory provisions in it brings me

back to 2009, when the Republicans opposed the defense bill because it had an antihate crime piece of legislation attached to it.

There are reasons to oppose the defense bill other than you just don't really like people who serve in the military, and that is a condescending and irresponsible argument to make against those who would oppose the bill.

If we continue down this funding path, we are not serving the military. All of these readiness disasters that we keep hearing about have, in part, happened because of the way this committee and the Appropriations Committee has funded defense for the last 3 or 4 years, by taking from readiness to fund a wide variety of programs, including the beginning of the \$1 trillion Mr. BLUMENAUER talked about for our nuclear deterrent.

We are not making choices. We refuse to get rid of the A-10. We refuse to lay off 11 cruisers. We refuse to allow the military to shrink its size and, instead, we keep putting it on a credit card and hoping that the money will appear.

Well, when that money doesn't appear—and it is not going to. I haven't seen money just sort of burst out of nowhere in my lifetime. Maybe we will be lucky and maybe it will be the first time—but it puts the Department of Defense in a tenuous position.

We need to start making choices based on the money that we actually have. This bill doesn't do that.

Six months from now, our troops serving in Afghanistan and Iraq will have no money, and we hope that problem fixes itself. That is a national security reason for opposing this bill.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I think I made clear a few moments ago that I believe we need to have a better way to fund defense, a more predictable way. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not willing to wait to support the military until that is done. I am not willing to wait until we have tax reform and entitlement reform and all sorts of other things before I am willing to stand up and support the military. There are lives at stake today, and we have enormous challenges in the future, there is no question, budgetary and otherwise.

But I think it would be a mistake if I were to say we have all these challenges coming down the road, therefore, I am not going to fix this problem that is affecting pilots, mechanics, others today. We can do something about it today.

As a matter of fact, the gentleman talks about the Budget Control Act. We have made some alterations to the Budget Control Act for each of the last 4 years because of this problem.

I think most people, at least on both sides of the aisle, realize that when you cut defense 23 percent since 2010, and the world is not 23 percent safer, we are not asking our military folks for 23 percent fewer deployments, that something has got to give.

So there has been—it has been painful, it has been messy, it has not been ideal, but there has been some alterations to the Budget Control Act.

I said a while ago that I am for doing away with these artificial caps. The Budget Control Act did not work as anyone, I think, intended. There was never the mandatory spending reform that was the goal.

And what bore the brunt of the cuts? Defense.

Fifteen percent of the budget has absorbed 50 percent of the cuts under the Budget Control Act. That is wrong.

Now, I think if Members on both sides of the aisle committed to working together to fix that, we could. Now, that would involve not having a President use the military as a hostage to try to force more domestic spending, which is what this President has done. That would mean that we focus on trying to fix defense, and understand that all of us have other priorities that we need to also work on at the same time.

But we are always going to have different budget laws and different circumstances. I still do not understand how a Democratic majority, in 2008, could use this approach, to give the new President the benefit of the doubt, the benefit of a fresh look; and when we try to do the same for the next President, who none of us know who it is going to be, but when we try to use the same approach, all of a sudden then you just can't do it. It is irresponsible, it is a gimmick, and all sorts of names.

The gentleman mentioned that we are not making choices and mentioned specifically the A-10.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot more things that I would like to have done in this bill, lots of additional programs I would like to have authorized. We had to make difficult choices.

But just to take the A-10 for an example, the administration has proposed eliminating the A-10 for the past several years. This Congress reached a different judgment on that. That is what the Constitution, by the way, says we are supposed to do. It is our job to raise and support, build and maintain the Armed Forces of the United States.

On the A-10 program, we reached a different conclusion. We decided that, until you have something to take its place, we shouldn't get rid of it.

And you know what?

The Secretary of Defense has testified that it has been devastating in its use against ISIS today. If we had eliminated it, it wouldn't be there.

So sometimes our judgment—and we have a long list of instances where Congress, under majorities of both parties, have exercised a different judgment from the administration and where we were proved right. So we make tough

choices. Sometimes our choices actually turn out to look pretty good in hindsight.

But the bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is we could all wait to support a defense bill until some far-off condition were met. It is easy to vote "no" unless something happens or unless some condition is met; but for this, if only that. That is easy.

But that does not fix the immediate problems that face the men and women who volunteer to defend our country, the problems that they are facing today. That is what we are trying to do with this bill. We don't actually fix them. We just start to turn it around.

I don't think there is an excuse that justifies opposing doing what is right for them, and that is the reason I believe that this bill should be supported. I hope Members will support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 1215(b)—

(1) strike paragraphs (2), (3), and (4);

(2) in paragraph (6), insert "and" after "2018";

(3) in paragraph (7), strike "and" and insert a period; and

(4) strike paragraph (8).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes language telling the President to expand our mission in Afghanistan, language that tells the President to put more of our troops in harm's way, to go backwards towards a combat mission in Afghanistan.

Now, Republicans may not say it, but the effect is exactly what they are pushing for—moving the United States military and the United States back toward a combat mission in Afghanistan, not forward away from one. Worse yet, they are pushing for an expanded mission before the new commander on the ground, General John Nicholson, finishes his review. That is right. Congress is giving instructions to the President before the current commander has weighed in. This is a mistake.

So the opening line of the sense of Congress tells the President to leave 9,800 troops in Afghanistan next year. The current plan calls for 5,500. This sets the tone for what is next. Unfortunately, the amendment that strikes this language was not ruled in order.

My amendment starts by striking the next provision. The Republicans want our military to unilaterally strike the Taliban. Now, of course, these people are absolutely bad news, but the State Department does not recognize them as a terrorist organization at this time. This is a decision that should be based on military considerations.

Thus, our counterterrorism mission is allowed to strike and go after Daesh and al Qaeda, but the mission regarding the Taliban is defensive in nature; and if that is going to be changed, it should be based on military considerations, not just through a piece of legislation.

In fact, the Afghans are leading all missions against the Taliban, and this has been happening well before we transitioned to a noncombat mission. So let's not call for going back to combat mission tactics, especially when the commander has not asked for it.

Finally, I would like to talk about a particular provision that is close to me. I would like to address what I regard as actually a troubling piece in the provision, which says, and I will quote from the proposed legislation:

The United States military personnel who are tasked with the mission of providing combat search and rescue support, casualty evacuation, and medical support should not be counted as part of any force management level limitation on the number of United States ground forces in Afghanistan.

This is a mistake. I believe that our medical personnel and others should be considered boots on the ground, contrary to the language in the provision. Combat medics carry weapons, they take casualties, and they are killed. Why shouldn't we count them? It doesn't seem to make sense to me. One of the closest people in the whole wide world to me is an Active Duty military combat medic, and if they are in a war zone, I want them counted.

So with that, I ask for my amendment to be approved and included, and I ask that we listen to military people on the ground before we start trying to tell them what to do, and that we absolutely count combat medics and people who do rescue.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to make some sense of this.

We just had an amendment where we were debating providing the Authoriza-

tion of Use of Military Force to the President, and we wanted to make certain that the President had the authority, and this is the portion of our bill where we actually provide authority. The word "authority" is throughout these sections that are, by this amendment, being asked to be deleted. But as Mr. ELLISON stated, we should look to the commanders on the ground. So let's look at what they have said.

General Campbell, testifying about the Haqqani network, said that it remains the most capable threat to U.S. and coalition forces.

Now, what does threat mean? It means that they are trying to kill us and our coalition forces. It is a State Department-designated terrorist organization which harbors al Qaeda and is the most lethal actor on the battlefield. These provisions that will be deleted relate to our ability to fight them.

Approximately 30 percent of district centers are under Taliban control and influence or are at such risk, says General Campbell.

Now, General Nicholson, who is currently the commander, is doing his review. That is correct. But what we are doing in these provisions is providing the status quo. We are not presuming that he is going to come back and say: Let's cut; we can go do this with less troops. We are allowing that he would have the same resources that General Campbell had so that he would have an ability to defend our troops.

Basically, if you go down to these paragraphs that are being deleted, this comes down to some fairly easy decisions:

If you believe that ISIL is not a threat to our troops, vote for this amendment.

If you believe that ISIL is not a threat to our allies in the Middle East, vote for this amendment.

If you believe that the killings that were directed and inspired by ISIL in Brussels and Paris are not a threat to our Nation or our NATO allies, vote for this amendment.

If you believe that it is okay for the Taliban to control portions of Afghan territory, even though al Qaeda planned and directed 9/11 under Taliban-controlled Afghanistan, vote for this amendment.

If you believe that the U.S. and NATO troops should be responsible for Afghan security, and not Afghan security forces, vote for this amendment.

If you believe, however, that we have a responsibility for our national security and to our troops, vote against this amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank Congressman ELLISON for yield-

ing and for his tremendous leadership. This amendment is extremely important.

Today I rise to urge my colleagues to support this amendment and, really, allow our ground commanders to do their job. Now, of course, time and time again, Congress has refused to do its job. From Zika funding to confirming a new Supreme Court Justice, we failed to do our job.

Instead of letting Congress do its job, the majority only seems interested in Congress doing other peoples' jobs, and that is including our military commanders. There is no way we should be allowing this to happen.

Make no mistake, Republicans are trying to expand the U.S. mission in Afghanistan and further expand America's longest war. For nearly 15 years, we have been fighting a war in Afghanistan. Our brave servicemen and -women have gone way beyond the call of duty. They have done everything we have asked them to do. It is past time to bring them home to their families and to their children. But minimally, we should not be telling our military leaders what to do in a war zone, especially before they have completed their on-the-ground assessment.

So I hope that we vote "yes" on this commonsense amendment. While our young men and women are in Afghanistan, until we bring them home, let's use the best type of intelligence, the best information, and the best direction that the ground commanders have determined based on their ground assessment in this war.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, just to be clear, the underlying provisions which the gentleman's amendment would strike are sense of Congress provisions. Basically, it is the sense of Congress that the ground commanders ought to make these decisions.

Unfortunately, artificial troop caps and overly restrictive requirements on our military increase the danger that our military faces in Afghanistan. So if you draw down too low the number of people you have, for example, then you don't have enough to protect yourself. That is part of what we are seeing in Afghanistan.

If you tie the military's hands and say, "Okay. You cannot go after this enemy, even though they may pose the most deadly threat to you," then you increase the danger to our military. That is exactly what these provisions try to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, the Afghans are doing the fighting in Afghanistan. They are advancing and getting more capable all the time, but they still need us to be there and to advise and assist them.

Just to look briefly at some of the provisions that the gentleman would strike, one says that the commander in

Afghanistan has the authority to strike the Haqqani network. They are the ones that pose, in many people's eyes, the biggest threat for big bombings and so forth in that region. Why would we not allow our military commander, if he wants to, if he thinks it is right, to strike them?

Another provision the gentleman strikes is the one that says that we ought to have resources to go after ISIS. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that it is not just al Qaeda and the Taliban that are growing in Afghanistan. ISIS is growing there, too. This just says we ought to do something about that. The gentleman's amendment would strike it.

On troop caps, part of what is happening in Afghanistan is that we are artificially limiting the number of people there. As I mentioned, that increases the danger to the troops we do have there. Otherwise, we are bringing some people in on a temporary basis or hiring contractors to do the job.

So these artificial troop caps mean that commanders and the administration have got to find all these ways around it, but they still increase the danger that the people we do have there face. That doesn't make sense. There are still dangers in Afghanistan to our national security.

These provisions the gentleman would strike just try to untie the hands of our military so they can deal with it on a military basis, not a political basis.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I urge Members to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1502 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1502. PROCUREMENT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for procurement accounts for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in—

- (1) the funding table in section 4102; or
- (2) the funding table in section 4103.

(b) FUNDING REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables

in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for procurement for overseas contingency operations for base requirements, as specified in the funding table in section 4103, is hereby reduced by \$9,440,300,000.

Strike section 1504 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1504. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in—

- (1) the funding table in section 4302; or
- (2) the funding table in section 4303.

(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Amounts specified in the funding table in section 4302 shall remain available for obligation only until April 30, 2017, at a rate for operations as provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016 (division C of Public Law 114-113).

(c) FUNDING INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in this section for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4302, is hereby increased by \$9,440,300,000, of which \$26,000,000 is designated for suicide prevention.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for my amendment to H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

The overseas contingency operations account is supposed to provide emergency funding for wars and unexpected operations overseas, operations that cannot be planned for in the base budget.

Republicans are raiding this account. They are taking money from missions designed to protect our Nation from imminent threats to feed the military industrial complex. They argue that this makes our military stronger and that it improves our national security; but what it really does is, the Republicans have taken money from operations overseas and put it towards money for procurement, for nonwar needs, so much so that the operators would only be funded through 2017, April of next year. My amendment puts the money back.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Carter stated that this gimmick is gambling "with warfighter money at a time of war." He said: "It would spend money taken from the war account on things that are not DOD's highest priorities across the joint force."

My amendment takes the \$9.4 billion taken for procurement on items like extra F-35s and the littoral combat ship, which the Pentagon did not prioritize, and puts the funds back in the OCO operations and maintenance account.

□ 1715

Mr. Chair, \$26 million of that money will go to preventing suicides amongst

our military, as the President's request for this was \$26 million lower than the amount we appropriated in 2016. This problem is not going down, and it should not receive less support from us.

In summary, we are putting money back where it belongs. We are supporting our troops on the ground. We are supporting those services overseas. We are supporting military readiness. We are supporting the priorities of the Pentagon and the President, not those of the defense industry.

And I will say, Mr. Chairman, that if I were to ask you who I got a call from and ask you to guess, did I get a call from the President's office or the Pentagon or Boeing, the answer would be number three, Boeing. That is who called me and doesn't like this particular amendment. In fact, we didn't hear from the others. We heard from the industry, the special interests.

Let's just say the Republicans do push through extra funds for OCO next year. This would still be shortchanging domestic programs that will have to be cut to pay for the defense industry.

We all know that Republicans won't let us raise taxes to cover additional costs. We won't be able to take on more debt. Americans are going to suffer under the Republicans' scheme to give the Pentagon equipment and the industry just more.

I oppose it, and I urge support for my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, when we read our newspapers, we certainly know that the world is becoming a much less safe place. The conflicts around the world and the ability of our military to respond are incredibly important. But also, if you read the newspaper, you understand that our military is at a critical juncture. The effects of sequestration have significantly undermined the readiness of our military.

The argument that Mr. ELLISON is making about what pot of money funds come out of is kind of irrelevant in that his amendment isn't pure and that he doesn't take all of the money out of one pot and move it into another. He only takes a portion. The President does the same thing in this shell game of where dollars come from. It is not an issue of where do dollars come from. It is an issue of, where do they go?

If you read this bill, the issue of where these go, which is what Mr. ELLISON wants to stop, is moneys that go to readiness. It goes to the ability of our military to be prepared.

The Admiral Vice Chief of Staff, General Daniel Allyn, recently explained that to build readiness "the Army has been forced to cancel or delay military construction, sustainment, restoration,

and modernization across our posts, camps, and stations. Additionally, the Army reduced key installation services, individual training programs, and modernization." In essence, readiness.

This amendment strips away funding from critical programs that have been identified by our military services that were not fully funded by the President's budget request that go to readiness. We are currently in a readiness crisis.

Marine pilots are having to cannibalize museum parts to get their F-18s ready to deploy. Of the Marine Corps 271 strike aircraft, only 46 can fly. Of the most severe type of aviation accidents, Marines are 84 percent above their 10-year average. The Air Force maintainers are also cannibalizing museum parts to get aircraft in the air. Of the 20 B-1 bombers, which are workhorses in Iraq and Syria, only 9 can fly due to parts and maintenance shortfalls. Pilots are getting less than half of their training required during a time when our adversaries are becoming increasingly capable and technologically advanced.

The Air Force's Vice Chief of Staff, David Goldfein, recently stated during congressional testimony that lower than planned funding levels have resulted in one of the smallest, oldest, and least ready forces across the full-spectrum of operations in our history.

Voting for this amendment supports cutting our troops' strength, cutting training and maintenance, forcing our armed services to maintain crumbling facilities, and forcing our servicemembers to continue to rely on faulty and worn out equipment.

It is not an issue of what pot this money comes out of. It is a matter of where it goes. It needs to go for our servicemembers, so vote against this amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RICE from South Carolina). The gentleman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for yielding, and for introducing this amendment, and for his leadership to end waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon.

This amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor, would stop Republicans from using the overseas contingency operation fund as a piggy bank for more wasteful Pentagon spending. Yes, it really does appear that Christmas is coming in May for the military-industrial complex.

Right now, Republicans have robbed critical programs, like military suicide prevention, and redirected that money to the OCO fund where there is no accountability, no transparency, or oversight. By funneling this money to the OCO account, Republicans are short-changing lifesaving programs to fund wasteful programs, like the F-35 and tanks that rust in the Nevada desert.

Even the Pentagon say they don't want these programs funded. Yet, Republicans are jeopardizing our real national security priorities to further enrich the military-industrial complex.

Our troops deserve better, Mr. Chairman. This is a dangerous budgeting gimmick. This amendment would end the OCO fraud and return the funds to the important programs that they were intended for.

Let's end this scheme and put the money back into where it belongs, and that is protecting our troops and the American people.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that it is time to put resources where they are needed, among suicide prevention and directly to our troops, not into simply more military-industrial complex procurement stuff, not just to help private business feed its bottom line profit, but to help our soldiers and to help our military on the ground, when needed.

I urge support for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, just to be clear, the President in his budget request takes some of the OCO dollars and uses it to meet base requirements. He does that in his budget. It is not a question of whether it is done or not. The question is, how much?

And even though the President uses OCO dollars to help meet base shortfalls, his own Comptroller in the defense budget review writes, even though they do that in the President's budget request: "The Department will continue to experience gaps in training and maintenance over the near term and have a reduced margin of error in dealing with risks of uncertainty in a dynamic and shifting security environment."

In other words, even the President's own budget documents say that it is not enough what he has done. So what we try to do is we try to do more. We are not going to do it all, but we try to do more to make sure that the training and maintenance that our troops are entitled to are provided. What that means is we should not send anyone out on a mission for which they are not fully prepared and fully supported.

The problem is, as I mentioned awhile ago with the Black Hawk example, some of these folks have to fly helicopters that were made in 1979. I, myself, saw a fighter plane that President Reagan sent to bomb Muammar Qadhafi in 1986, and they couldn't find the parts for it. The pilot tried. He figured out a way to take a part off of a museum aircraft and tried to make it fit, but the holes were drilled in the wrong place, so it didn't work.

The only thing you can do to replace a helicopter made in 1979 or an airplane that was flown on a mission in 1986 is to get a new one. So that is what the procurement is.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, we have had a number of people from the Democratic side of the aisle who have asked for C-40s, MQ-4s, Black Hawks, B-22s, F-18s, F-35s, C-130s. Now, they didn't just invent that. The reason that Democratic Members have asked for those things above and beyond what the President submitted is because there is a real need and because the only way we are going to fix some of these readiness problems, in addition to more money for training and maintenance, more money for facilities, and preventing further cuts in end strength, is to replace some of this old equipment with new equipment. That is what we do. The gentleman would undo that. I think his amendment should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 20, 36, 37, 39, 48, 49, 52, 53, 59, and 63 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall establish a Global Engagement Center (in this section referred to as the "Center"). The purposes of the Center are—

(1) to lead and coordinate the compilation and examination of information on foreign government information warfare efforts monitored and integrated by the appropriate interagency entities with responsibility for such information, including information provided by recipients of information access fund grants awarded under subsection (f) and other sources;

(2) to establish a framework for the integration of critical data and analysis provided by the appropriate interagency entities with responsibility for such information on foreign propaganda and disinformation efforts into the development of national strategy;

(3) to develop, plan, and synchronize, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, whole-of-government initiatives to expose and counter foreign propaganda and disinformation directed

against United States national security interests and proactively advance fact-based narratives that support United States allies and interests;

(4) to demonstrate new technologies, methodologies and concepts relevant to the missions of the Center that can be transitioned to other departments or agencies of the United States Government, foreign partners or allies, or other nongovernmental entities;

(5) to establish cooperative or liaison relationships with foreign partners and allies in consultation with interagency entities with responsibility for such activities, and other entities, such as academia, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector; and

(6) to identify shortfalls in United States capabilities in any areas relevant to the United States Government's mission, and recommend necessary enhancements or changes.

(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Center shall carry out the following functions:

(1) Integrating interagency and international efforts to track and evaluate counterfactual narratives abroad that threaten the national security interests of the United States and United States allies.

(2) Integrating, and analyzing relevant information, data, analysis, and analytics from United States Government agencies, allied nations, think tanks, academic institutions, civil society groups, and other nongovernmental organizations.

(3) Developing and disseminating fact-based narratives and analysis to counter propaganda and disinformation directed at United States allies and partners.

(4) Identifying current and emerging trends in foreign propaganda and disinformation based on the information provided by the appropriate interagency entities with responsibility for such information, including information obtained from print, broadcast, online and social media, support for third-party outlets such as think tanks, political parties, and nongovernmental organizations, and the use of covert or clandestine special operators and agents to influence targeted populations and governments in order to coordinate and shape the development of tactics, techniques, and procedures to expose and refute foreign misinformation and disinformation and proactively promote fact-based narratives and policies to audiences outside the United States.

(5) Facilitating the use of a wide range of technologies and techniques by sharing expertise among agencies, seeking expertise from external sources, and implementing best practices.

(6) Identifying gaps in United States capabilities in areas relevant to the Center's mission and recommending necessary enhancements or changes.

(7) Identifying the countries and populations most susceptible to foreign government propaganda and disinformation based on information provided by appropriate interagency entities.

(8) Administering the information access fund established pursuant to subsection (f).

(9) Coordinating with allied and partner nations, particularly those frequently targeted by foreign disinformation operations, and international organizations and entities such as the NATO Center of Excellence on Strategic Communications, the European Endowment for Democracy, and the European External Action Service Task Force on Strategic Communications, in order to amplify the Center's efforts and avoid duplication.

(c) **COORDINATOR.**—The Secretary of State shall appoint a full-time Coordinator to lead the Center.

(d) **EMPLOYEES OF THE CENTER.**—

(1) **DETAILEES.**—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Center without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege for a period of not more than three years.

(2) **PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTORS.**—The Secretary of State may exercise the authority provided under section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, to establish a program (referred to in this subsection as the "Program") for hiring United States citizens or aliens as personal services contractors for purposes of personnel resources of the Center, if—

(A) the Secretary determines that existing personnel resources are insufficient;

(B) the period in which services are provided by a personal services contractor under the Program, including options, does not exceed three years, unless the Secretary determines that exceptional circumstances justify an extension of up to one additional year;

(C) not more than 20 United States citizens or aliens are employed as personal services contractors under the Program at any time; and

(D) the Program is only used to obtain specialized skills or experience or to respond to urgent needs.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Under "Diplomatic and Consular Programs", for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, \$10,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State and may remain available until expended to carry out the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the Center.

(f) **INFORMATION ACCESS FUND.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY FOR GRANTS.**—The Center is authorized to provide grants or contracts of financial support to civil society groups, journalists, nongovernmental organizations, federally-funded research and development centers, private companies, or academic institutions for the following purposes:

(A) To support local independent media who are best placed to refute foreign disinformation and manipulation in their own communities.

(B) To collect and store examples in print, online, and social media, disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda directed at the United States and its allies and partners.

(C) To analyze and report on tactics, techniques, and procedures of foreign government information warfare with respect to disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda.

(D) To support efforts by the Center to counter efforts by foreign governments to use disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda to influence the policies and social and political stability of the United States and United States allies and partners.

(2) **FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND LIMITATIONS.**—The Secretary of State shall provide that each organization that applies to receive funds under this subsection undergoes a vetting process in accordance with the relevant existing regulations to ensure its bona fides, capability, and experience, and its compatibility with United States interests and objectives.

(g) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act to carry out this section shall be used for purposes other than countering foreign propaganda and misinformation that threatens United States national security.

(h) **TERMINATION OF CENTER.**—The Center shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12yy. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER POSITION.

The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.; Public Law 103-236) is amended—

(1) by amending section 304 (22 U.S.C. 6203) to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

"(a) CONTINUED EXISTENCE WITHIN EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall continue to exist within the Executive branch of Government as an entity described in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall be a Chief Executive Officer, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall nominate the Chief Executive Officer not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section. Until such time as a Chief Executive Officer is appointed and has qualified, the current or acting Chief Executive Officer appointed by the Board may continue to serve and exercise the authorities and powers under this Act.

"(2) TERM.—The first Chief Executive Officer appointed pursuant to paragraph (1) shall serve for an initial term of three years.

"(3) COMPENSATION.—A Chief Executive Officer appointed pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be compensated at the annual rate of basic pay for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

"(c) TERMINATION OF DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING BUREAU.—Immediately upon appointment of the Chief Executive Officer under subsection (b), the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau shall be terminated, and all of the responsibilities, authorities, and immunities of the Director or the Board under this or any other Act or authority before the date of the enactment of this section shall be transferred to and assumed or overseen by the Chief Executive Officer, as head of the agency.

"(d) MEMBERS OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.—Members of the Broadcasting Board of Governors in office as of the date of the enactment of this section may serve the remainder of their terms of office in an advisory capacity, but such terms may not be extended beyond the date on which such terms are set to expire.

"(e) IMMUNITY FROM CIVIL LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all limitations on liability that apply to the Chief Executive Officer shall also apply to members of the board of directors of RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, or any organization that consolidates such entities when such members are acting in their official capacities.";

(2) in section 305 (22 U.S.C. 6204)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "Board" each place it appears and inserting "Chief Executive Officer";

(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting "direct and" before "supervise";

(iii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) by inserting "and cooperative agreements" after "grants"; and

(II) by striking "sections 308 and 309" and inserting "this Act, and on behalf of other agencies, accordingly";

(iv) in paragraph (6), by striking "subject to the limitations in sections 308 and 309 and";

(v) in paragraph (11), by inserting “not” before “subject”;

(vi) in paragraph (15)(A), by striking—
 (I) “temporary and intermittent”; and
 (II) “to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code,”; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(20) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 308(a), to condition, if appropriate, any grant or cooperative agreement to RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks on authority to determine membership of their respective boards, and the consolidation of such entities into a single grantee organization.

“(21) To redirect funds within the scope of any grant or cooperative agreement, or between grantees, as necessary, and to condition grants or cooperative agreements, if appropriate, on similar amendments as authorized under section 308(a) to meet the purposes of this Act.

“(22) To change the name of the Board pursuant to congressional notification 60 days prior to any such change.”;

(B) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and
 (C) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

SEC. 122z. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF 1994.

The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.; Public Law 103-236) is amended—

(1) in section 306 (22 U.S.C. 6205)—
 (A) in subsection (a)—
 (i) by striking the heading; and
 (ii) by striking “Board” each place it appears and inserting “Agency”; and
 (B) by striking subsection (b);
 (2) by striking section 307 (22 U.S.C. 6206); and

(3) by inserting after section 309 the following new sections:

“SEC. 310. BROADCAST ENTITIES REPORTING TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.

“(a) GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following provisions shall apply:

“(1) CONSOLIDATION.—The Chief Executive Officer, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, who is authorized to incorporate a grantee, may condition annual grants to RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks on the consolidation of such grantees into a single, consolidated private, non-profit corporation (in accordance with section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code), which may broadcast and provide news and information to audiences wherever the Agency may broadcast, for activities that the Chief Executive Officer determines are consistent with the purposes of this Act, including the terms and conditions of subsections (g)(5), (h), (i), and (j) of section 308, except that the Agency may select any name for such a consolidated grantee.

“(2) FEDERAL STATUS.—Nothing in this or any other Act, or any action taken pursuant to this or any other Act, may be construed to make such a consolidated grantee described in paragraph (1) or RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, or the Middle East Broadcasting Networks or any other grantee or entity provided funding by the Agency a Federal agency or instrumentality. Employees or staff of such grantees or entities shall not be considered Federal employees. For pur-

poses of this subsection and this Act, the term ‘grant’ includes agreements under section 6305 of title 31, United States Code, and the term ‘grantee’ includes recipients of such agreements.

“(3) LEADERSHIP OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONS.—Officers of RFE/RL Inc., Radio Free Asia, and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks or any organization that is established through the consolidation of such entities, or authorized under this Act, shall serve at the pleasure of the Chief Executive Officer of the Agency.

“(b) VOICE OF AMERICA.—

“(1) STATUS AS A FEDERAL ENTITY.—The Chief Executive Officer is authorized to establish an independent grantee organization, as a private nonprofit organization, to carry out all broadcasting and related programs currently performed by the Voice of America. The Chief Executive Officer may make and supervise grants or cooperative agreements to such grantee, including under terms and conditions and in any manner authorized under section 305(a). Such grantee shall not be considered a Federal agency or instrumentality and shall adhere to the same standards of professionalism and accountability required of all Board broadcasters and grantees. The Board is authorized to transfer any facilities or equipment to such grantee, and to utilize the provisions of subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Voice of America, operating as a nonprofit organization, should have the mission to—

“(A) serve as a consistently reliable and authoritative source of news on the United States, its policies, its people, and the international developments that affect the United States;

“(B) provide accurate, objective, and comprehensive information, with the understanding that these three values provide credibility among global news audiences;

“(C) present the official policies of the United States, and related discussions and opinions about those policies, clearly and effectively; and

“(D) represent the whole of the United States, and shall accordingly work to produce programming and content that presents a balanced and comprehensive projection of the diversity of thought and institutions of the United States.

“SEC. 311. INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service shall exercise the same authorities with respect to the Broadcasting Board of Governors and the International Broadcasting Bureau as the Inspector General exercises under the Inspector General Act of 1978 and section 209 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 with respect to the Department of State.

“(b) RESPECT FOR JOURNALISTIC INTEGRITY OF BROADCASTERS.—The Inspector General shall respect the journalistic integrity of all the broadcasters covered by this title and may not evaluate the philosophical or political perspectives reflected in the content of broadcasts.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title V (page 153, after line 9), add the following new section:

SEC. 568. REPORT AND GUIDANCE REGARDING JOB TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT SKILLS TRAINING, APPRENTICESHIPS, AND INTERNSHIPS AND SKILLBRIDGE INITIATIVES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE BEING SEPARATED.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and make available to the public, a report evaluating the success of the Job Training, Employment Skills Training, Apprenticeships, and Internships (known as JTEST-AI) and SkillBridge initiatives, under which civilian businesses and companies make available to members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from the Armed Forces training or internship opportunities that offer a high probability of employment for the members after their separation.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—In preparing the report required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall use the effectiveness metrics described in Enclosure 5 of Department of Defense Instruction No. 1322.29. The report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) An assessment of the successes of the JTEST-AI and SkillBridge initiatives.

(2) Recommendations by the Under Secretary regarding ways in which the administration of the JTEST-AI and SkillBridge initiatives could be improved.

(3) Recommendations by civilian companies participating in the initiatives regarding ways in which the administration of the JTEST-AI and SkillBridge initiatives could be improved.

(4) Testimony from a sample of members of the Armed Forces who are participating in a JTEST-AI or SkillBridge initiative regarding the effectiveness of the initiatives and the members’ support for the initiatives.

(5) Testimony from a sample of recently separated members of the Armed Forces who participated in a JTEST-AI or SkillBridge initiative regarding the effectiveness of the initiatives and the members’ support for the initiatives.

(c) ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the submission of the report required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall issue guidance to commanders of units of the Armed Forces for the purpose of encouraging commanders, consistent with unit readiness, to allow members of the Armed Forces under their command who are being separated from the Armed Forces to participate in a JTEST-AI or SkillBridge initiative.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. FARENTHOLD OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___ . CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION IN ADVANCE OF APPOINTMENTS TO SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in the matter after paragraph (10) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “When a nominee of a Senator, Representative, or Delegate is selected for appointment as a cadet, the Senator, Representative, or Delegate shall be notified at least 48 hours before the official notification or announcement of the appointment is made.”.

(b) UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.—Section 6954(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in the matter after paragraph (10) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “When a nominee of a Senator, Representative, or Delegate is selected for appointment as a midshipman, the Senator, Representative, or Delegate shall be notified at least 48 hours before the official notification or announcement of the appointment is made.”.

(c) UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9342(a) of title 10, United States

Code, is amended in the matter after paragraph (10) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "When a nominee of a Senator, Representative, or Delegate is selected for appointment as a cadet, the Senator, Representative, or Delegate shall be notified at least 48 hours before the official notification or announcement of the appointment is made."

(d) UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.—Section 51302 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION IN ADVANCE OF APPOINTMENTS.—When a nominee of a Senator, Representative, or Delegate is selected for appointment as a cadet, the Senator, Representative, or Delegate shall be notified at least 48 hours before the official notification or announcement of the appointment is made"

(e) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the appointment of cadets and midshipmen to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, and United States Merchant Marine Academy for classes entering these service academies after January 1, 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 173, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 599A. SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

Section 1967(f)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 173, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 599A. EXTENSION OF SUICIDE PREVENTION AND RESILIENCE PROGRAM.

Section 10219(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "October 1, 2017" and inserting "October 1, 2018".

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII (page 326, after line 4), insert the following new section:

SEC. 843. STUDY AND REPORT ON CONTRACTS AWARDED TO MINORITY-OWNED AND WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the number and types of contracts for the procurement of goods or services for the Department of Defense awarded to minority-owned and women-owned businesses during fiscal years 2010 through 2015. In conducting the study, the Comptroller General shall identify minority-owned businesses according to the categories identified in the Federal procurement data system (described in section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In section 1047(c)(1), strike "and approvals" and insert ", approvals, and the total costs of all flyover missions, including the costs of fuel, maintenance, and manpower,".

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

Page 394, after line 5, insert the following new subsection:

(e) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,

Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Page 423, after line 3, insert the following:
SEC. 1070. REPORT ON CARRIER AIR WING FORCE STRUCTURE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of changes to existing carrier air wing force structure and the impact a potential reduction to 9 carrier air wings would have on overall fleet readiness if aircraft and personnel were to be distributed throughout the remaining 9 air wings.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

Page 462, after line 13, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1098. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Maritime Occupational Safety and Health Advisory Committee Act".

SEC. 2. MARITIME OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 7 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 656) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) There is established a Maritime Occupational Safety and Health Advisory Committee, which shall be a continuing body and shall provide advice to the Secretary in formulating maritime industry standards and regarding matters pertaining to the administration of this Act related to the maritime industry. The composition of this advisory committee shall be consistent with the advisory committees established under subsection (b), provided that a member of this committee who is otherwise qualified may continue to serve until a successor is appointed. The Secretary may promulgate or amend regulations as necessary to implement this subsection."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak first about an amendment to be considered in a later en bloc regarding Special Immigrant Visas. I want to call attention to the urgent need to continue the Special Immigrant Visa program for Afghans who worked for U.S. forces.

This bipartisan amendment, backed by several veterans on the committee, would remove the unfortunate narrowing of eligibility requirements included in the mark, which would prevent hundreds of Afghans whose lives are at risk because of their work for our country from even being considered for resettlement in the United States.

The narrowing of eligibility intentionally excludes hundreds of Afghans who worked for the State Department, USAID, and U.S. security contractors in a number of capacities, many of whom face well-documented death threats due to their work with our government, regardless of whether that

was with frontline troops or on an American base.

By narrowing eligibility, the program would erode the expectations of hundreds of Afghan staff whose lives remain in danger because of their work for the U.S. mission and also make it more difficult to hire and retain qualified Afghan staff in the future who are essential to achieving our diplomatic and assistance goals.

For that risk and sacrifice, the very least we can do is offer them a chance to stay live, to keep living, rather than abandoning them to the same enemies they united with us to destroy.

One of the things I was most proud of as a Marine infantry officer was that we never let our enemies make us compromise our values. One of those values is a solemn commitment to our allies and to our brothers in arms.

I urge your support on the floor in following through on our commitment to our Afghan partners.

I also want to comment on the fact that the chairman of the committee and I worked to resolve some differences that we had on understanding the concerns of our diplomatic mission in Afghanistan. I appreciate very much his work with me on that to support our troops and mission overseas.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and he is exactly right. He and other Members are very concerned about this issue. He has talked to me about it a number of times.

I have been concerned that there was abuse of this system. That was gathered from visits I have made to Afghanistan, including last year.

But I very much appreciate the points that the gentleman from Massachusetts has made. I think he and others who have worked on this issue have come up with a good amendment. I support it.

All of us agree that if someone has risked their lives or would be in danger for supporting the United States and our folks in Afghanistan, then that person needs protection. None of us want to see the program abused.

But I am convinced that the changes that the gentleman has been instrumental in working out are helpful. I support it. And I thank him for his efforts on doing this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

□ 1730

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I will be brief.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, our men and women who are defending our Nation and their families are twice as likely to fall victim to

identity theft and fraud. Because they protect us, we need to do more to protect them and their families from scammers who take advantage of their service. My amendment No. 177 simply requires the Department of Defense to report to Congress on its efforts to protect their information.

I thank the chairman for working with me on this amendment, and I look forward to working the committee to better protect those who sacrifice so much to defend our Nation. I also thank my co-chair of the Bipartisan Congressional Task Force to Combat Identity Theft and Fraud, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), for her great work. She has been a great partner in helping to protect taxpayers and now our servicemembers from having their identities stolen.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Mr. MOULTON for supporting the Young-Sinema amendment. I thank Congressman YOUNG for working with me and others in offering this bipartisan amendment to protect members of the Armed Forces and their families from identity theft.

My home State of Arizona is one of the top 10 States that is affected by identity theft. Military families are among those most targeted and most at risk for these crimes. Our amendment improves the Department of Defense's efforts to protect military families' financial information from identity theft. I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to combat identity theft and financial fraud.

Again, I thank my friend, Congressman YOUNG, for working with me on this important, commonsense amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Among the amendments in this en bloc package is one that I have authored to establish a global engagement center. I thank my cosponsors of this amendment, Mr. WILSON and Mr. LANGEVIN, the chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats & Capabilities. I also thank Chairman ROYCE, who has worked with us. Included in this amendment are reforms of the Broadcasting Board of Governors that he and his ranking member have worked on for some time.

Mr. Chair, it has been a source of great frustration for me that our government has seemed to be so inept in the battle of ideas against the terrorists.

I first introduced a bill on this topic in 2005. Today there is a lot of talk not only of the so-called physical caliphate that ISIS claims, but of the virtual caliphate. Unless and until we can be more effective at engaging in the battle of ideas, we will not succeed in defeating terrorism.

It is not just the terrorists we have to worry about. We have seen the Rus-

sians lie and use deception for military gain. We have seen similar sorts of tactics by the Chinese in their building these islands out in the South China Sea and elsewhere around the world.

This amendment requires the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and others—the executive branch—to get their act together, coordinate, and more effectively engage in the battle of ideas. I hope it helps. As I say, this is a crucial battlefield, and our country needs to do better in this field.

Mr. Chair, as I have no further speakers at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I am appreciative to the gentleman from Massachusetts for allowing me to speak on my amendment.

Mr. Chair and Members, a lack of opportunity for Federal contracting is one of the main factors of the widening racial wealth gap. As the Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government has a critical responsibility to focus on increasing minority and female inclusion in the job market; yet, only a fraction of Federal contracts goes to minority- or female-owned businesses. This is partly why the wealth gap and extreme disparities in racial incomes continue.

Amendment No. 49 ensures that we meet important contracting goals by analyzing a 5-year study by the GAO on how the DOD contracts with minority- and female-owned businesses. While there are many ways the government can address the issue of more equitable contracting, one important and more immediate impact, I believe, the Federal Government can have is by providing more opportunities for minority-owned businesses.

The DOD spends roughly \$285 billion a year on contracting, more than all Federal agencies combined. With such large purchasing power, it is imperative that these funds are used not only to provide the best services for the Department of Defense, but also to distribute fairly and wisely in all communities.

The study proposed is the first step toward identifying where those opportunities lie for great inclusion. This amendment further emphasizes and underscores the importance of minorities in both our local and national communities.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding and also for his service to the Nation. I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. SMITH; the

chairman of the full committee, Mr. THORNBERRY; and the Rules Committee for accepting this amendment. Let me thank the gentlemen doubly and triply for being kind enough to accept this amendment on a regular basis, and I am going to persist because I believe it is important.

Mr. Chair, let me make a big pronouncement or announcement or breaking news: there are women in the United States military. I want to say that again. There are women in the United States military.

My amendment deals with triple negative breast cancer. It calls for the increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health to combat triple negative breast cancer. This amendment directs the Department of Defense to identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for TNBC. "Triple negative breast cancer" is a term used to describe breast cancer. Its cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors and does not have an excess of HER2 protein on its cell membrane of tumor cells.

I am not in the military. I have had many family members in the military, but I would venture to say this is a case in which you have battalions, and you are on the field, and you have a difficult enemy who keeps moving away from your sight and your target. Though you have used overlapping forces, you can't seem to pinpoint the enemy. Ultimately you are victorious, but that is because you collaborate and you work together. This makes commonly used tests and methods to detect breast cancer not as effective, meaning the ordinary style of fighting does not work for triple negative breast cancer.

Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than 5 years after being diagnosed. It is important to note that TNBC affects women under 50 years of age, and it makes up more than 30 percent of all breast cancer diagnoses, specifically in African American women.

The collaboration between the Department of Defense and the NIH to combat triple negative breast cancer can support the development of multiple targeted therapies for this devastating disease and can help women in the United States military, those who are serving our country. Triple negative breast cancer is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available.

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

Mr. MOULTON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman so very much.

Mr. Chair, it is a disease, however, that can be conquered. Triple negative breast cancer, TNBC, accounts for between 13 percent and 25 percent of all breast cancers in the United States. It is of a higher grade, and it onsets at a

young age. That means these women are in the United States military.

Finally, because it continues, there is a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trials that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease. My amendment would provide for that.

In coming from Houston, Texas, with MD Anderson Cancer Center, I can tell you that they are looking at major research that can be very helpful between the NIH and the Department of Defense. I hope my amendment will stay in this particular bill, and I hope it will go to the Senate and will be signed by the President.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH and the Rules Committee for making in order and including Jackson Lee Amendment and including it in En Bloc Amendment Number 2 to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017."

This is the first of 3 Jackson Lee amendments made in order by the House Rules Committee.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 45, calls for increased collaboration between the DoD and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 45 directs the DoD and NIH to collaborate to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

This amendment directs the Department of Defense to identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for TNBC.

"Triple Negative Breast Cancer" is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the "HER2" protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

This makes commonly used tests and methods to detect breast cancer not as effective.

This is a serious illness that affects between 10–17% of female breast cancer patients and this condition is more likely to cause death than the most common form of breast cancer.

Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 45 will help to save lives.

TNBC disproportionately impacts younger women, African American women, Hispanic/Latina women, and women with a "BRCA1 genetic mutation, which is prevalent in Jewish women.

TNBC usually affects women under 50 years of age and makes up more than 30% of all breast cancer diagnoses in African Americans. Black women are far more susceptible to this dangerous subtype than white or Hispanic women.

The collaboration between the Department of Defense and NIH to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer can support the development of multiple targeted therapies for this devastating disease.

Triple negative breast cancer is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available.

The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer "an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates."

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

In 2011, the Centers for Disease Control predicted that that year 26,840 black women would be diagnosed with TNBC.

The overall incidence rate of breast cancer is 10% lower in African American women than white women.

African American women have a five year survival rate of 78% after diagnosis as compared to 90% for white women.

The incidence rate of breast cancer among women under 45 is higher for African American women compared to white women.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer cells: TNBC accounts for between 13% and 25% of all breast cancer in the United States; usually of a higher grade and size; onset at a younger age; are more aggressive; are more likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than White women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26% versus 16% in non-African-American women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently there is no targeted treatment for TNBC.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

Because there continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease Jackson Lee Amendment Number 45 included in En Bloc 2 is essential to paving a way for advancements in these areas.

I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for including these amendments in the En Bloc Amendment Number 2, and I urge all Members to join me in voting for its adoption.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of an amendment I offered along with Mrs. COMSTOCK.

It seeks to expand the SkillBridge job training program by directing unit commanders to encourage participation by departing servicemembers. It also directs the DOD to form a comprehensive study so that they can evaluate and improve the program as needed. The SkillBridge initiative helps returning veterans by providing them with job training and apprenticeship programs in areas that span every sector of the workforce.

This program has already trained around 4,500 servicemembers, and the 18 SkillBridge programs claim to have an employment success rate of 100 percent. Encouraging participation will help more of our veterans find employment when they reenter civilian life, which is something we need to do all we can to promote.

I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for supporting this amendment in this bloc. I urge my colleagues to support the bloc.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would like to discuss an amendment to come up in a future en bloc package.

I joined a vast array of foreign policy experts and retired generals—and even Israel's own nuclear commission—in supporting the nuclear deal with Iran because, although it was an imperfect deal, nobody could articulate a better pathway to a better deal to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. The nuclear deal, however, is only that—a nuclear deal. As when President Reagan was negotiating nuclear deals with the Soviets, we make these agreements with our enemies, not with our friends, and we must not forget that Iran remains opposed to us in a vast array of other ways. As with the Soviets, enforcement of the deal requires continued vigilance.

My amendment would require the President to notify Congress whenever Iran conducts a ballistic missile launch and inform Congress as to the actions the President will take in response, including diplomatic efforts to pursue additional sanctions and the passage of a United Nations Security Council resolution.

While we have been successful in deterring Iran from building a nuclear weapon with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, we must continue to apply pressure to deter further actions that destabilize this fragile region and threaten our allies.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of the en bloc package.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. ZINKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-571.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chair, I offer amendment No. 10 as the designee of Mrs. LUMMIS from the great State of Wyoming.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . MATTERS RELATED TO INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States to maintain and modernize a responsive and alert intercontinental ballistic missile force to ensure robust nuclear deterrence by preventing any adversary from believing it can carry out a small, surprise, first-strike attack on the United States that disarms the strategic forces of the United States.

(b) **PROHIBITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided by paragraph (2), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 shall be obligated or expended for—

(A) reducing, or preparing to reduce, the responsiveness or alert level of the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the United States; or

(B) reducing, or preparing to reduce, the quantity of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles of the United States to a number less than 400.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition in paragraph (1) shall not apply to any of the following activities:

(A) The maintenance or sustenance of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(B) Ensuring the safety, security, or reliability of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(C) Reduction in the number of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles that are carried out in compliance with—

(i) the limitations of the New START Treaty (as defined in section 494(a)(2)(D) of title 10, United States Code); and

(ii) section 1644 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3651; 10 U.S.C. 494 note).

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding efforts to carry out section 1057 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 495 note).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following with respect to the period of the expected lifespan of the Minuteman III system:

(A) The number of nuclear warheads required to support the capability to redeploy multiple independently retargetable reentry vehicles across the full intercontinental ballistic missile fleet.

(B) The current and planned (until 2030) readiness state of nuclear warheads intended to support the capability to redeploy multiple independently retargetable reentry vehicles across the full intercontinental ballistic missile fleet, including which portion of the active or inactive stockpile such warheads are classified within.

(C) The current and planned (until 2030) reserve of components or subsystems required to redeploy multiple independently retargetable reentry vehicles across the full intercontinental ballistic missile fleet, including the plans or industrial capability and capacity to produce more such components or subsystems, if needed.

(D) The current and planned (until 2030) time required to commence redeployment of multiple independently retargetable reentry vehicles across the intercontinental ballistic missile fleet, including the time required to finish deployment across the full fleet.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this amendment to highlight the importance of maintaining our nuclear deterrence. This amendment will ensure that our land-based nuclear ICBMs are ready at a moment's notice and are not placed on a reduced-alert status.

President Reagan had it right. He championed the notion of peace through strength. Those wise words still apply today, even greater. The harsh reality is that we live in an increasingly unstable international environment. Nuclear deterrence provided by the triad has been the backbone of our national security posture for over half a century. Just last fall, the Secretary of Defense stated: “The nuclear deterrent is a must-have . . . It is the foundation. It's the bedrock and it needs to remain healthy . . .”

Montana is a proud defender of our triad, and our troops are always ready. Our ICBMs should be, too.

As more nation-states, including Iran, begin to defy international laws and pursue nuclear and ballistic missiles, it is critical that we do not scale back our nuclear deterrence.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

□ 1745

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Having previously served as the chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee for several years, I am intimately familiar with our intercontinental ballistic missile forces and the important role ICBM deterrence plays when it comes to our national defense. While I understand the intent of this amendment, it is fundamentally unnecessary, dramatically overreaching, and lacks meaningful policy reform.

The budget request for FY 2017 contains no funding for reducing the alert level or reducing the number of deployed ICBMs below 400, and there are no plans to do so in the future. Furthermore, the statement of policy with regard to ICBMs, which is legally binding, significantly overreaches. It states that modernization of the ICBMs and retaining an alert ICBM force is necessary to ensure robust nuclear deterrence by preventing any adversary from believing it can carry out a small, surprise, first-strike attack which disarms the strategic forces of the United States.

However, this disregards the crucial and fundamental role of submarines that provide assured, survivable second-strike capability, which would dis-

sua an adversary from even thinking they could launch a disarming attack against the United States.

If we include any legislation on ICBMs, Mr. Chairman, it should be that we increase accountability and ensure that we are improving the morale and culture inside the Air Force with regard to nuclear weapons. Some of the serious and embarrassing problems that have plagued the ICBM missileers and security forces in recent years unfortunately continues, such as the Air Force base in Wyoming where 14 enlisted airmen in the security forces were being investigated for drug use just several weeks ago. I see nothing in this amendment that addresses that problem, nor do I see anything in the bill that addresses that issue.

If we are going to talk about keeping ICBMs, it should be in a meaningful way, instead of yet another annual amendment driven by what seems like parochial interests in highlighting their role, particularly at the exclusion of other legs of the nuclear triad.

While the committee tried to work with Ms. Lummis, Mr. Chairman, to avail the amendment of some of these concerns, bipartisan negotiations was seemingly rejected.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we are able to make some of these adjustments as we conference with the Senate, but I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment as offered.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reducing our ICBM alertness is reducing our readiness, and the whole point of the Defense Authorization Act is to ensure our military readiness.

The ICBMs have been a very effective deterrent to enemy aggression for decades. This amendment is simply a deterrent to those who would try to reduce our readiness by reducing our alertness and reducing the number of ICBMs. This would be a dangerous step, contrary to the longstanding policies of our defense and certainly a bad posture.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, I understand that the responsiveness and distributed nature of our ICBMs are their most critical feature and their unique contribution to our nuclear triad.

Without ICBMs, an adversary would only need to strike less than 10 targets to disarm our nuclear forces. With ICBMs, an adversary needs to strike hundreds of hardened targets deep in the American homeland. That is a much more difficult proposition and is at the very heart of deterrence.

This is not a parochial issue or a political issue. This is a profound national security issue. De-alerting our

ICBMs or unilaterally cutting their numbers is a terrible idea.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, as I previously stated—and with all due respect to my colleague—this bill contains no funding for reducing the alert level or reducing the number of deployed ICBMs below 400, and there are no plans to do so in the future.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy and his leadership on this, and I think he laid it out very clearly.

This is an imaginary problem, but it is an area that actually needs to have some attention to it. He referenced recent problems in terms of potential drug abuse. You know they found the cheating earlier because they were investigating drug abuse when they found out that there was cheating on the readiness test.

I would advise my colleagues to read Eric Schlosser’s “Command and Control,” a fascinating study about the history of American nuclear weapons and problems that we have had, mistakes that were made, and near misses.

There are serious issues that we need to be thinking in terms of the readiness and how it goes forward. We need to think clearly about what we do in the future, what is the right level of deterrence, and how are we going to adequately analyze it.

454 land-based missiles are not necessarily a magic number that we should be freezing on a permanent basis. Looking at what happens going forward with the trillion-dollar commitment with missiles that are submarine based—we have our bombers; we have land based—and being able to have a critical appraisal of how much deterrence is enough and look at problems, such as security lapses, training problems, drug problems, this is not a situation that we should just sort of happily freeze for the next go-around and maintain that any adjustment to this or even evaluating an adjustment is somehow a threat to national security.

The real problems that we face dealing with international terrorism and the potential of nuclear weapons falling into rogue hands, those are very real problems that we need to be doing more. This vast nuclear triad that we will spend a trillion dollars on does not help us with those challenges. Rather than hollow out the military, we ought to be looking at potential changes going forward.

This amendment is ill-advised, unnecessary, and is the wrong direction we should be going.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chair, this amendment is about ensuring that our nu-

clear deterrence that has protected this country for over 70 years remains strong and viable.

Yesterday, this body passed a measure to keep our nukes safe. It is now time to ensure they are ready at a moment’s notice. There is no reason to have a nuclear force unless they are ready.

To lower the alert posture of our land-based ICBMs would result in a 2-week delay before our ICBMs would be ready to use. This would cripple our ability to respond quickly, which is the entire point of having a nuclear triad.

In the military, we always hope for the best but plan for the worse. While I hope we never have to use our nuclear weapons—and, indeed, I believe everyone in this body does—to lower their posture status of land-based ICBMs would unnecessarily put us at risk.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subsections (b) and (c) of section 2856 and insert the following:

(b) RECOGNITION.—Congress recognizes the National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as America’s National World War II Aviation Museum.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas and committee staff for their willingness to work with me on this amendment. I fought long and hard to get this museum the recognition it deserves, and I am very pleased that we have a path forward where we can finally achieve that.

My amendment simply recognizes this museum in Colorado Springs as the National Museum of World War II Aviation. This amendment does not authorize any funds. The museum is not seeking Federal funds and does not have plans to do so in the future.

The National Museum of World War II Aviation has taken great care to focus its story line on an aspect of military history that has not been fully explored by other national military museums. The intent is to augment the tremendous work that is being done by those museums, not to duplicate or replace it.

It is the only museum in the United States that exists to exclusively preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation in winning World

War II. It is dedicated to celebrating the American spirit and to recognizing the teamwork, patriotism, and courage of the men and women who fought, as well as those on the home front who mobilized and supported the national aviation effort.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) has been a strong advocate for this museum, and I certainly appreciate him bringing it to the committee’s attention and to the attention of the House.

Many Members share the gentleman’s commitment to the preservation of historic aircraft, and I will certainly work with him on this and related issues.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, based on that reassurance and on that pledge to work together, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title XXXV add the following:

SEC. ____ GAO REPORT ON MARITIME SECURITY FLEET PROGRAM.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act the Comptroller General of the United States shall study and report to the relevant congressional committees on the following:

(1) The justification for the size of the Maritime Security Fleet established under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, given present national defense operational requirements for such fleet, and how the annual per-essel payment under that chapter corresponds to the costs of operating vessels in such Fleet.

(2) The difference in costs between the Maritime Security Fleet program and other options for achieving the same objectives as that program, such as—

(A) procurement by the United States of a national defense sealift fleet;

(B) contracting for United States-flag vessels and foreign-flag vessels on a temporary basis; and

(C) other potential options.

(3) Instances, examined in detail, in which use of foreign-flag, foreign-crewed vessels for national defense sealift purposes has hindered national security or impeded United States military operations.

(4) Comparison, in detail, of volumes and types of—

(A) Federal cargo that has been carried on foreign-flagged vessels; and

(B) Federal cargo that has been carried on vessels in the Maritime Security Fleet.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise with a very simple amendment. It would do nothing more than call for a GAO report of the maritime security fleet. I do so because I think that we would all acknowledge that knowledge is power, and the ability to look very closely at what is happening within that fleet, I think, is important. I would also say that, as a believer that defense is a core function of the Federal Government, we would want to have transparency in the way that we expend those funds in pursuit of our Nation's defense.

I think that this is important in light of the fact that overall funding has risen by about \$89 million here over the last, I guess, funding cycle. You have seen the per-ship stipend go from \$3.5 million to \$5 million.

There has not been a study of what is happening within that fleet of ships for more than 12 years, and so, again, this is not in any way prescriptive in nature as to what should or shouldn't happen or the merits or demerits of the program. It is simply saying might we not learn a little bit more of what is happening within that fleet, and that is it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

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

The gentleman from South Carolina is correctly concerned about the expenditure of money. I would suggest to him that this study is a waste of the expenditure of money by the GAO and, hence, the taxpayers of the United States.

Studies about the MSP have been available over many, many years; and in fact, there is now, in the Office of Management and Budget, a comprehensive study that was commissioned by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The gentleman can certainly contact OMB and get that study and, quite probably, get all the information he is going to request in this particular analysis and, furthermore, not have to waste taxpayer money in the process.

I would point out to the gentleman a statement that was made on January 17 of this year concerning the MSP program by General Darren McDew, commander of US TRANSCOM. This is the guy who is responsible for moving men, women, materiel, and equipment around the world.

He said: "Our overwhelming success was due in large part to the 10,000 U.S.

mariners who sped 220 shiploads of decisive U.S. combat power throughout the buildup known as Operation Desert Shield. Without those mariners and vessels, our ability to project decisive force and demonstrate our national resolve would have been a mere fraction of what was required to ensure the swift victory the world witnessed. Simply put, moving an army of decisive size and power can only be accomplished by sea," and the MSP is the central part of that.

We don't need this study. What we need is strong support for the MSP.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would say to my colleague that, again, what we would all recognize is that OMB is different than the Government Accountability Office. The OMB is fundamentally executive branch in nature. I think there is a real value to having a third party independent look at what is happening with the study. Again, it is not prescriptive in nature, but having that third party look, I think, is that much more important in all of our justifications of this program or other programs like it.

I would also say this, in terms of "waste of money," as we know, GAO is funded through the legislative branch. This would not involve an additional expenditure of money. It would be incorporated into the expenditures that currently take place within the legislative branch and, again, GAO, by extension. In that regard, I think it would be a good use of taxpayer money to take a look that has not been taken in more than 12 years.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, that is the first time I have ever heard that expenditure by the House of Representatives is not taxpayer money, but I guess some people can claim that.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I know how committed he is to national defense and to fiscal responsibility in the country. However, one of the things that we haven't talked about in this amendment is it asks us to look at outsourcing this to foreign countries to be able to do, and I think today I rise not just as chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, but also on behalf of my good friend Mr. COURTNEY, who is the ranking member on that subcommittee and who has given us authority to say that he is opposed to this as well for these reasons.

The sealift, if we lose that sealift, we have lost the lifeblood to our warfighters because that is the vessel, that is the lifeline that keeps them and sustains them. The very question for us is this: If that balloon goes up and the bell rings, are we going to trust a foreign power to hold in their hand that

very lifeblood for our men and women and our warfighters?

I want to remind everyone in the House that in World War II, 1 in 26 merchant mariners were actually killed. It was a higher rate of loss than any other service. The rate was so high, in fact, that the merchant marine concealed it because they were afraid they couldn't find enough mariners if the true danger of the services were known.

So our big question here is, even if we came back with a study that said it might be cheaper to outsource it, would anyone in this room dare place that trust in a foreign country? I think very clearly we would not.

Mr. Chairman, also these decisions are probably best made by military transportation command, sealift command, and maritime command, and they have said there is no guarantee whatsoever that a foreign-flagged fleet will sail into harm's way if we need them. They have said a 60-ship capability is extremely important, and they have said that foreign-flagged ships which might be cheaper cannot be relied on for critical national security missions.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will oppose this amendment, we will reject it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would say this: in essence, we already have outsourced this. I think the question about the maritime security fleet is that it is currently run by a foreign-flagged fleet of vessels. If I am not mistaken, it is almost exclusively run by Maersk, which is a foreign-flagged vessel.

The question of this amendment is to say: Might not there be other ways of doing it? Maybe this is the best way to do it. Maybe there are other ways to do it. But this notion of not being willing to look, not being willing to have a third party validate or, if you will, take a look and say this makes sense or, no, there is a better way of skinning this cat both for the military and for the taxpayer, I think again warrants, in this case, the study by the GAO.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In Desert Storm I, back in the 1990s, a ship that was manned by Pakistanis was loaded at the docks, began to sail, and turned around because the crew refused to go into that zone. We cannot

allow that to happen ever again. The MSP was started specifically to provide that kind of sealift power that we need to move our men, materiel, and equipment, wherever they may be needed in the world. It does us little good to spend \$680 billion on a Defense appropriation bill and not be able to get where the trouble is. Do away with the MSP, and that is where you are headed with this, moving toward foreign flags and, indeed, Maersk is operated by a foreign country, but it is licensed to operate in the United States with American sailors on American ships for the MSP program.

We don't need to waste money on this. The studies are available dating back to 2006, 2009, and, more recently, with the OMB study. We don't need to waste our money. We need to get on with supporting the MSP program. I ask for a "no" vote.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would again go back to the basics. This stipend goes to Maersk presently. It has been raised from \$3.5 million to \$5 million. Maybe that is the best thing in the world to do; maybe it is not. But I think it is worthy of study, particularly given the fact that we have raised the stipend by \$89 million over the last year, particularly given the fact that we have not looked at this issue from the standpoint of an outside third-party validation from the GAO for more than 12 years.

It is for that reason I simply say, again, in no way prescriptively, it is worth a look. And again, given the fact that the Government Accountability Office does regular studies on a whole host of different issues on a very regular basis, I think this is worthy, given the additional \$89 million that was spent last year.

I would ask for a "yes" vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 114-571.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1045 and insert the following:

SEC. 1045. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL SPECTRUM OPERATIONS.

Section 1004 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-74; 47 U.S.C. 921 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) PROTECTION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL SPECTRUM OPERATIONS.—If the report required by subsection (a) determines that reallocation and auction of the spectrum described in the report would harm national security by impacting existing terrestrial Federal spectrum operations at the Nevada Test and Training Range, the Commission, in coordination with the Secretary shall, prior to the auction described in subsection (c)(1)(B), establish rules for licensees in such spectrum sufficient to mitigate harmful interference to such operations.

"(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any requirement under section 1062(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (47 U.S.C. 921 note; Public Law 106-65)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Spectrum Pipeline Act was included in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 that we passed in December. Now, apparently, there has developed some disagreement among lawyers about whether that had some effect on section 1062(b) of the fiscal year 2000 National Defense Authorization Act related to spectrum.

My amendment simply clarifies what everyone that I know of agrees on, and that is it was never intended to have any effect. We have assurance from the Office of Management and Budget that was their intention. I appreciate Chairman FRED UPTON, who has worked with us on this amendment, saying that was not his intention. Basically, Mr. Chairman, I see this as a technical amendment to resolve some disagreement among lawyers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the Nation's spectrum is one of our most valuable natural resources. Under the bipartisan oversight of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, one spectrum auction alone last year raised more than \$40 billion. It is imperative that we continue our bipartisan management of this valuable national asset, but to do that we must follow regular order through the proper committee of jurisdiction. That is the only way that we can make sure that we continue proper congressional oversight.

This amendment that we are considering today was made public 1 day ago. This process runs counter to our suc-

cessful bipartisan efforts to manage spectrum well. It does not allow the relevant agencies adequate time to weigh in, and it does not allow interested stakeholders to provide meaningful input.

I appreciate my colleague's efforts to improve this amendment, but these are extremely complicated issues of national importance. They cannot be put together overnight.

Earlier today when the rule for consideration of this bill was debated here on the floor, my Republican colleagues said that they chose to exclude some Democratic amendments because those amendments did not go through the committee process. Well, the same can be said of this amendment as well, Mr. Chairman.

If there are issues of national security underlying this amendment, the Democrats on the Committee on Energy and Commerce stand ready to work on them expeditiously, but we must stand by our commitment to regular order. The consequences of getting this wrong are simply too high.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly a problem that we need to work on. The chairman and I have worked together in talking about it and making sure that our military assets are protected as we deal with spectrum auctions.

I look forward to having the conversation in conference committee about how to deal with this, but my concern is this is something that many on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and I as well, have worked on for a number of years. We worked with the Department of Defense for years to try and make sure that their equities were protected. We talked with everyone we could conceivably talk with. This auction was originally set up to make sure that we protected those.

Now we are hearing a slightly new argument. I certainly want to make sure that the Department of Defense's interests are protected, but I also want to make sure that they don't have absolute veto power on auctioning spectrum. That was sort of the law before all of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and others worked on, and it really tied up a very valuable national asset, as Mr. PALLONE points out.

I hope that as we get into conference committee we will figure out how to both protect the interests of national security and the Defense, but also make sure that, if spectrum can be safely made available, it is safely made available.

As I said, this was something that was worked on for a very long time,

and we thought we had it worked out. So right at the eleventh hour here, to have the Department of Defense say “No, we want to change it” is something I think we still need to examine more closely.

I thank Mr. PALLONE for the time.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time simply to say this amendment, a version of this amendment, was filed last week. Working with the Committee on Energy and Commerce, it has been revised. Again, the purpose of this amendment is—and what I think it clearly does is simply restate what everybody thought was the case—to resolve a disagreement among lawyers. That is the reason I call it, really, a technical amendment. I hope that the House will adopt it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1815

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 23, 43, 44, 46, 47, 50, 51, 54, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 69 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle F of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16. HARMFUL INTERFERENCE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM.

(a) FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CONDITIONS ON COMMERCIAL TERRESTRIAL OPERATIONS.—Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: “**SEC. 343. CONDITIONS ON COMMERCIAL TERRESTRIAL OPERATIONS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall not permit commercial terrestrial operations in the 1525–1559 megahertz band or the 1626.5–1660.5 megahertz band until the date that is 90 days after the Commission resolves concerns of widespread harmful interference by such operations in such band to covered GPS devices.

“(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the conclusion of the proceeding on such operations in such band, the Commission shall submit to the congressional committees described in paragraph (2) official copies of the documents containing the final decision of the Commission regarding whether to permit such operations in such band. If the decision is to permit such operations in such band, such documents shall contain or be accompanied by an explanation of how the concerns described in subsection (a) have been resolved.

“(2) CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DESCRIBED.—The congressional committees described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

“(B) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

“(c) COVERED GPS DEVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered GPS device’ means a Global Position System device of the Department of Defense.”.

(b) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REVIEW OF HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the date referred to in paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review to—

(A) assess the ability of covered GPS devices to receive signals from Global Positioning System satellites without widespread harmful interference; and

(B) determine if commercial communications services are causing or will cause widespread harmful interference with covered GPS devices.

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—

(A) NOTICE.—If the Secretary of Defense determines during a review under paragraph (1) that commercial communications services are causing or will cause widespread harmful interference with covered GPS devices, the Secretary shall promptly submit to the congressional defense committees notice of such interference.

(B) CONTENTS.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a list and description of the covered GPS devices that are being or expected to be interfered with by commercial communications services;

(ii) a description of the source of, and the entity causing or expect to cause, the interference with such receivers;

(iii) a description of the manner in which such source or such entity is causing or expected to cause such interference;

(iv) a description of the magnitude of harm caused or expected to be caused by such interference;

(v) a description of the duration of and the conditions and circumstances under which such interference is occurring or expected to occur;

(vi) a description of the impact of such interference on the national security interests of the United States; and

(vii) a description of the plans of the Secretary to address, alleviate, or mitigate such interference, including the cost of such plans.

(C) FORM.—The notice required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) TERMINATION DATE.—The date referred to in this paragraph is the earlier of—

(A) the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date on which the Secretary—

(i) determines that commercial communications services are not causing any widespread harmful interference with covered GPS devices; and

(ii) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees notice of the termination made under clause (i).

(c) COVERED GPS DEVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered GPS device” means a Global Position System device of the Department of Defense.

(d) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1534) is repealed.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF GEORGIA

Page 269, line 7, insert “including small business pharmacies,” after “retail pharmacy”.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle D of title VII add the following:

SEC. . DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STUDIES ON PREVENTING THE DIVERSION OF OPIOID MEDICATIONS.

(a) STUDIES.—With respect to programs of the Department of Defense that dispense drugs to patients, the Secretary of Defense (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall study the feasibility, the effectiveness in preventing the diversion of opioid medications, and the cost-effectiveness of—

(1) requiring that such programs, in appropriate cases, dispense opioid medications in vials using affordable technologies designed to prevent access to the medications by anyone other than the intended patient, such as a vial with a locking-cap closure mechanism; and

(2) the Secretary providing education on the risks of opioid medications to individuals for whom such medications are prescribed, and to their families, with special consideration given to raising awareness among adolescents on such risks.

(b) FEEDBACK.—In conducting the studies under subsection (a), the Secretary shall seek feedback (on a confidential basis when appropriate) from the individuals and entities involved in the studies.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the results of the studies conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 810A. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ENHANCED TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPED AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORIES.

Section 801(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 804; 10 U.S.C. 2514 note) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2021”.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. JENKINS OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR NATIONAL GUARD COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAMS.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1404 for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense-wide is hereby increased by \$30,000,000 (to be used in support of the National Guard counter-drug programs).

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated for in section 101 for procurement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aircraft Procurement, Navy, for Common Ground Equipment (Line 064), is hereby reduced by \$20,000,000; and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for advanced component development and prototypes, Advanced Innovative Technologies (Line 095) is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 372, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1014. FUNDING FOR COUNTER NARCOTICS OPERATIONS.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501 is hereby increased by \$3,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for administration and servicewide activities, Defense Logistics Agency (Line 160) is hereby reduced by \$3,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

Page 372, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 1014. REPORT ON EFFORTS OF UNITED STATES SOUTHERN COMMAND OPERATION TO DETECT AND MONITOR DRUG TRAFFICKING.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the effectiveness of the United States Southern Command Operation to limit threats to the national security of the United States by detecting and monitoring drug trafficking, specifically heroin and fentanyl.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle F of title X (page 423, before line 4), add the following new section:
SEC. 1070. QUARTERLY REPORTS ON PARACHUTE JUMPS CONDUCTED AT FORT BRAGG AND POPE ARMY AIRFIELD AND AIR FORCE SUPPORT FOR SUCH JUMPS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Until January 31, 2020, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate quarterly reports—

(1) specifying the number of parachute jumps conducted at Fort Bragg and Pope Army Airfield, North Carolina, during the three-month period covered by the report; and

(2) describing and evaluating the level of air support provided by the Air Force for those jumps.

(b) JOINT AIRBORNE AIR TRANSPORTABILITY TRAINING CONTRACTS.—As part of each report submitted under subsection (a), the Secretaries shall specifically provide the following:

(1) The number of Joint Airborne Air Transportability Training contracts requested during the three-month period covered by the report by all units located at Fort Bragg and Pope Army Airfield.

(2) The number of Joint Airborne Air Transportability Training contracts validated during the three-month period covered by the report for units located at Fort Bragg and Pope Army Airfield.

(3) The number of Joint Airborne Air Transportability Training contracts not validated during the three-month period covered by the report for units located at Fort Bragg and Pope Army Airfield.

(4) In the case of each Joint Airborne Air Transportability Training contract identified pursuant to paragraph (3), the reason the contract was not validated.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 462, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1098. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND PREPAREDNESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States Northern Command plays a crucial role in providing additional

response capability to State and local governments in domestic disaster relief and consequence management operations;

(2) the United States Northern Command must continue to build upon its current efforts to develop command strategies, leadership training, and response plans to effectively work with civil authorities when acting as the lead agency or a supporting agency; and

(3) the United States Northern Command should leverage whenever possible training and management expertise that resides within the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private sector businesses and academic institutions to enhance—

(A) its defense support to civil authorities and incidence management missions;

(B) relationships with other entities involved in disaster response; and

(C) its ability to respond to unforeseen events.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

At the end of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1098. COST OF WARS.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service and the Director of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, shall post on the public Web site of the Department of Defense the costs, including the relevant legacy costs, to each American taxpayer of each of the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO OF GUAM

Page 462, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1098. WORKFORCE ISSUES FOR RELOCATION OF MARINES TO GUAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled “A Joint Resolution to approve the ‘Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union With the United States of America’, and for other purposes”, approved March 24, 1976 (48 U.S.C. 1806(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS FOR NON-IMMIGRANT WORKERS.—An alien, if otherwise qualified, may seek admission to Guam or to the Commonwealth during the transition program as a nonimmigrant worker under section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)) without counting against the numerical limitations set forth in section 214(g) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)). An alien, if otherwise qualified, may, before October 1, 2028, be admitted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of such Act for a period of up to 3 years (which may be extended by the Secretary of Homeland Security before October 1, 2028, for an additional period or periods not to exceed 3 years each) to perform services or labor on Guam pursuant to any agreement entered into by a prime contractor or subcontractor calling for services or labor required for performance of the contract or subcontract in direct support of all military-funded construction, repairs, renovation, and facilities services, or to perform services or labor on Guam as a health-care worker, notwithstanding the requirement of such section that the service or labor be temporary. This subsection does not apply to any employment to be performed outside of Guam or the Commonwealth.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 462, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1098. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEBT COLLECTION REGULATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review and update Department of Defense regulations to ensure such regulations comply with Federal consumer protection law with respect to the collection of debt.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 480, before line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1112. PUBLIC-PRIVATE TALENT EXCHANGE.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1105 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1599g. Public-private talent exchange

“(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary may, with the agreement of a private-sector organization and the consent of the employee, arrange for the temporary assignment of an employee to such private-sector organization, or from such private-sector organization to a Department of Defense organization under this section.

“(b) AGREEMENTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide for a written agreement among the Department of Defense, the private-sector organization, and the employee concerned regarding the terms and conditions of the employee’s assignment under this section. The agreement—

“(A) shall require that the employee of the Department of Defense, upon completion of the assignment, will serve in the Department of Defense, or elsewhere in the civil service if approved by the Secretary, for a period equal to the length of the assignment; and

“(B) shall provide that if the employee of the Department of Defense or of the private-sector organization (as the case may be) fails to carry out the agreement, such employee shall be liable to the United States for payment of all expenses of the assignment, unless that failure was for good and sufficient reason, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

“(2) An amount for which an employee is liable under paragraph (1) shall be treated as a debt due the United States.

“(3) The Secretary may waive, in whole or in part, collection of a debt described in paragraph (2) based on a determination that the collection would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interests of the United States, after taking into account any indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee.

“(c) TERMINATION.—An assignment under this section may, at any time and for any reason, be terminated by the Department of Defense or the private-sector organization concerned.

“(d) DURATION.—An assignment under this section shall be for a period of not less than 3 months and not more than one year, renewable up to a total of 4 years. No employee of the Department of Defense may be assigned under this section for more than a total of 4 years inclusive of all such assignments.

“(e) STATUS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED TO PRIVATE-SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS.—An employee of the Department of Defense who is assigned to a private-sector organization under this section shall be considered, during the period of assignment, to be on detail to a regular work assignment in the Department for all purposes. The written agreement established under subsection (b)(1) shall address the specific terms and conditions related to the employee’s continued status as a Federal employee.

“(f) TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR PRIVATE-SECTOR EMPLOYEES.—An employee of a private-sector organization who is assigned to a Department of Defense organization under this section—

“(1) shall continue to receive pay and benefits from the private-sector organization from which such employee is assigned and shall not receive pay or benefits from the Department of Defense, except as provided in paragraph (2);

“(2) is deemed to be an employee of the Department of Defense for the purposes of—

“(A) chapters 73 and 81 of title 5;

“(B) sections 201, 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, 603, 606, 607, 643, 654, 1905, and 1913 of title 18;

“(C) sections 1343, 1344, and 1349(b) of title 31;

“(D) the Federal Tort Claims Act and any other Federal tort liability statute;

“(E) the Ethics in Government Act of 1978; and

“(F) chapter 21 of title 41;

“(3) shall not have access to any trade secrets or to any other nonpublic information which is of commercial value to the private-sector organization from which such employee is assigned.

“(g) PROHIBITION AGAINST CHARGING CERTAIN COSTS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—A private-sector organization may not charge the Department of any other agency of the Federal Government, as direct or indirect costs under a Federal contract, the costs of pay or benefits paid by the organization to an employee assigned to a Department organization under this section for the period of the assignment.

“(h) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Defense—

“(1) shall ensure that, of the assignments made under this section each year, at least 20 percent are from small business concerns (as defined by section 3703(e)(2)(A) of title 5);

“(2) shall take into consideration the question of how assignments under this section might best be used to help meet the needs of the Department of Defense with respect to the training of employees; and

“(3) shall take into consideration, where applicable, areas of particular private sector expertise, such as cybersecurity.”.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter, as amended by section 1105 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1599g. Public-private talent exchange.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does one thing: it maintains oversight and accountability of the Air Force. This will ensure that the Air Force follows through on their promise of providing adequate air support to ensure there is no negative impact on the readiness of Fort Bragg paratroopers.

I have said this is a terrible decision, and today's amendment is about holding the Air Force accountable. It will require the Secretary of the Army and the Air Force to evaluate and to report the levels of air support provided to Fort Bragg by the Air Force. As the

Representative of Fort Bragg, this will allow me to monitor jump numbers and ensure military readiness is not jeopardized in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, thank my HASC colleague across the aisle, ETC Chairman WILSON from the great State of South Carolina, for working with me on this bipartisan amendment to expand talent exchange authorities within the DOD.

This amendment addresses a key challenge facing the Department, which is competition with the private sector to recruit and retain highly skilled talent.

As we understand right now, it is exceptionally competitive in, for example, the IT and cybersecurity fields. We need to be able to retain, attract, and recruit the best and the brightest in this field, particularly because salaries are very high and it is very difficult in many ways for the DOD to compete in this space.

While we are very grateful, of course, for those who devote their lives to a military career, not everyone will give 20 or 30 years of their lives to the U.S. military. But there is certainly no shortage of patriotism across the private sector, and dedicating several months or years of their lives to our national security is certainly a worthy endeavor.

This also gives DOD employees exposure to cutting-edge operational techniques and best practices across a wide array of disciplines, while giving private sector employees insight into how the Department operates.

Mr. Chairman, we must ensure that we are recruiting the best and the brightest in order to uphold our national defenses.

This amendment has been sought after by the DOD. Again, there is bipartisan support on this amendment. It gives great flexibility to the Department to be able to work to bring in people of great talent from the private sector for a period of time. Again, it also allows the DOD to have our men and women in uniform go to the private sector for a time and learn best practices and what cutting-edge techniques and capabilities are happening in the private sector.

So this is a good, commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in this very important endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment package, which includes my amendment that clarifies that the pilot program for prescription drug acquisition costs regarding TRICARE pharmacy benefits will also include small business pharmacies.

Currently, the pilot program helps extend discounts to TRICARE beneficiaries for prescription drugs filled at retail pharmacies. My amendment simply clarifies that small business pharmacies are retail pharmacies and will be included in this pilot program.

In many cases around the country, people are unlimited when it comes to which pharmacy they can have their preparations filled at. With this amendment, we can ensure all pharmacies, both large and small retailers, will be included in this pilot program.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment package.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to refer back to an amendment that was in the previous en bloc that dealt with the special immigrant visas.

I want to express my appreciation to the committee, the chairman, the ranking member, and to the staff. This is a complicated issue. It is in your bill, but it is not entirely within your jurisdiction. And there has been an ebb and flow. It has been something that I have, as you know, been working on for a decade, and that is for the United States to keep faith with the people in Afghanistan who made the mission possible—the people who literally risked their lives as guides, construction workers, interpreters, and truck drivers—the men and women who made it possible for us to succeed.

It isn't just the Department of Defense. There are men and women who worked with the State Department and USAID, which are an important part of our activities in those countries. Those foreign nationals are every bit at risk as somebody who is guiding our troops in the field.

I appreciate your willingness to put in the en bloc amendment a little bit of flexibility. I hope it is not the last word, because we need to think seriously about what we do for the people who work on base, people who work for the State Department, and the people who work for USAID so that we are able to make sure that we have an adequate number of visas and that we don't have an arbitrarily short period of time because the pipeline has been hopelessly complex and flawed.

We have been working with the bureaucracy in trying to make it work better, but that is an ongoing struggle. And the fact is, there are different people with different committees who have different orientations.

I hope that this en bloc amendment is just the start and that we can continue working with the chairman, with the minority party, with the staff, and with the advocates and various people who are committed to making sure that we do right by the people who are at risk now of being killed, murdered, tortured, and having family members killed.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished

gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina is a proud, strong military State. We are proud of the men and women who answer the call and risk their lives to protect us. I never, ever want them to be in a fair fight. I want them to always have the tools, the equipment, and the training needed to dominate and destroy the enemy. That is why I filed an amendment with my colleague, RENEE ELLMERS, to protect training of paratroopers at Fort Bragg, the epicenter of the universe.

As you may know, the Air Force has moved forward with plans to deactivate the 440th Airlift Wing. This deactivation puts these young paratroopers, and indeed our very national security, at risk, as evidenced by the failure of the Air Force to meet current training requirements.

For the sake of our national security, this amendment is absolutely critical to hold the Air Force accountable and to ensure our rapid reaction forces are prepared for deployment at a moment's notice.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the bipartisan amendment I have co-written with my colleague, Judge TED POE of Texas.

The amendment, which is part of the en bloc amendments, endorses an ongoing effort at the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to develop a comprehensive framework for the assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of security cooperation activities of the Department of Defense. It follows a related monitoring evaluation amendment Judge POE and I offered to the NDAA for FY 2016 and the committee retained, gratefully, in the 2017 bill.

Security cooperation with foreign security forces builds valuable international partnerships and enhances the ability of our partners to carry out joint military operations and enhances American security while it is at it. However, few requirements are placed on these programs to measure the impact of funding provided to our foreign security partners. Looking at efficacy, does it work?

Judge POE and I have led the effort to apply assessment, monitoring, and evaluation leading principles to U.S. foreign assistance administered by the State Department, USAID, and other Federal agencies.

Last year, the House of Representatives passed our bill, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability, H.R. 3766. We should have a similar expectation of accountability for our security cooperation programs as well.

I welcome the committee's bipartisan efforts to begin to reform, consolidate, and modify the more than 120 security cooperation authorities Congress has provided DOD over the years.

Notably, the underlying bill strengthens country-by-country re-

porting requirements for security cooperation and begins to reorganize security cooperation authorities into one coherent separate section of title X of the U.S. Code.

Furthermore, the Senate is advancing an NDAA bill that requires DOD to produce an annual budget justification for security cooperation funding.

There is obviously significant demand, Mr. Chairman, for more transparency and accountability in terms of U.S. security cooperation. Our amendment is consistent with that demand, and it builds on the great work done by the committee in this area to define clear objectives and metrics for security cooperation.

I want to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and both committee staffs, minority and majority, for their excellent work and for their bipartisan approach to this and so many other issues in the bill.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, and I want to thank the chairman for including it in the en bloc package.

My amendment increases funding for U.S. NORTHCOM's Joint Task Force North by \$3 million to assist with its counternarcotics operations.

As part of my work as the chair of the Task Force to Combat the Heroin Epidemic, I traveled to the Mexican border earlier this spring to investigate sources of illegal fentanyl and heroin coming into the country. There I learned and had the opportunity to meet with the commanding officers at the Joint Task Force North, the joint service command that supports Federal law enforcement agencies with resources to identify and interdict criminal activities conducted within the United States and its borders.

My goal is to ensure that Joint Task Force North receives the funding necessary to continue their counternarcotics efforts.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and the Armed Services Committee for their work on the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I also thank the chairman of the full committee, the ranking member of the full committee, and the subcommittee chairs as well.

I serve on the Homeland Security Committee, and I am constantly aware of the overlapping duties and responsibilities, Mr. Chairman, of the United States military, which has its confinement in certain areas, but also working to secure the homeland.

The Jackson Lee amendment No. 64 in en bloc amendment No. 4 makes an

important contribution to the bill by improving the effectiveness of U.S. Northern Command, or NORTHCOM, in fulfilling its critical mission of protecting the U.S. homeland in the event of war and to provide support to local, State, and Federal authorities in times of national emergency.

Specifically, here is what my amendment does. It develops and has in place a leadership strategy that will strengthen and foster necessary institutional and interpersonal relationships with State and local governments. The backbone of securing the homeland is engaging State and local governments. Also, to develop an instructional program to train key personnel how to lead effectively in the event of a disaster when they do not have command authority to dictate actions.

□ 1830

In addition, NORTHCOM, which was established in 2002 in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, is to bring the capabilities and the resources of the U.S. military to the assistance the American people during a catastrophic disaster like war or a pandemic outbreak of diseases, such as Ebola, Zika, SARS, or influenza; major earthquakes, floods, and natural disasters; or terrorist attacks.

I live in the Gulf Coast, and I am well familiar with hurricanes, enormous rains that we have just experienced, needing to bring to bear moving large numbers of people, housing large numbers of people.

And then this morning I spent time after time of dealing with the Zika virus, which, again, our southern Gulf Coast region may be the epicenter.

Let me quote, for example, a quote from a renowned professor, Leonard Marcus, out of Harvard. What we are trying to do is: "Effective emergency preparedness and response requires leadership that can accomplish perceptible coordination and communication amongst diverse agencies . . ."

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The challenge is, as we learned from 9/11, "operating within their specified scope of authority, preparedness leaders in characteristic bureaucratic fashion often serve to bolster the profile and import of their own organization, thereby creating a silo effect . . ."

So let me speak as that Homeland Security member and the person who has been engaged in the crises or disasters in my own community. When we collaborate we work better together. When we develop relationships, we work better together.

Let me just offer a moment of personal privilege as someone speaking about relationships. This bill has many good elements in it, and I am propelled

and committed to diversity and respecting all people.

I am saddened by the language that the Russell amendment has dealing with the LGBT, and I am saddened that the Dent amendment was not allowed in. We need to build on collaborating with all people to secure America and to make a better military.

I thank the gentleman for the support of my amendment in the en bloc.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of En Bloc Amendment Number 4 to H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, offered by Chairman THORNBERRY.

I want to express my thanks and appreciation to Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH, and their colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for their work thank on this bill and their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces.

I also thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER of the Rules Committee for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 64, which is included in En Bloc Amendment Number 4.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 64 makes an important contribution to the bill by improving the effectiveness of the Northern Command ("NORTHCOM") in fulfilling its critical mission of protecting the U.S. homeland in event of war and to provide support to local, state, and federal authorities in times of national emergency.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 64 encourages NORTHCOM to:

1. Develop and has in place a leadership strategy that will strengthen and foster necessary institutional and interpersonal relationships with state and local governments; and

2. Develop an instructional program to train key personnel how to lead effectively in the event of a disaster when they do not have command authority to dictate actions.

A mission critical function of NORTHCOM, which was established in 2002 in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks is to bring the capabilities and the resources of the U.S. military to the assistance of the American people during a catastrophic disaster like war, a pandemic outbreak of diseases such Ebola, Zika, Sars, or influenza; major earthquakes, floods, and natural disasters; or terrorist attacks like those occurring on September 11, 2001 and at the Boston Marathon on April 15, 2013.

NORTHCOM leaders will be much more effective in saving lives, protecting assets, and enhancing resilience after the disaster has occurred if they are trained in the techniques of effective engagement with civilian leadership.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 64 will help ensure that such training will be available.

Mr. Chair, let me explain why this type of training—commonly referred to as "Resilience" training is very important.

As stated in a highly influential journal article by Professor Leonard Marcus and his colleagues at Harvard's National Public Leadership Initiative, "effective emergency preparedness and response requires leadership that can accomplish perceptive coordination and communication amongst diverse agencies and sectors." (Leonard J. Marcus, Barry C. Dorn, and Joseph M. Henderson, *Meta-Leadership and National Emergency Preparedness: A Model to Build Government Connectivity, in Biosecurity And Bioterrorism: Biodefense*

Strategy, Practice, And Science Volume 4, Number 2, 2006).

The challenge is, as we learned from the 9/11 Commission, operating within their specified scope of authority, preparedness leaders in characteristic bureaucratic fashion often serve to bolster the profile and import of their own organization, thereby creating a silo effect that interferes with effective system wide planning and response.

Resilience training seeks to equip preparedness leaders overcome this obstacle of "traditional silo thinking by teaching "meta-leadership," a new type of overarching leadership that intentionally connects the purposes and work of different organizations or organizational units.

Meta-leadership training enables leaders to provide guidance, direction, and momentum across organizational lines that develop into a shared course of action and a commonality of purpose among people and agencies that are doing what may appear to be very different work.

Meta-leaders have the skill and training to imaginatively and effectively leverage system assets, information, and capacities, which a particularly critical function for organizations with emergency preparedness responsibilities like responding to terrorist attacks, natural disasters, or pandemic outbreaks of infectious diseases like the Ebola and the Zika Virus, which may disproportionately affect persons in the Gulf Coast region, including my congressional district in Houston, Texas.

As a senior and charter member of the Homeland Security Committee, and the Ranking Member of Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I have spent the better part of the last decade and a half working to craft policies and provide the resources, personnel, equipment, and funding needed to protect the security of our homeland and the American people.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 64 will help ensure that those responsible for providing leadership in times of national emergency have the skills and training to prevent, mitigate, or recover from any major catastrophe, disaster, or tragedy that could befall our nation.

I urge my colleagues to support En Bloc Amendment Number 64 and thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for including Jackson Lee Amendment Number 64 in this important measure.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of two amendments I offered to this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

The amendment we are currently considering requires the DOD to report on the effectiveness of efforts to detect and monitor drug trafficking, specifically heroin and fentanyl, which is devastating my home State of Michigan and the entire country.

The United States Southern Command is already doing important work to interdict drug runners and provide needed training to counternarcotic teams in Central America.

My amendment would help quantify those efforts and see what more can be

done to combat the heroin and fentanyl coming from this region.

The second bipartisan amendment, which we will consider later today, requires DOD to verify it has sufficient access to Afghan accounts to guarantee effective audits.

It is important that our military has access to financial information to protect U.S. funds from waste, fraud, and abuse, and ensure taxpayer resources are being spent effectively.

I appreciate these amendments being included in bloc. I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, and I thank the chairman for including it in the next en bloc amendment, one that brings accountability to countries granting consent to Russian naval vessels calling into port.

The aggressive posture and actions of the Russian Federation over the last few years has profoundly changed the global landscape. Russia has invaded Crimea, and currently still occupies that region. And Russia directly intervened militarily to shore up the Assad regime in Syria.

The common thread that runs through these two interventions is that of warm water ports for the Russian navy. Crimea's port in Sevastopol and Syria's port of Tartus provide Russia with access to the warm waters of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, waters that are essential to Russia's reach of aggression.

Despite these aggressive actions, some countries are accommodating the Russian navy by allowing warships and submarines to call into their ports.

Spain, although a cherished NATO ally, grants Russia access to the ports in its enclaves across the strategically important Strait of Gibraltar, where the United Kingdom has a Permanent Joint Operating Base that hosts U.S. ships.

Furthermore, Greece and Malta have hosted Russian warships last year. The recent high-profile visits to Cuba, Venezuela, and Nicaragua by Russia's navy in recent years are also cause for concern.

Mr. Chairman, governments across the globe should be isolating the Russian navy, not accommodating it.

The Russian navy must constantly compete with geographic and strategic disadvantages of lacking access to warm blue waters of the world, but these disadvantages are forfeited when we lack a cohesive, unified effort to deny Russian vessels the ability to call into foreign ports.

With the inclusion of this amendment, the Secretary of Defense will have to report to Congress and, thus, the American people on these instances. And I hope governments will think twice before offering up their ports to Putin's navy.

I urge support of the underlying bill as well.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of amendment No. 74 in the en bloc, the Blumenauer Special Immigrant Visa amendment. I just want to speak to the program broadly and quickly.

In Afghanistan, countless people put their lives on the line to serve as translators, basically being the middle person between American troops and the population we are trying to secure.

Now, we promised them opportunity to come into the United States, but this process has been bogged down by bureaucracy. In fact, many have been in this process for years, and still in the first steps because of the bureaucracy on this.

Unfortunately, today, actually, many Afghans are being killed every day by the Taliban, by ISIS, by al Qaeda, as a result of having worked with us.

I want to thank Representative MOULTON and Representative BLUMENAUER for their work on this. This is a bipartisan issue, and one that I think we ought to take very seriously, keeping our commitment to those that help us, because there will be a war again some day, and we ought to be able to maintain the trust of the population we are there to secure.

So I thank Mr. BLUMENAUER for putting this amendment in, and I thank the chairman for accepting it.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I just think it is important to pause for a second and just think about what has just happened here. We have had a package of amendments that have been discussed, about an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. They have talked about very important issues and contributions that they have made, but if a Member then votes against final passage of the bill, the contributions are nullified.

And I think it is just important to step back and just reiterate that all of us have provisions in this bill we agree with and disagree with. We place different values on different parts of the bill. But what has happened before is that Members have put aside some personal differences and still paid attention to the larger purpose of the bill, which is to support the men and women who serve our country. I hope that can happen again.

However proud Members may be of the various provisions—and there are a lot of good provisions from both sides of the aisle—however proud they may be of those, if you don't support the final bill, you are not accomplishing very much.

I hope Members not only will support this en bloc package, but the final measure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 68, 70, 74, 77, and 82 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1070. BRIEFING ON REAL PROPERTY INVENTORY.

(a) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the status of the Installation Geospatial Information and Services of the Department of Defense as it relates to the real property inventory of the Department, and the extent to which the Department has made use of the cadastral geographic information systems-based real property inventory.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The briefing required by subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, cover the following:

(1) The status of current policies of the Department governing real property inventories and the use of geospatial information systems, the status of real property inventory in relation to the financial improvement and audit readiness efforts of the Department, and the status of implementation of Department of Defense Instruction 8130.01, Installation Geospatial Information and Services (IGI&S).

(2) The extent to which the Department is coordinating with the Federal Geographic Data Committee, other Federal agencies, and State and local governments, and how existing Department standards and common protocols ensure that the interoperability of geospatial information complies with section 216 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note) and Executive Orders 12906 and 13327.

(3) The existing real property inventories systems or any components of any cadastre currently authorized by law or conducted by the Department of Defense, the statutory authorization for such inventories or components, and the amount expended by the Federal Government for each such activity in fiscal year 2015.

(4) A discussion of the Department's ability to make this information publicly available on the Internet in a graphically geo-enabled and searchable format, and how the Department plans to prevent the disclosure of any parcel or parcels of land, any buildings or facilities on any such parcel, or any information related to any such parcel, building, or facility, if such disclosure would impair or jeopardize the national security or homeland defense of the United States.

(5) Any additional topics identified by the Secretary.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL OF OKLAHOMA

Page 423, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1071. REPORT ON ADJUSTMENT AND DIVERSIFICATION ASSISTANCE.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a briefing on the adjustment and diversification assistance authorized by subsections (b) and (c) of section 2391 of title 10, United States Code. Such briefing shall include each of the following:

(1) A description of the activities and programs currently being conducted under subsections (b)(1) and (c) of such section, including a list of the recipients of grants, and amount received by each recipient, of such activities and programs in each of the five most recent fiscal years.

(2) For each of the five fiscal years preceding the fiscal year during which the briefing is conducted, separate estimates of the funding the Department of Defense has directed to activities under each of clauses (A) through (E) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and under subsection (c) of such section and the recipients of such funding.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 542, after line 6, insert before "Such" the following: "The number and type of transient Russian naval vessels that have utilized ports of the country."

Page 542, line 8, insert before "and" the following: ", including the use of ports of such country by transient Russian naval vessels,".

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF IOWA

Insert at the end of subtitle F of title X the following:

SEC. 1070. BRIEFING ON THE PROTECTION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the efforts of the Department of Defense to protect the personally identifiable information of members of the Armed Forces and their families, and of employees of the Department of Defense, which shall include—

(1) current and planned initiatives to protect the personally identifying information of members of the Armed Forces and their families, and employees of the Department of Defense;

(2) the challenges encountered in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1); and

(3) any trends related to fraudulent activity that targets the personally identifying information of members of the Armed Forces or their families, or employees of the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 462, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1098. IMPORTANCE OF ROLE PLAYED BY WOMEN IN WORLD WAR II.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) National Rosie the Riveter Day is a collective national effort to raise awareness of the 16 million women working during World War II.

(2) Americans have chosen to honor female workers who contributed on the home front during World War II.

(3) These women left their homes to work or volunteer full-time in factories, farms, shipyards, airplane factories, banks, and other institutions in support of the military overseas.

(4) These women worked with the USO and Red Cross, drove trucks, riveted airplane parts, collected critical materials, rolled bandages, and served on rationing boards.

(5) It is fitting and proper to recognize and preserve the history and legacy of working women, including volunteer women, during World War II to promote cooperation and fellowship among such women and their descendants.

(6) These women and their descendants wish to further the advancement of patriotic ideas, excellence in the workplace, and loyalty to the United States of America.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress acknowledges the important role played by women in World War II.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. FORBES OF VIRGINIA

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

SEC. 1098. RECOVERY OF EXCESS RIFLES, AMMUNITION, AND PARTS GRANTED TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND TRANSFER TO CERTAIN PERSONS.

(a) RECOVERY.—Subchapter II of chapter 407 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 40728A the following new section:

“§ 40728B. Recovery of excess rifles, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries and transfer to certain persons

“(a) AUTHORITY TO RECOVER.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army may acquire from any person any rifle, ammunition, repair parts, or other supplies described in section 40731(a) of this title which were—

“(A) provided to any country on a grant basis under the conditions imposed by section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314) that became excess to the needs of such country; and

“(B) lawfully acquired by such person.

“(2) The Secretary of the Army may not acquire anything under paragraph (1) except for transfer to a person in the United States under subsection (c).

“(3) The Secretary of the Army may accept rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or other supplies under paragraph (1) notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31.

“(b) COST OF RECOVERY.—The Secretary of the Army may not acquire anything under subsection (a) if the United States would incur any cost for such acquisition.

“(c) AVAILABILITY FOR TRANSFER.—Any rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies acquired under subsection (a) shall be available for transfer in the United States to the person from whom acquired if such person—

“(1) is licensed as a manufacturer, importer, or dealer pursuant to section 923(a) of title 18; and

“(2) uses an ammunition depot of the Army that is an eligible facility for receipt of any rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies under this paragraph.

“(d) CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (k) of section 2304 of title 10, the Secretary may enter into such contracts or cooperative agreements on a sole source basis pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (c) of such section to carry out this section.

“(e) AECA.—Transfers authorized under this section may only be made in accordance with applicable provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778).

“(f) RIFLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘rifle’ has the meaning given such term in section 921 of title 18.”

(b) SALE.—Section 40732 of such title is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) SALES BY OTHER PERSONS.—A person who receives a rifle or any ammunition, re-

pair parts, or supplies under section 40728B(c) of this title may sell, at fair market value, such rifle, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies. With respect to rifles other than caliber .22 rimfire and caliber .30 rifles, the seller shall obtain a license as a dealer in rifles and abide by all requirements imposed on persons licensed under chapter 44 of title 18, including maintaining acquisition and disposition records, and conducting background checks.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the heading, by inserting “BY THE CORPORATION” after “LIMITATION ON SALES”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 407 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 40728A the following new item:

“40728B. Recovery of excess rifles, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries and transfer to certain persons.”

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF INDIANA

At the end of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1098. PROJECT MANAGEMENT.

(a) DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT.—

(1) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—Section 503 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to the direction and approval of the Director, the Deputy Director for Management or a designee shall—

“(A) adopt governmentwide standards, policies, and guidelines for program and project management for executive agencies;

“(B) oversee implementation of program and project management for the standards, policies, and guidelines established under subparagraph (A);

“(C) chair the Program Management Policy Council established under section 1126(b);

“(D) establish standards and policies for executive agencies, consistent with widely accepted standards for program and project management planning and delivery;

“(E) engage with the private sector to identify best practices in program and project management that would improve Federal program and project management;

“(F) conduct portfolio reviews to address programs identified as high risk by the Government Accountability Office;

“(G) not less than annually, conduct portfolio reviews of agency programs in coordination with Project Management Improvement Officers designated under section 1126(a)(1) to assess the quality and effectiveness of program management; and

“(H) establish a 5-year strategic plan for program and project management.

“(2) APPLICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense to the extent that the provisions of that paragraph are substantially similar to or duplicative of—

“(A) the provisions of chapter 87 of title 10; or

“(B) policy, guidance, or instruction of the Department related to program management.”

(2) DEADLINE FOR STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue the standards, policies, and guidelines required under section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the standards, policies, and guidelines are issued under paragraph (2), the Deputy Director for Manage-

ment of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Program Management Policy Council established under section 1126(b) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1), and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall issue any regulations as are necessary to implement the requirements of section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(b) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1126. Program Management Improvement Officers and Program Management Policy Council

“(a) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—The head of each agency described in section 901(b) shall designate a senior executive of the agency as the Program Management Improvement Officer of the agency.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Program Management Improvement Officer of an agency designated under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) implement program management policies established by the agency under section 503(c); and

“(B) develop a strategy for enhancing the role of program managers within the agency that includes the following:

“(i) Enhanced training and educational opportunities for program managers that shall include—

“(I) training in the relevant competencies encompassed with program and project manager within the private sector for program managers; and

“(II) training that emphasizes cost containment for large projects and programs.

“(ii) Mentoring of current and future program managers by experienced senior executives and program managers within the agency.

“(iii) Improved career paths and career opportunities for program managers.

“(iv) A plan to encourage the recruitment and retention of highly qualified individuals to serve as program managers.

“(v) Improved means of collecting and disseminating best practices and lessons learned to enhance program management across the agency.

“(vi) Common templates and tools to support improved data gathering and analysis for program management and oversight purposes.

“(3) APPLICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—This subsection shall not apply to the Department of Defense to the extent that the provisions of this subsection are substantially similar to or duplicative of the provisions of chapter 87 of title 10. For purposes of paragraph (1), the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (or a designee of the Under Secretary) shall be considered the Program Management Improvement Officer.

“(b) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT POLICY COUNCIL.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of Management and Budget a council to be known as the ‘Program Management Policy Council’ (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Council’).

“(2) PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall act as the principal interagency forum for improving agency practices related to program and project management. The Council shall—

“(A) advise and assist the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(B) review programs identified as high risk by the General Accountability Office and make recommendations for actions to be taken by the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget or a designee;

“(C) discuss topics of importance to the workforce, including—

“(i) career development and workforce development needs;

“(ii) policy to support continuous improvement in program and project management; and

“(iii) major challenges across agencies in managing programs;

“(D) advise on the development and applicability of standards governmentwide for program management transparency; and

“(E) review the information published on the website of the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to section 1122.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of the following members:

“(i) Five members from the Office of Management and Budget as follows:

“(I) The Deputy Director for Management.

“(II) The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

“(III) The Administrator of Federal Procurement Policy.

“(IV) The Controller of the Office of Federal Financial Management.

“(V) The Director of the Office of Performance and Personnel Management.

“(ii) The Program Management Improvement Officer from each agency described in section 901(b).

“(iii) Other individuals as determined appropriate by the Chairperson.

“(B) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget shall be the Chairperson of the Council. A Vice Chairperson shall be elected by the members and shall serve a term of not more than 1 year.

“(ii) DUTIES.—The Chairperson shall preside at the meetings of the Council, determine the agenda of the Council, direct the work of the Council, and establish and direct subgroups of the Council as appropriate.

“(4) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet not less than twice per fiscal year and may meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Council.

“(5) SUPPORT.—The head of each agency with a Project Management Improvement Officer serving on the Council shall provide administrative support to the Council, as appropriate, at the request of the Chairperson.

“(6) COMMITTEE DURATION.—Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Council.”.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with each Program Management Improvement Officer designated under section 1126(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, shall submit to Congress a report containing the strategy developed under section 1126(a)(2)(B) of such title, as added by paragraph (1).

(c) PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL STANDARDS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “agency” means each agency described in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, other than the Department of Defense.

(2) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the standards, policies, and guidelines are issued under section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of

the Office of Management and Budget, shall issue regulations that—

(A) identify key skills and competencies needed for a program and project manager in an agency;

(B) establish a new job series, or update and improve an existing job series, for program and project management within an agency; and

(C) establish a new career path for program and project managers within an agency.

(d) GAO REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICIES ON PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office shall issue, in conjunction with the High Risk list of the Government Accountability Office, a report examining the effectiveness of the following on improving Federal program and project management:

(1) The standards, policies, and guidelines for program and project management issued under section 503(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1).

(2) The 5-year strategic plan established under section 503(c)(1)(H) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1).

(3) Program Management Improvement Officers designated under section 1126(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1).

(4) The Program Management Policy Council established under section 1126(b)(1) of title 31, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(1).

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

In section 1101—

(1) in subsection (a), insert “or as a military technician (dual status)” after “Base”; and

(2) amend subsection (c) to read as follows: (c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “defense industrial base facility” means any Department of Defense depot, arsenal, or shipyard located within the United States; and

(2) the term “military technician (dual status)” has the meaning given such term in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AN ASSESSMENT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR SECURITY COOPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should develop and maintain an assessment, monitoring, and evaluation framework for security cooperation with foreign countries to ensure accountability and foster implementation of best practices; and

(2) such framework—

(A) should be consistent with interagency approaches and existing best practices;

(B) should be sufficiently resourced and appropriately placed within the Department of Defense to enable the rigorous examination and measurement of security cooperation efforts towards meeting stated objectives and outcomes; and

(C) should be used to inform security cooperation planning, policies, and resource decisions as well as ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of security cooperation efforts.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Beginning on page 503, strike line 16 through page 504, line 11, and insert the following:

(a) ALIENS DESCRIBED.—Section 602(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I) of the Afghan Allies Protec-

tion Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(I)(aa) by, or on behalf of, the United States Government, in the case of an alien submitting an application for Chief of Mission approval pursuant to subparagraph (D) before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017; or

“(bb) in the case of an alien submitting an application for Chief of Mission approval pursuant to subparagraph (D) on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, in a capacity that required the alien—

“(AA) to serve as an interpreter or translator for personnel of the Department of State or the United States Agency for International Development in Afghanistan while traveling away from United States embassies or consulates with such personnel;

“(BB) to serve as an interpreter or translator for United States military personnel in Afghanistan while traveling off-base with such personnel; or

“(CC) to perform sensitive and trusted activities for United States military personnel stationed in Afghanistan; or”.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

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

SEC. 12xx. MODIFICATION TO SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT ON ENHANCING SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.

Subsection (b) of section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3550), as amended by section 1213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1045), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) AFGHAN PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM.—A description of the status of the implementation of the Afghan Personnel and Pay System (APPS) at the Afghan Ministry of Interior and the Afghan Ministry of Defense for personnel funds provided through the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, including a description of the following:

“(A) The expected completion date of installation and full implementation and utilization of the APPS.

“(B) If installation of the APPS is complete at one, or both, ministries, the extent to which the APPS is being utilized to distribute personnel funds to the Afghan National Army and Afghan National Police.

“(C) If installation of the APPS is not complete at one, or both, ministries, or full implementation and utilization of the APPS has not been achieved at one, or both, ministries, an explanation of any delays, any expected obstacles, and any additional support that may be needed for installation or full implementation and utilization.

“(D) Any examples of intentional delay or obstruction by members of the Government of Afghanistan, to include one, or both, ministries, or any sub-unit thereof, to installing or fully implementing or utilizing the APPS.

“(E) If the APPS is fully implemented at one, or both, ministries, the identified cost savings to date, due to the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse at the ministry compared to the previous payroll system. If the APPS is not fully implemented at one, or both, ministries, the expected cost savings due to the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse at the ministry once the APPS is fully implemented.

“(F) If the APPS is not fully implemented, what steps the United States and Afghanistan are taking to mitigate waste, fraud, and abuse in the disbursement of personnel funds

provided through the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

Page 545, after line 22, insert the following: “(22) A description of the People’s Republic of China’s military and nonmilitary activities in the South China Sea.”.

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REDESIGNATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF SOUTH CHINA SEA INITIATIVE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should continue supporting the efforts to the Southeast Asian nations to strengthen their maritime security capacity, domain awareness, and integration of their capabilities.

(b) REDESIGNATION AS SOUTHEAST ASIA MARITIME SECURITY INITIATIVE.—Subsection (a)(2) of section 1263 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1073; 10 U.S.C. 2282 note) is amended by striking “the ‘South China Sea Initiative’” and inserting “the ‘Southeast Asia Maritime Security Initiative’”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows: “SEC. 1263. SOUTHEAST ASIA MARITIME SECURITY INITIATIVE.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the distinguished chair of our Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership of peace through strength.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of amendment No. 69, a bipartisan amendment submitted with Ranking Member JIM LANGEVIN.

As we reach to secure cyberspace and protect American families from new and emerging threats while encouraging innovation, we turn to the mutual benefit that public-private partnerships provide industry employees and Department of Defense personnel.

We have seen the success of public-private partnerships already in the IT field. This amendment will provide an opportunity to expand the benefits of the talent exchange to all components of the Department of Defense.

The benefits to the military are clear. These partnerships provide the ability for fresh talent and concepts from outside the government sector.

The private sector benefits as well by having the flexibility to gain a unique insight into how the government operates and engage in public service creating jobs.

This bipartisan amendment promotes choice and opportunity that will benefit America’s workers and the defense community. Actually, the collaboration will benefit all American families. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support two amendments that we have in the en bloc, the first on veteran hiring, a sense of Congress amendment.

I rise to support a simple, but important effort that everyone in this Chamber can agree on. My amendment adds to this bill a sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should seek ways to maximize the number of veterans employed to build military construction projects.

We are talking about good jobs here that can help our veterans make the transition to civilian life. In places like San Diego, we have already had a number of contractors employing highly skilled veterans to do this work.

Many Members of this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, champion the cause of hiring veterans. It is a policy we have incentivized the private sector to implement.

I hope Members will support this amendment and join in showing that our military readiness can be built by those who know personally how important that readiness is when fighting for our freedom.

I also want to speak on integrated missile defense. Mr. Chairman, Iran is a chief sponsor of international terrorism, and regularly threatens to obliterate Israel, our most important ally in the region.

Those who supported agreement last year to keep Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon understood that the JCPOA does not eliminate all of Iran’s threats to the United States and our partners in the Middle East.

My amendment would take further steps to support our allies in the region and crack down on Iranian aggression.

By vocalizing our support for working with Israel, the Gulf Cooperation Council, Jordan, and Egypt, to build an integrated missile defense system, we can build off of the successes of Israel’s existing missile defense network.

I support the funding authorizations included in this year’s defense budget that will continue to support Israel’s missile defense program. Through a smart, targeted approach with our partners, we can continue to counter Iranian aggression and promote security.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment package, which includes my amendment that ensures the safety of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay.

Home to the Atlantic ballistic missile submarine fleet, Kings Bay’s contributions to national security and to the nuclear deterrence capabilities of the U.S. fleet cannot be overstated.

Just south of the installation is a low-use general aviation airport called

St. Mary’s Airport. The flight lines for their airport take civilian aircraft right over the base, raising a number of security concerns for the installation and for the weapons packages stored there.

The dangers this poses to our nuclear stockpile is glaring, and this amendment is the first step in remedying that situation. This amendment would allow for the relocation of the St. Mary’s Airport service due to national security concerns posed to Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay.

This amendment has been a major priority for the Navy, and provides much-needed changes to security concerns that have been persistent for a number of years.

With this amendment, we can protect our nuclear submarines while providing new economic opportunities.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, the Counter Iran Maritime Initiative.

□ 1845

Iran is a serious risk to our national security. We must remain vigilant. We must protect our troops and our allies in the Middle East. This amendment will help stop illegal arms shipments from Iran to terrorists and protect our national security. My amendment will help keep American troops and our allies in the region, including Israel, safe.

It authorizes our military to provide training, equipment, supplies, and military construction to nations along the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Sea, and the Mediterranean Sea.

I am glad that there is broad, bipartisan consensus on the need for this amendment so that we can keep our troops safe and shore up the safety of our allies in the region.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you briefly about the Roskam amendment, which requires the President to provide Congress with a comprehensive report on Iran’s usage of commercial aircraft for military and terrorist activity. You say to yourself, Mr. Chairman: Why do we need this? Why is this important?

Here is why. There is an important American company that is actively talking to the Iranians about the possibility of selling aircraft to them.

Here is the problem with that. Everybody—everybody—agrees that the Iranians are the world’s largest state sponsor of terror; and therefore, it goes that if you give them something that is useful for military purposes—that is, aircraft—it is fungible, and it can be used for any purpose. The notion that the Iranians are going to use Boeing

aircraft, for example, simply to transport people on vacation back and forth within Iran is profoundly naive.

So what this amendment does is it puts the aircraft industry on notice and it puts the Iranians on notice that we are very interested in what they are doing with commercial aircraft, for what purpose.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, thanks again to the Armed Services Committee for making in order with the Rules Committee my three amendments that I have discussed today, two that I have already discussed, and this one that I will now bring to my colleagues' attention.

Today, walking out of the bush of Nigeria, it was determined that another Chibok girl has been found, discovered, or fled. The debate is whether or not the military forces of Nigeria helped her out. What we do know is that she was missing for 2 years, along with the 200-plus girls that were taken. Fifty-seven of them escaped in the immediacy of the hours, and six of them died, and this young woman has now come out 2 years later.

Families are suffering, and Boko Haram has become one of the most vile and most vicious terrorist groups in the world. They are affiliated with ISIS, ISIL, but they have, if you will, no conformity to any protocol but killing. They have burned and killed Muslims and Christians alike, schools, homes, mosques, and churches. They have decapitated people. They have sent 8-year-olds with bombs strapped to their bodies to kill.

So my amendment is very straightforward.

As I do this, let me say that a number of you have joined Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON week after week wearing red to bring the girls home. She joined me, and we traveled together within weeks of the girls being taken in 2014. We confronted families, saw the pain, saw women with slashed throats that had healed, and we saw the leaders of government who then were somewhat, if you will, challenged about this task.

So my amendment is one that deals with collaboration. It is a sense of Congress that provides for condemning the ongoing violence, expresses its support for the Nigerian people, and calls on the President to support Nigeria, Lake Chad Basin, and the international community to ensure accountability for crimes against humanity.

It also asks for the initiative that we can engage the Department of Defense to assist the Government of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to develop capacities to deploy and destroy Boko Haram, obviously with the use of possible security forces, recognizing the Leahy amendment, but also with technology.

Lives are still in the midst. Lives are still not being provided for.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am asking that we collaborate with the forces in Nigeria and the forces that have been part of the multinational task force to be able to have a strategy that deals with Boko Haram.

This report can be critical in our efforts to empower and complement the efforts of the Multinational Joint Task Force as well as the commitment espoused at the recent Lake Chad Basin Regional Security Summit.

So I would say that we have to recognize that we now have an individual. This young woman can give us the intelligence. I am concerned that these girls cannot be rescued now. This is partly asking President Buhari of Nigeria to join in with this information—this new information, the collaboration that, hopefully, as we move through this legislation, ongoing, right now—to rescue those girls and also support the idea of a special envoy to focus on the dangers in the Lake Chad Basin region.

Let me compliment the African command. I met many of them when I was in Nigeria. I think it is an excellent command among all the other commands. They can be dynamic in their work.

My resolution, my amendment, my sense of Congress, is to give us focus to bring back the girls and save these girls. We have the information. Bring back these girls.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORBERRY, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH and the Rules Committee for making in order and including Jackson Lee Amendment Number 99 and including it in En Bloc Amendment Number 8 to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017."

This is the third of 3 Jackson Lee amendments made in order by the House Rules Committee.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 99, calls for a report on efforts to combat Boko Haram in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin.

In the wake of the Rules Committee making this Amendment in order, I hold in my hand an article entitled "#BringBackOurGirls: Chibok Victim Found in Nigeria After 2 Years, Activist Says."

Two years after her captivity, we learn that a 19 year Chibok school girl named Ameina Nkeki was found Tuesday by the Civilian JTF vigilante group, which fights alongside the Nigerian military, in a village near the Sambisa Forest.

Nkeki had a baby with her and told the militia members she had escaped from Boko Haram captivity.

Indeed, just last night right before presenting before the Rules Committee on this Amendment, I met with a remarkable couple whose name I do not want to mention in order not to place their lives in danger.

This couple, through their NGO, helped in the rescue, recovery and reintegration of over 10 Chibok girls.

Because of their remarkable work, the girls are now able to continue to pursue their education. Unfortunately, the lives of these good Samaritans are now in jeopardy.

I plan to do everything in my power to make sure that they and the persons they seek to empower are not harmed.

This is why I have introduced the bipartisan measure H. Res. 528—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the Victims of the Terror Protection Fund.

And this is why I am working on a measure related to a Special Envoy on Boko Haram to the Lake Chad Basin.

Support for this Amendment is timely as it is:

1. Strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin carried out by Boko Haram;

2. Expresses support for the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic region;

3. Calls on the President to support Nigerian, Lake Chad Basin, and International Community efforts to ensure accountability for crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin, particularly young girls kidnapped from Chibok and other internally displaced persons affected by the actions of Boko Haram;

Additionally, the Report calls that no later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General shall jointly submit to Congress a report on efforts to combat Boko Haram in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin;

Among others, the report shall also include the following elements:

1. A description of initiatives undertaken by the Department of Defense to assist the Government of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to develop capacities to deploy special forces to combat Boko Haram;

2. A description of United States' activities to enhance the capacity of Nigeria and the countries in the Lake Chad Basin to investigate and prosecute human rights violations perpetrated against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin by Boko Haram, al-Qaeda affiliates, and other terrorist organizations to promote respect for rule of law in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin;

3. This report can be critical in our efforts to empower and complement the efforts of the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) as well as the commitments espoused at the recent Lake Chad Basin Regional Security Summit.

Mr. Chair, the U.S. war on terror has been waged for over a decade and the lesson is clear that our adversaries adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations.

In the beginning it was only Al Qaeda—now the list includes Al Shabaab, Boko Haram which last year affiliated itself with ISIS/ISIL.

Indeed, the data on persons affected by violent extremism is staggering.

There are now more than 2.2 million Nigerians, and over 450,000 internally-displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees in neighboring Cameroon, Chad and Niger.

An estimated 4.2 million people in the Lake Chad Basin region face water and food security crises, including 800,000 in Nigeria's

northern Borno and Yobe states, Nigeria, where an estimated 184 children a day risk starvation without the immediate provision of emergency food assistance.

Boko Haram continues to claim responsibility for atrocious and targeted violence ranging from burnings, kidnappings and killings of civilians and school children, such as the Chibok girls and a suicide bombing of the United Nations building in Abuja on August 26, 2011, that killed 21 people and injured dozens more, many of them aid workers supporting development projects across Nigeria.

Half of persons displaced are children.

I continue to commend the tireless efforts of the United Nations, United States officials, Regional Leaders, Civil Society Organizations, Community Groups and good Samaritans who have helped to support efforts of combatting Boko Haram and securing peace and security in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin.

Through this Amendment, we will establish our strong support and commitment for the protection and empowerment of the peoples of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin who continue to face the threat of terrorism and violent extremism from Syria to Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin which covers Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad and everywhere in between.

As terrorist craft new strategies to threaten our homeland and harm our allies, it is in the U.S. security interest to double our counterterrorism efforts that identify, engage and empower people who are victimized by terrorist groups like Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, Al Qaeda and ISIS in Africa and Pakistan.

For this reason, our military must adapt as quickly and as seamlessly as our adversaries in empowering our allies.

Our message must be clear: the United States must expand its capacity to meet the terrorist threat where it emerges whether here in the homeland or abroad.

The Nuremberg trials were essential in bringing to justice war criminals who committed acts of barbarism against civilians and military personnel during World War II, but a critical component of bringing war criminals to justice is the gathering and preservation of evidence.

No person whether they travel to a battle field and later return to their native country or live in the region where they commit acts of terrors should rest well because they believe that no one will come to seek justice on behalf of the millions of lives destroyed.

Our message must be clear: terrorism will not thrive on our watch.

I ask for your support of this Amendment.

[May 18, 2016]

#BRINGBACKOURGIRLS: CHIBOK VICTIM FOUND IN NIGERIA AFTER 2 YEARS, ACTIVIST SAYS
(By Alexander Smith)

The mass kidnapping of 276 schoolgirls by Boko Haram from the Nigerian town of Chibok in April 2014 ignited an international outcry. The ensuing #BringBackOurGirls campaign was backed by the likes of Michelle Obama, while the U.S. and other countries sent military assistance.

A handful of the kidnapped girls managed to escape early on but most were never found.

Both Nigeria's military and the #BringBackOurGirls campaign said Wednesday that one of the girls was now in safe hands—but gave conflicting information on the circumstances and her identity.

Bukky Shonibare, one of the strategic team members of the #BringBackOurGirls

campaign, told NBC News that a 19-year-old named Ameina Nkeki was found Tuesday by the Civilian JTF vigilante group, which fights alongside the Nigerian military, in a village near the Sambisa Forest.

Nkeki had a baby with her and told the militia members she had escaped from Boko Haram captivity, Shonibare said, noting that the details of the girl's escape were not immediately clear.

This is a major, major breakthrough—this is the breakthrough we've been waiting for," she said.

Nkeki was taken to a military base in Damboa before being brought to her mother and her former high-school head teacher—both of whom positively confirmed her identity, according to Shonibare.

The activists are "100 percent sure that this was one of the Chibok girls," Shonibare added.

Col. Sani Usman, a spokesman for the Nigerian Army, confirmed via WhatsApp message that one of the kidnapped Chibok girls had been recovered.

He added in a statement that the girl was "rescued" by "our troops" near Damboa. It was not immediately clear if he was referring to his soldiers or the JTF.

Usman's statement also identified the girl as Falmata Mbalala—which did not correspond to the name given by Shonibare and the Bring Back Our Girls movement.

Both Usman and Shonibare insisted they had the correct name for the young woman. NBC News was not immediately able to reconcile the differing accounts.

While the Chibok Girls drew the most international attention, an estimated 2,000-plus women and girls have been abducted during Boko Haram's violent campaign in Nigeria. Chibok may not even be the largest group to be kidnapped, with Human Rights Watch reporting that some 400 people were taken from the town of Damasak last year.

The army gave details of a large-scale operation against Boko Haram on Tuesday—the day the young woman was reportedly found—in Sambisa forest.

The military said troops killed 15 Boko Haram fighters after coming under heavy fire in the area of Alafa.

Troops also rescued 41 hostages—mainly women and children the military added in a statement.

While Nigeria's government has publicly touted an aggressive campaign to beat back Boko Haram, its failure to find the girls has drawn criticism.

The news comes one day after the president's wife, Aisha Buhari, presented "symbolic" checks to the mothers of the missing girls.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate Chairman THORNBERRY's acceptance of my amendments No. 100 and No. 125. The first recognizes the heroic efforts of the Pakistani doctor, Dr. Afridi, who helped us bring to justice Osama bin Laden, the prime mover in the massacre of 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

Dr. Afridi is a courageous hero who enabled us to destroy this terrorist monster. He continues to languish in a Pakistani dungeon. This amendment was adopted by the House during consideration of past defense authorization acts but was stripped out during conference negotiations with the Senate. This is a shameful slap in the face

to Dr. Afridi and other heroic friends around the world who put themselves at risk to stand up with us.

Who will trust us? Who will stand with us if we betray our friends like this? It is time to end this irrational support that we give to Pakistan. It is only prudent that we increase—which is another one of the amendments I talk about today—certification required to release American military or economic aid to Pakistan.

It behooves us not to finance Pakistan's brutal suppression of ethnic groups and religious minorities like the Baloch and the Sindhis who are under attack today simply for seeking their political and religious freedom.

I would ask my colleagues to join with me and to stand also with the people around the world. Send a message: If you stand with the United States, we will not forget you; we will stand with you. The people of the United States and the United States Congress stand tall with you and appreciate that you have risked your lives in a way that saved American lives.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and so I urge adoption of the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the bipartisan amendment with Congressman SETH MOULTON, No. 95, that would increase transparency and accountability—in addition to promoting peace through strength.

In the past few months, the Tehran regime has repeatedly pushed the boundaries of the dangerous Iran deal and on United Nations Security Council resolutions. Since January, the Iranian regime has tested at least two intercontinental ballistic missiles, including one that had the writing "Israel should be wiped off the Earth," written in Hebrew. These ICBMs have the ability to reach Israel and other allies in the Middle East from southeastern Europe to India.

Sadly, the American people have not received satisfactory answers about why the actions by Iran are without repercussions. This amendment will require a quick and clear response: Why or why not did the ICBM tests violate international agreements, and what response the administration will take.

This bipartisan amendment will hold the administration accountable and require a timely and thorough report on our response to hostile actions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in support.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking both Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman ROYCE for

their assistance in helping to craft this amendment, and also let me thank Ranking Member ENGEL and Dr. Bera, who joined Chairman ROYCE as original cosponsors.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment truly is a testament to the broad, bipartisan support for the U.S.-India relationship here in Congress. Our agreement is straightforward. It seeks to promote greater defense trade and encourage additional military cooperation between the United States and India.

I believe that by requiring our government to take actions such as strengthening the Defense Technology and Trade Initiative and encouraging combined military planning with India, we can make certain that the U.S.-India defense relationship endures.

Mr. Chairman, given the dynamic nature of the Indo-Pacific region and its importance to our own national security and future economic growth, now is the time to build on recent successes and propel the U.S.-India strategic partnership forward.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Amendment Number 70.

I want to thank Representative CONNOLLY for his good work on this amendment.

DOD is one of the last agencies that implement most of our foreign aid to come up with an evaluation policy. USAID has one. The State Department has one. The Millennium Challenge Corporation has one. But not DOD.

Evaluations do not just trace how money is spent. Evaluations help us figure out if the money is achieving its intended outcome. Is it working? Is it making a lasting difference?

The good news is that the DOD is working on an evaluation policy now. But just because they are working on it doesn't mean it will get done. We all know what bureaucrats can do if given the time.

Amendment Number 70 makes it clear that Congress supports a strong evaluation policy.

We should be doing rigorous evaluation on all our foreign aid because Americans deserve to know how their money is being spent. And that's just the way it is.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON THE PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE TO UNITS OF FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES THAT HAVE COMMITTED A GROSS VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on its implementation of section 294 of title 10, United States Code (relating to prohibition on use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights).

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall contain the following:

(1) A detailed description of the policies and procedures governing the manner in which Department of Defense personnel identify and report information on gross violations of human rights and how such information is shared with personnel responsible for implementing the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) of section 294 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The funding expended in fiscal years 2015 and 2016 for purposes of implementing section 294 of title 10, United States Code, including any relevant training of personnel, and a description of the titles, roles, and responsibilities of the personnel responsible for reviewing credible information relating to human rights violations and the personnel responsible for making decisions regarding the implementation of the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) of such section 294.

(3) An addendum that includes any findings or recommendations included in any report issued by a Federal Inspector General related to the implementation of section 294 of title 10, United States Code, and, as appropriate, the Department of Defense's response to such findings or recommendations.

(4) Any other matters the Secretary determines is appropriate.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Page 497, line 11, strike "and" at the end.
Page 497, line 16, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 497, after line 16, insert the following:
(4) Pakistan has shown progress in arresting and prosecuting Haqqani network senior leaders and mid-level operatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 497, line 11, strike "and".
Page 497, line 16, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 497, after line 16, insert the following:
(4) Pakistan is not using its military or any funds or equipment provided by the United States to persecute minority groups seeking political or religious freedom, including the Balochi, Sindhi, and Hazara ethnic groups and minority religious groups, including Christian, Hindu, and Ahmadiyya Muslim.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO DR. SHAKIL AFRIDI.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The attacks of September 11, 2001, killed approximately 3,000 people, most of whom were Americans, but also included hundreds of individuals with foreign citizenships, nearly 350 New York Fire Department

personnel, and about 50 law enforcement officers.

(2) Downed United Airlines flight 93 was reportedly intended, under the control of the al-Qaeda high-jackers, to crash into the White House or the Capitol in an attempt to kill the President of the United States or Members of the United States Congress.

(3) The September 11, 2001, attacks were largely planned and carried out by the al-Qaeda terrorist network led by Osama bin Laden and his deputy Ayman al Zawahiri, after which Osama bin Laden enjoyed safe haven in Pakistan from where he continued to plot deadly attacks against the United States and the world.

(4) The United States has obligated nearly \$30 billion between 2002 and 2014 in United States taxpayer money for security and economic aid to Pakistan.

(5) The United States very generously and swiftly responded to the 2005 Kashmir Earthquake in Pakistan with more than \$200 million in emergency aid and the support of several United States military aircraft, approximately 1,000 United States military personnel, including medical specialists, thousands of tents, blankets, water containers and a variety of other emergency equipment.

(6) The United States again generously and swiftly contributed approximately \$150 million in emergency aid to Pakistan following the 2010 Pakistan flood, in addition to the service of nearly twenty United States military helicopters, their flight crews, and other resources to assist the Pakistan Army's relief efforts.

(7) The United States continues to work tirelessly to support Pakistan's economic development, including millions of dollars allocated towards the development of Pakistan's energy infrastructure, health services and education system.

(8) The United States and Pakistan continue to have many critical shared interests, both economic and security related, which could be the foundation for a positive and mutually beneficial partnership.

(9) Dr. Shakil Afridi, a Pakistani physician, is a hero to whom the people of the United States, Pakistan and the world owe a debt of gratitude for his help in finally locating Osama bin Laden before more innocent American, Pakistani and other lives were lost to this terrorist leader.

(10) Pakistan, the United States and the international community had failed for nearly 10 years following attacks of September 11, 2001, to locate and bring Osama bin Laden, who continued to kill innocent civilians in the Middle East, Asia, Europe, Africa and the United States, to justice without the help of Dr. Afridi.

(11) The Government of Pakistan's imprisonment of Dr. Afridi presents a serious and growing impediment to the United States' bilateral relations with Pakistan.

(12) The Government of Pakistan has levied and allowed baseless charges against Dr. Afridi in a politically motivated, spurious legal process.

(13) Dr. Afridi is currently imprisoned by the Government of Pakistan, a deplorable and unconscionable situation which calls into question Pakistan's actual commitment to countering terrorism and undermines the notion that Pakistan is a true ally in the struggle against terrorism.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that Dr. Shakil Afridi is an international hero and that the Government of Pakistan should release him immediately from prison.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title XII (page 504, after line 25), add the following:

SEC. 1217. REPORT ON ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN TO AUDIT THE USE OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.

Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which the Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan has adequate access to financial records of the Government of Afghanistan to audit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for assistance for Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY OF NEBRASKA

Page 507, line 7, strike “and”.

Page 507, line 11, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 507, after line 11, insert the following:

(4) securing safe areas, including the Nineveh Plain, for purposes of resettling and reintegrating ethnic and religious minorities, including victims of genocide, into their homelands, is a critical component of a safe, secure, and sovereign Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY OF NEBRASKA

Page 510, line 24, insert “including ethnic and religious minority groups,” after “local security forces.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. OPPORTUNITIES TO EQUIP CERTAIN FOREIGN MILITARY ENTITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of State, shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

(1) efforts to make United States manufacturers aware of opportunities to equip foreign military entities that have been approved to receive assistance from the United States; and

(2) any new plans or strategies to raise United States manufacturers’ awareness with respect to such opportunities.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER OF TENNESSEE

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . REPORTS ON INF TREATY AND OPEN SKIES TREATY.

(a) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the following reports:

(1) A report on the Open Skies Treaty containing—

(A) an assessment, conducted by the Chairman jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, of whether and why, the Treaty remains in the national security interest of the United States, including if there are compliance concerns related to implementation by the Russian Federation of the Treaty;

(B) a specific plan by the Chairman jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State on remedying any such compliance concerns; and

(C) a military assessment conducted by the Chairman of such compliance concerns.

(2) A report on the INF Treaty containing—

(A) an assessment, conducted by the Chairman jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, of whether and why, the Treaty remains in the national security interest of the United States, including how any ongoing violation bear on the

assessment if such a violation is not resolved in the near-term;

(B) a specific plan by the Chairman jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to remedy violation by the Russian Federation of the Treaty, and a judgment of whether Russia intends to take the steps required to establish verifiable evidence that Russia has resumed its compliance with the Treaty if such non-compliance and inconsistencies are not resolved by the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(C) a military assessment conducted by the Chairman of the risks posed by Russia’s violation of the Treaty.

(b) **UPDATE.**—Not later than February 15, 2018, the Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to each report under subsection (a).

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(3) The term “Open Skies Treaty” means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.

It is the sense of Congress that continued United States leadership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is critical to the national security of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. AUTHORIZATION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President is authorized to provide assistance to Israel to improve maritime security and maritime domain awareness.

(b) **ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.**—Activities that may be supported by assistance under subsection (a) include the following:

(1) Procurement, maintenance, and sustainment of the David’s Sling Weapon System for purposes of intercepting short-range missiles.

(2) Payment of incremental expenses of Israel that are incurred by Israel as the direct result of participation in a bilateral or multilateral exercise of the United States Navy or Coast Guard.

(3) Visits of United States naval vessels at ports of Israel.

(4) Conduct of joint research and development for advanced maritime domain awareness capabilities.

(c) **SUNSET.**—This section shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF A DENUCLEARIZED KOREAN PENINSULA.

It is the sense of Congress that United States foreign policy should support a denuclearized Korean peninsula.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no speakers here at this point, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for including my amendment in the en bloc amendment. This amendment will require a report detailing plans to inform American manufacturers about opportunities to equip foreign militaries receiving U.S. assistance.

Each year, our country provides billions of dollars to our international partners in military assistance to foster security relationships and to ensure our national security. This is a worthwhile investment necessary to preserve American interests abroad, but we need to make sure that American businesses, particularly American manufacturers, are given ample opportunity to compete for these taxpayer-funded contracts.

My amendment helps ensure American companies are aware of what opportunities are available to them and to their employees. By ensuring more American companies are aware of these opportunities, we can support job growth among American companies, which in turn will support the overall health of our economy and our Nation’s defense industrial base.

Increased competition also helps ensure that our international partners are provided with the highest quality products available, thus helping to better secure their own better future and protecting our own national security interests.

□ 1900

The amendment simply ensures that American businesses have the opportunity to compete for these contracts so that as we are building up and securing our national security interests around the world, we are also strengthening American jobs, American manufacturing, and growing our economy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about a bipartisan amendment that passed the full Committee on Armed Services, and also had to go through the Foreign Affairs Committee to be approved. It calls on the administration to report to Congress on a comprehensive political and military strategy for our fight against ISIS in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, we are sending troops back into Iraq today, just 7 or 8 years after we pulled the last troops out. Many of the battles they are fighting have familiar names—Fallujah, Ramadi, and Haditha—battles that we fought and won a long time ago. But we did not have a strategy to ensure the peace.

Mr. Clausewitz taught us about 200 years ago that war is an extension of politics.

We have to have a political endgame for our fight in Iraq, or we will find ourselves continually going back there again and again. When Iraqi politics fail, a new terrorist group sweeps in; and American troops are left to pick up the mess.

If you think about what happened when ISIS swept in from Syria and entered western, then northern Iraq, the Iraqi army wasn't just defeated by ISIS. The Iraqi Army put their weapons down and went home because they had lost faith in the Iraqi Government.

We must have a long-term, comprehensive political and military strategy. We owe it to the troops to ensure that their efforts will not be in vain.

I am proud of the bipartisan support for this amendment, both on the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I am especially proud that the chairman worked with me to get it adopted. I am glad that it is included in the bill.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendments en bloc.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, on Sept. 22, 2011, Adm. Mike Mullen, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Haqqani Network was behind the 2011 attack on our embassy and a truck bombing that wounded more than 70 U.S. and NATO troops. Adm. Mullen went on to say, "The Haqqani Network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency."

Last year, the Haqqani Network and the Taliban killed more Afghan civilians and troops than in any other year since the Taliban was toppled in 2001.

My amendment adds a fourth condition on the aid to Pakistan. This new condition requires the Administration to certify that Pakistan has shown progress in arresting and prosecuting Haqqani Network senior leaders and mid-level operatives.

This forces Pakistan to make a choice: either go after the Haqqani Network in a public way that it has never done before or lose hundreds of millions of dollars of US aid.

And that's just the way it is.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 7 consisting of amendment Nos. 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 93, 94, 95, 96, and 97 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE OF NEW MEXICO

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

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BUSINESS PRACTICES OF THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND SYRIA (ISIS).

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) For nearly two years, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) has capitalized on established oil production facilities throughout Iraq and Syria in order to fund its jihadist operations globally.

(2) Oil production and sale represent the largest and most vulnerable income factors for ISIS.

(3) In 2015, ISIS oil sales brought in over \$400,000,000 to prop up the terror group's operations world-wide.

(4) ISIS has executed a robust recruitment scheme to staff and operate the oil facilities within the group's control and maintained smuggling routes for the sale of that oil.

(5) Further disrupting ISIS oil production and sale structures would be minimally invasive but would effectively curtail the terror group's ability to self-finance.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should focus all necessary efforts in the Middle East to disrupt the financing of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) through oil production and sale.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 12xx. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF MAN-PORTABLE AIR DEFENSE SYSTEMS TO ANY ENTITY IN SYRIA.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2017 may be obligated or expended to transfer or facilitate the transfer of man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) to any entity in Syria.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12 . MEASURES AGAINST PERSONS INVOLVED IN ACTIVITIES THAT VIOLATE ARMS CONTROL TREATIES OR AGREEMENTS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IMPOSITION OF MEASURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the measures described in subsection (b) with respect to—

(A) a person the President determines—

(i)(I) is an individual who is a citizen, national, or permanent resident of a country described in paragraph (2); or

(II) is an entity organized under the laws of a country described in paragraph (2); and

(ii) has engaged in any activity that contributed to or is a significant factor in the President's or the Secretary of State's determination that such country is not in full compliance with its obligations as further described in paragraph (2); and

(B) a person the President determines has provided material support to a person described in subparagraph (A).

(2) COUNTRY DESCRIBED.—A country described in this paragraph is a country that the President or the Secretary of State has determined, in the most recent annual report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 403 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2593a), is not in full compliance with its obligations undertaken in all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements or commitments to which the United States is a participating state.

(b) MEASURES DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The measures to be imposed with respect to a person under subsection (a) are the head of any executive agency (as defined in section 133 of title 41, United States Code) may not enter into, renew, or extend a contract for the procurement of goods or services with the person.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR MAJOR ROUTES OF SUPPLY.—The requirement to impose measures under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any contract for the procurement of goods or services along a major route of supply to a zone of active combat or major contingency operation.

(3) REQUIREMENT TO REVISE REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards shall be revised to implement paragraph (1)(B).

(B) CERTIFICATIONS.—The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation under subparagraph (A) shall include a requirement for a certification from each person that is a prospective contractor that the person, and any person owned or controlled by the person, does not engage in any activity described in subsection (a)(1)(A)(ii).

(C) REMEDIES.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a person has submitted a false certification under subparagraph (B) on or after the date on which the applicable revision of the Federal Acquisition Regulation required by this paragraph becomes effective—

(i) the head of that executive agency shall terminate a contract with such person or debar or suspend such person from eligibility for Federal contracts for a period of not less than 2 years;

(ii) any such debarment or suspension shall be subject to the procedures that apply to debarment and suspension under the Federal Acquisition Regulation under subpart 9.4 of part 9 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(iii) the Administrator of General Services shall include on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Nonprocurement Programs maintained by the Administrator under part 9 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation each person that is debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment or suspension by the head of an executive agency on the basis of a determination of a false certification under subparagraph (B).

(4) UNITED STATES PERSON DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "United States person" means—

(A) a natural person who is a citizen or resident of the United States or a national of the United States (as defined in section

101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)); and

(B) an entity that is organized under the laws of the United States or any State.

(c) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the application of measures on a case-by-case basis under subsection (a) with respect to a person if the President—

(A) determines that—

(i) (I) in the case of a person described in subsection (a)(1)(A), the person did not knowingly engage in any activity described in such subsection; or

(II) in the case of a person described in subsection (a)(1)(B), the person conducted or facilitated a transaction or transactions with, or provided financial services to, a person described in subsection (a)(1)(A) that did not knowingly engage in any activity described in such subsection; and

(ii) the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(d) TERMINATION.—The measures imposed with respect to a person under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date on which the President submits to Congress a subsequent annual report pursuant to section 403 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2593a) that does not contain a determination of the President that the country described in subsection (a)(2) with respect to which the measures were imposed with respect to the person is a country that is not in full compliance with its obligations undertaken in all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements or commitments to which the United States is a participating state.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO OF KANSAS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT ON COOPERATION BETWEEN IRAN AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to Congress a report on cooperation between Iran and the Russian Federation and how and to what extent such cooperation affects United States national security and strategic interests.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) How and to what extent Iran and the Russian Federation cooperate on matters relating to Iran’s space program, including how and to what extent such cooperation strengthens Iran’s ballistic missile program.

(2) How and to what extent Iran’s interests and actions and the Russian Federation’s interests and actions overlap with respect to Latin America.

(3) A description and analysis of the intelligence-sharing center established by Iran,

the Russian Federation, and Syria in Baghdad, Iraq and whether such center is being used for purposes other than the purposes of the joint mission of such countries in Syria.

(4) A description and analysis of—

(A) naval cooperation between Iran and the Russian Federation, including joint naval exercises between the two countries; and

(B) the implications of—

(i) an increased Russian Federation naval presence in the Eastern Mediterranean; and

(ii) an Iranian naval presence in the Persian Gulf.

(5) A description of the increased cooperation between Iran and the Russian Federation since the start of the current conflict in Syria.

(6) The steps Iran has taken to adopt the Russian Federation model of hybrid warfare against potential targets such as Gulf Cooperation Council states with sizeable Shiite populations.

(7) The extent of Russian Federation cooperation with Hezbollah in Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq, including cooperation with respect to training and equipping and joint operations.

(8) A description of the weapons that have been provided by the Russian Federation to Iran that have violated relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions imposing an arms embargo on Iran.

(c) SUBMISSION PERIOD.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, for such period of time as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Act remains in effect.

(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON MAINTENANCE BY ISRAEL OF A ROBUST INDEPENDENT CAPABILITY TO REMOVE EXISTENTIAL SECURITY THREATS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8601 et seq.) established the policy of the United States to support the inherent right of Israel to self-defense.

(2) The United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 expresses the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should transfer to the Government of Israel defense articles and defense services.

(3) The inherent right of Israel to self-defense necessarily includes the ability to defend against threats to its security and defend its vital national interests.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Israel should be able to defend its vital national interests and protect its territory and population against existential threats.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report that—

(A) identifies defensive capabilities and platforms requested by the Government of Israel that would contribute to maintenance of Israel’s defensive capability against threats to its territory and population, including nuclear and ballistic missile facilities in Iran, and defend its vital national interests;

(B) assesses the availability for sale or transfer of items requested by the Government of Israel to maintain the capability de-

scribed in subparagraph (A), including the legal authorities available for making such transfers; and

(C) describes what steps the President is taking to transfer the items described in subparagraph (B) for Israel to maintain the capability described in subparagraph (A).

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “specified congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT AND RELATED SERVICES FOR ILLICIT MILITARY OR OTHER ACTIVITIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on use by the Government of Iran of commercial aircraft and related services for illicit military or other activities during the 5-year period ending of such date of enactment.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include a description of the extent to which—

(1) the Government of Iran has used commercial aircraft or related services to transport illicit cargo to or from Iran, including military goods, weapons, military personnel, military-related electronic parts and mechanical equipment, and rocket or missile components;

(2) the commercial aviation sector of Iran has provided financial, material, and technological support to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC); and

(3) foreign governments and persons have facilitated the activities described in paragraph (1), including allowing the use of airports, services, or other resources.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. AUTHORITY TO GRANT OBSERVER STATUS TO THE MILITARY FORCES OF TAIWAN AT RIMPAC EXERCISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to grant observer status to the military forces of Taiwan in any maritime exercise known as the Rim of the Pacific Exercise.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to any maritime exercise described in subsection (a) that begins on or after such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. MENG OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO DEVELOP LAND-BASED WATER RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF AND IN PREPARATION FOR CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized

to enter into agreements with the governments of foreign countries to develop land-based water resources in support of and in preparation for contingency operations, including water selection, pumping, purification, storage, distribution, cooling, consumption, water reuse, water source intelligence, research and development, training, acquisition of water support equipment, and water support operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. MENG OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. EXTENSION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS ON THE USE OF CERTAIN IRANIAN SEAPORTS BY FOREIGN VESSELS AND USE OF FOREIGN AIRPORTS BY SANCTIONED IRANIAN AIR CARRIERS.

Section 1252(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8808(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "2016" and inserting "2019".

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCH BY IRAN.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress within 48 hours of a suspected ballistic missile launch, including a test, by Iran based on credible information indicating that such a launch took place.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall initiate an assessment within 48 hours of providing the notification described in subsection (a) to determine whether a missile launch, including a test, described in subsection (a) took place.

(2) DETERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which an assessment is initiated under paragraph (1), the President shall determine whether Iran engaged in a launch described in subsection (a) and shall notify Congress of the basis for any such determination.

(3) AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION.—If the President determines under paragraph (2) that a launch described in subsection (a) took place, the President shall further notify Congress of the following:

(A) An identification of entities involved in the launch.

(B) A description of steps the President will take in response to the launch, including—

(i) imposing unilateral sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13382 (2005) or other relevant authorities against such entities; or

(ii) carrying out diplomatic efforts to impose multilateral sanctions against such entities, including through adoption of a United Nations Security Council resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTEGRATED BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM FOR GCC PARTNER COUNTRIES, JORDAN, EGYPT, AND ISRAEL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Iran has conducted numerous ballistic missile tests; and

(2) such tests are in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 and unnecessarily provoke Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) partner countries and threaten Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should encourage and enable as appropriate an inte-

grated ballistic missile defense system that links GCC partner countries, Jordan, Egypt, and Israel in order assist in preventing an attack by Iran against such countries.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING TO INCREASE MARITIME SECURITY AND DOMAIN AWARENESS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES BORDERING THE PERSIAN GULF, ARABIAN SEA, OR MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to authorize assistance and training to increase maritime security and domain awareness of foreign countries bordering the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Sea, or the Mediterranean Sea in order to deter and counter illicit smuggling and related maritime activity by Iran, including illicit Iranian weapons shipments.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out the purpose of this section as described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized—

(A) to provide training to the national military or other security forces of Israel, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Kuwait, and Qatar that have among their functional responsibilities maritime security missions; and

(B) to provide training to ministry, agency, and headquarters level organizations for such forces.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The provision of assistance and training under this section may be referred to as the "Counter Iran Maritime Initiative".

(c) TYPES OF TRAINING.—

(1) AUTHORIZED ELEMENTS OF TRAINING.—Training provided under subsection (b)(1)(A) may include the provision of de minimis equipment, supplies, and small-scale military construction.

(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF TRAINING.—Training provided under subsection (b) shall include elements that promote the following:

(A) Observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

(B) Respect for legitimate civilian authority within the country to which the assistance is provided.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301, \$50,000,000 shall be available only for the provision of assistance and training under subsection (b).

(e) COST SHARING.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, given income parity among recipient countries, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, should seek, through appropriate bilateral and multilateral arrangements, payments sufficient in amount to offset any training costs associated with implementation of subsection (b).

(2) COST-SHARING AGREEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall negotiate a cost-sharing agreement with a recipient country regarding the cost of any training provided pursuant to section (b). The agreement shall set forth the terms of cost sharing that the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary and appropriate, but such terms shall not be less than 50 percent of the overall cost of the training.

(3) CREDIT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The portion of such cost-sharing received by the

Secretary of Defense pursuant to this subsection may be credited towards appropriations available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON TRAINING.—Not later than 15 days before exercising the authority under subsection (b) with respect to a recipient country, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification containing the following:

(1) An identification of the recipient country.

(2) A detailed justification of the program for the provision of the training concerned, and its relationship to United States security interests.

(3) The budget for the program, including a timetable of planned expenditures of funds to implement the program, an implementation time-line for the program with milestones (including anticipated delivery schedules for any assistance and training under the program), the military department or component responsible for management of the program, and the anticipated completion date for the program.

(4) A description of the arrangements, if any, to support recipient country sustainment of any capability developed pursuant to the program, and the source of funds to support sustainment efforts and performance outcomes to be achieved under the program beyond its completion date, if applicable.

(5) A description of the program objectives and an assessment framework to be used to develop capability and performance metrics associated with operational outcomes for the recipient force.

(6) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(h) TERMINATION.—Assistance and training may not be provided under this section after September 30, 2020.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this en bloc package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say quickly, in the en bloc package, there was an amendment that was put in there having to do with our development of a new rocket engine and a new launch vehicle. I just want to thank publicly Mr. ROGERS, the subcommittee chairman, who worked very closely with me on developing this language.

We have got a lot of great things going on out there. There are a lot of American companies that are working hard to develop a new engine so we will no longer have to rely on the Russian engine.

The amendment that was included allows those companies to use some of the money that the Air Force is providing for the development of a new engine, to use it also to develop a launch vehicle to go along with that engine. We have got, like I said, great companies like Blue Origin in my district, Aerojet Rocketdyne—a lot of folks working on new vehicles—SpaceX as well. This amendment allows the money that the Air Force is providing not just to go to the engine but for some of it to go to a launch vehicle as well. I think this will greatly reduce the cost of our launch costs for the Air Force, which has been a significantly problem recently.

So I thank Chairman ROGERS for allowing us to offer that amendment and for working with me on it.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my good friend Mr. ROGERS from Alabama for his work with me on this amendment.

The Intermediate Nuclear Forces or “INF” Treaty places limits on ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers.

In 2008, the Russians tested a missile within this prohibited range and were caught red handed.

But it took 3 years for the Administration to report any concern about Russian compliance to Congress. It took a full 6 years for the State Department to officially find the Russians in violation. After eight years, there have been no serious consequences for Russia’s violation of the treaty.

My amendment would prohibit government contracts with entities that have contributed to Russia’s violation of the INF Treaty.

Russia is not our ally, is not our friend, and we cannot take it at its word. Czar Putin is determined to restore Russia to its glory days. We must respond with strength.

And that’s just the way it is.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 8 consisting of amendment Nos. 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110 printed in House Report 114–571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MILITARY RELATIONS BETWEEN VIETNAM AND THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States and Vietnam signed a Joint Vision Statement on Defense Relations on June 1, 2015.

(2) In October 2014, the Administration partially relaxed United States restrictions on the transfer of lethal weapons to Vietnam.

(3) In 2014, the United States provided \$18,000,000 in maritime security assistance to Vietnam.

(4) According to Reporters Without Borders, Vietnam ranks 175 out of 180 countries in press freedom, as the Government of Vietnam continues to persecute citizens for practicing the freedom of speech and expression.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should review its policy on the transfer of lethal weapons to Vietnam; and

(2) the United States Government should evaluate certain human rights benchmarks when providing military assistance to Vietnam.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO COMBAT BOKO HARAM IN NIGERIA AND THE LAKE CHAD BASIN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin carried out by Boko Haram;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic region; and

(3) calls on the President to support Nigerian, Lake Chad Basin, and International Community efforts to ensure accountability for crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin, particularly young girls kidnapped from Chibok and other internally displaced persons affected by the actions of Boko Haram.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General shall jointly submit to Congress a report on efforts to combat Boko Haram in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of initiatives undertaken by the Department of Defense to assist the Government of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to develop capacities to deploy special forces to combat Boko Haram.

(B) A description of United States’ activities to enhance the capacity of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to investigate and prosecute human rights violations perpetrated against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin by Boko Haram, al-Qaeda affiliates, and other terrorist organizations to promote respect for rule of law in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the appropriate place in title XII of division A of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 12xx. ENHANCING DEFENSE AND SECURITY COOPERATION WITH INDIA.

(a) REQUIRED ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State shall jointly take such actions as may be necessary to—

(A) recognize India’s status as a major defense partner of the United States;

(B) designate an individual within the Executive branch who has experience in defense acquisition and technology—

(i) to reinforce and ensure, through inter-agency policy coordination, the success of

the Framework for the United States-India Defense Relationship; and

(ii) to help resolve remaining issues impeding United States-India defense trade, security cooperation, and co-production and co-development opportunities;

(C) approve and facilitate the transfer of advanced technology, consistent with United States conventional arms transfer policy, to support combined military planning with the Indian military for missions such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, counter piracy, and maritime domain awareness missions;

(D) strengthen the effectiveness of the DTTI and the durability of the Department of Defense’s “India Rapid Reaction Cell”;

(E) collaborate with the Government of India to develop mutually agreeable mechanisms to verify the security of defense articles and related technology, such as appropriate cyber security and end use monitoring arrangements, consistent with United States export control laws and policy;

(F) promote policies that will encourage the efficient review and authorization of defense sales and exports to India;

(G) encourage greater government-to-government and commercial military transactions between the United States and India;

(H) support the development and alignment of India’s export control and procurement regimes with those of the United States and multilateral control regimes; and

(I) continue to enhance defense and security cooperation with India in order to advance United States interests in the South Asia and greater Indo-Pacific regions.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on how the United States is supporting its defense relationship with India in relation to the actions described in paragraph (1).

(b) MILITARY PLANNING.—The Secretary of Defense is encouraged to coordinate with the Ministry of Defense for the Government of India to develop combined military plans for missions such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, maritime domain awareness, and other missions in the national security interests of both countries.

(c) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State shall jointly, on an annual basis, conduct an assessment of the extent to which India possesses strategic operational capabilities to support military operations of mutual interest between the United States and India.

(2) USE OF ASSESSMENT.—The President shall ensure that the assessment described in paragraph (1) is used, consistent with United States conventional arms transfer policy, to inform the review by the United States of sales of defense articles and services to the Government of India.

(3) FORM.—The assessment described in paragraph (1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be in classified form.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Page 609, line 20, strike “or any fiscal year thereafter”.

Page 610, strike lines 8 through 15 and insert the following:

“(3) OTHER PURPOSES.—The Secretary may obligate or expend not more than a total of 31 percent of the funds that are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the rocket propulsion

system and launch system investment for activities not authorized by paragraph (1)(A), including for developing a launch vehicle, an upper stage, a strap-on motor, or related infrastructure. The Secretary may exceed such limit in fiscal year 2017 for such purposes if—

Page 612, strike lines 4 through 12 and insert the following:

“(3) PLAN TO PROTECT GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT AND ASSURED ACCESS TO SPACE.—

“(A) In developing the rocket propulsion system under paragraph (1), and in any development conducted pursuant to subsection (d)(3), the Secretary shall develop a plan to protect the investment of the United States and the assured access to space, including, consistent with section 2320 of title 10, United States Code, and in accordance with other applicable provisions of law, acquiring the rights, as appropriate, for the purpose of developing alternative sources of supply and manufacture in the event such alternative sources are necessary and in the best interest of the United States, such as in the event that a company goes out of business or the system is otherwise unavailable after the Federal Government has invested significant resources to use and rely on such system for launch services.

“(B) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the plan developed under subparagraph (A).”

Page 612, strike lines 13 through 25.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . REPORT ON USE OF SPACECRAFT ASSETS OF THE SPACE-BASED INFRARED SYSTEM WIDE-FIELD-OF-VIEW PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the feasibility of using available spacecraft assets of the space-based infrared system wide-field-of-view program to satisfy other mission requirements of the Department of Defense or the intelligence community.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) An evaluation of using the space-based infrared system wide-field-of-view spacecraft bus for other urgent national security space priorities.

(2) An evaluation of the cost and schedule impact, if any, to the space-based infrared system wide-field-of-view program if the spacecraft bus is used for another purpose.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . ASSESSMENT ON SECURITY OF INFORMATION HELD BY CLEARED DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the sufficiency of the regulatory mechanisms of the Department of Defense to secure defense information held by cleared defense contractors to determine whether there are any gaps that may undermine the protection of such information.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the findings of the assessment conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe regulations that the Secretary determines appropriate to improve the security of defense information held by cleared defense contractors.

(c) CLEARED DEFENSE CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term “cleared defense contractor” has the meaning given that term in section 393(e) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. . . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBER RESILIENCY OF THE NETWORKS AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Army and Air National Guard personnel need to have situational awareness and reliable communications during any of the following events occurring in the United States:

(A) A terrorist attack.

(B) An intentional or unintentional release of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive materials.

(C) A natural or man-made disaster.

(2) During such an event, it is vital that Army and Air National Guard personnel are able to communicate and coordinate response efforts with their own units and appropriate civilian emergency response forces.

(3) Current networks and communications systems of the National Guard, including commercial wireless solutions (such as mobile wireless kinetic mesh), and other systems that are interoperable with the systems of civilian first responders, should provide the necessary robustness, interoperability, reliability, and resilience to extend needed situational awareness and communications to all users and under all operating conditions, including degraded communications environments where infrastructure is damaged or destroyed or under cyber attack or disruption.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the National Guard should be constantly seeking ways to improve and expand its communications and networking capabilities to provide for enhanced performance and resilience in the face of cyber attacks or disruptions, as well as other instances of degradation.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1635. REQUIREMENT FOR ARMY NATIONAL GUARD STRATEGY TO INCORPORATE CYBER PROTECTION TEAMS INTO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CYBER MISSION FORCE.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of

this Act, the Secretary of the Army, if the Secretary has not already done so, shall provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees outlining a strategy for incorporating Army National Guard cyber protection teams into the Department of Defense cyber mission force.

(b) ELEMENTS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include, at minimum, the following:

(1) A timeline for incorporating Army National Guard cyber protection teams into the Department of Defense cyber mission force, including a timeline for receiving appropriate training.

(2) Identification of specific units to be incorporated.

(3) An assessment of how incorporation of Army National Guard cyber protection teams into the Department of Defense cyber mission force might be used to enhance readiness through improved individual and collective training capabilities.

(4) A status report on the Army’s progress in issuing additional guidance that clarifies how Army National Guard cyber protection teams can support State and civil operations in National Guard status under title 32, United States Code.

(5) Other matters as considered appropriate by the Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII (page 872, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 2807. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MAXIMIZING NUMBER OF VETERANS EMPLOYED ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that, when practical and cost-effective, the Department of Defense should seek ways to maximize the number of veterans employed on military construction projects (as defined in section 2801 of title 10, United States Code).

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. BRAT OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII (page 877, after line 25), add the following

SEC. 2817. IMPROVED PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY LOCATED OVERSEAS.

(a) PETITION TO ACQUIRE SURPLUS PROPERTY.—2687a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) PETITION PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL OF OVERSEAS SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process by which a foreign government may request the transfer of surplus real property or improvements under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense in the foreign country.

“(2) Upon the receipt of a petition under this subsection, the Secretary shall determine within 90 days whether the property or improvement subject to the petition is surplus. If surplus, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the foreign government within one year for the disposal of the property.

“(3) If real property or an improvement is determined not to be surplus, the Secretary shall not be obligated to consider another petition involving the same property or improvement for five years beginning on the date on which the initial determination was made.”

(b) ADDITIONAL USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS MILITARY FACILITY INVESTMENT RECOVERY ACCOUNT.—Section 2687a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “property disposal agreement,” after “forces agreement,”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) military readiness programs.”.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 2687a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) A report under paragraph (1) also shall specify the following:

“(A) The number of petitions received under subsection (g) from foreign governments requesting the transfer of surplus real property or improvements under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense overseas.

“(B) The status of each petition, including whether reviewed, denied, or granted.

“(C) The implementation status of each granted petition.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. . CLOSURE OF ST. MARYS AIRPORT.

(a) RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Subject to subsection (b), the United States, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, shall release the city of St. Marys, Georgia, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Marys Airport, to the extent such restrictions, conditions, and limitations are enforceable by the Administrator.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS.—The Administrator shall execute the release under subsection (a) once all of the following occurs:

(1) The Secretary of the Navy transfers to the Georgia Department of Transportation the amounts described in subsection (c) and requires as an enforceable condition on such transfer that all funds transferred shall be used only for airport development (as defined in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code) of a general aviation airport in Georgia, consistent with planning efforts conducted by the Administrator and the Georgia Department of Transportation.

(2) The city of St. Marys, for consideration as provided for in this section, grants to the United States, under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary, a restrictive use easement in the real property used for the St. Marys Airport, as determined acceptable by the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary to protect the interests of the United States and prohibiting the future use of such property for all aviation-related purposes and any other purposes deemed by the Secretary to be incompatible with the operations, functions, and missions of Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia.

(3) The Secretary obtains an appraisal to determine the fair market value of the real property used for the St. Marys Airport in the manner described in subsection (c)(1).

(4) The Administrator fulfills the obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) in connection with the release under subsection (a). In carrying out such obligations—

(A) the Administrator shall not assume or consider any potential or proposed future redevelopment of the current St. Marys airport property;

(B) any potential new general aviation airport in Georgia shall be deemed to be not

connected with the release noted in subsection (a) nor the closure of St. Marys Airport; and

(C) any environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for a potential general aviation airport in Georgia shall be considered through an environmental review process separate and apart from the environmental review made a condition of release by this section.

(c) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS DESCRIBED.—The amounts described in this subsection are the following:

(1) An amount equal to the fair market value of the real property of the St. Marys Airport, as determined by the Secretary and concurred in by the Administrator, based on an appraisal report and title documentation that—

(A) is prepared or adopted by the Secretary, and concurred in by the Administrator, not more than 180 days prior to the transfer described in subsection (b)(1); and

(B) meets all requirements of Federal law and the appraisal and documentation standards applicable to the acquisition and disposal of real property interests of the United States.

(2) An amount equal to the unamortized portion of any Federal development grants (including grants available under a State block grant program established pursuant to section 47128 of title 49, United States Code), other than used for the acquisition of land, paid to the city of St. Marys for use as the St. Marys Airport.

(3) An amount equal to the airport revenues remaining in the airport account for the St. Marys Airport as of the date of the enactment of this Act and as otherwise due to or received by the city of St. Marys after such date of enactment pursuant to sections 47107(b) and 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) AUTHORIZATION FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Using funds available to the Department of the Navy for operation and maintenance, the Secretary may pay the amounts described in subsection (c) to the Georgia Department of Transportation, conditioned as described in subsection (b)(1).

(e) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of St. Marys Airport shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary and concurred in by the Administrator.

(2) PLANNING OF GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORT.—Any planning effort for the development of a new general aviation airport in southeast Georgia using the amounts described in subsection (c) shall be conducted in coordination with the Secretary, and shall ensure that any such airport does not encroach on the operations, functions, and missions of Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the applicability of—

(1) the requirements and processes under section 46319 of title 49, United States Code;

(2) the requirements and processes under part 157 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(3) the public notice requirements under section 47107(h)(2) of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII (page 904, after line 22), add the following new section:

SEC. 2839. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, PORTION OF ORGAN MOUNTAINS AREA, FILLMORE CANYON, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary of Defense may not transfer administrative jurisdiction over the parcel of Federal land depicted as “Parcel D” on the map entitled “Organ Mountains Area - Fillmore Canyon” and dated April 19, 2016 from the Department of Defense to the Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON OF TEXAS

Page 936, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 2857. BATTLESHIP PRESERVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established within the Department of the Interior a grant program for the preservation of our nation’s most historic battleships.

(b) USE OF GRANTS.—Amounts received through grants under this section shall be used for the preservation of our nation’s most historic battleships in a manner that is self-sustaining and has an educational component.

(c) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, an entity shall—

(1) submit an application under procedures prescribed by the Secretary;

(2) match the amount of the grant, on a 1-to-1 basis, with non-Federal assets from non-Federal sources, which may include cash or durable goods and materials fairly valued as determined by the Secretary;

(3) maintain records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose—

(A) the amount and the disposition of the proceeds of the grant;

(B) the total cost of the project for which the grant is made; and

(C) other records as may be required by the Secretary, including such records as will facilitate an effective accounting for project funds; and

(4) provide access to the Secretary for the purposes of any required audit and examination of any books, documents, papers, and records of the entity.

(d) MOST HISTORIC BATTLESHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term “most historic battleship” means a battleship that is—

(1) between 75 and 115 years old;

(2) listed on the National Historic Register; and

(3) located within the State for which it was named.

(e) SAVINGS PROVISION.—The authorities contained in this section shall be in addition to, and shall not be construed to supercede or modify those contained in the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470-470x-6).

(f) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds made available to carry out this section may be used to acquire any real property, or any interest in any real property, without the written consent of the owner (or owners) of that property or interest in property.

(2) NO DESIGNATION.—The authority granted by this section shall not constitute a Federal designation or have any effect on private property ownership.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority to make grants under this section expires on September 30, 2023.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 735, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 9 consisting of amendment Nos. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, and 120 printed in House Report 114-571, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE OF WASHINGTON

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XXVIII the following new section:

SEC. 2867. REPORT ON DOCUMENTATION FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES ALONG COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON, BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

(a) REPORT ON DOCUMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall submit a report to Congress on the process by which the Corps of Engineers acquired the properties described in subsection (b), and shall include in the report the specific legal documentation pursuant to which the properties were acquired.

(b) PROPERTIES DESCRIBED.—The properties described in this subsection are each of the properties described in paragraph (2) of section 501(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303; 110 Stat. 3752).

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 3126. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACCOUNTING PRACTICES BY LABORATORY OPERATING CONTRACTORS AND PLANT OR SITE MANAGERS OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Energy should ensure that each laboratory operating contractor or plant or site manager of a National Nuclear Security Administration facility adopt generally accepted and consistent accounting practices for laboratory, plant, or site directed research and development.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31. BRIEFING ON THE INFORMATION-INTERCHANGE OF LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM.

(a) BRIEFING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of State shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the feasibility and potential benefits of a dialogue between the

United States and France on the use of low-enriched uranium in naval reactors.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 1009, lines 1 through 8, amend paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR.—The term ‘advanced nuclear reactor’ means—

“(A) a nuclear fission reactor with significant improvements over the most recent generation of nuclear fission reactors, which may include inherent safety features, lower waste yields, greater fuel utilization, superior reliability, resistance to proliferation, and increased thermal efficiency; or

“(B) a nuclear fusion reactor.”

Page 1014, lines 8 and 9, strike “advanced fission reactor systems, nuclear fusion systems,” and insert “advanced nuclear reactor systems”.

Page 1016, lines 12 and 13, strike “fusion and advanced fission experimental reactors” and insert “experimental advanced nuclear reactors”.

Page 1018, lines 3 and 4, strike “next generation nuclear energy technology” and insert “advanced nuclear reactor technologies”.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. DONOVAN OF NEW YORK

At the end of title XXXV add the following:

SEC. 35. EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS FOR SEPARATING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 70105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(r) EXPEDITED ISSUANCE FOR SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall, using authority available under other provisions of law—

“(1) seek to expedite processing of applications for transportation security cards under this section for members of the Armed Forces who are separating from active duty service with a discharge other than a dishonorable discharge;

“(2) in consultation with the Secretary of Defense—

“(A) enhance efforts of the Department of Homeland Security in assisting members of the Armed Forces who are separating from active duty service with receiving a transportation security card, including by—

“(i) including under the Transition Assistance Program under section 1144 of title 10—

“(I) applications for such cards; and

“(II) a form by which such a member may grant the member’s permission for government agencies to disclose to the Department of Homeland Security findings of background investigations of such member, for consideration by the Department in processing the member’s application for a transportation security card;

“(ii) providing opportunities for local officials of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to partner with military installations for that purpose; and

“(iii) ensuring that such members of the Armed Forces are aware of opportunities to apply for such cards;

“(B) seek to educate members of the Armed Forces with competencies that are transferable to maritime industries regarding—

“(i) opportunities for employment in such industries; and

“(ii) the requirements and qualifications for, and duties associated with, transportation security cards; and

“(C) cooperate with other Federal agencies to expedite the transfer to the Secretary the findings of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

“(3) issue or deny a transportation security card under this section for a veteran by not later than 13 days after the date of the submission of the application for the card, unless there is a substantial problem with the application that prevents compliance with this paragraph.”.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for each of the subsequent 2 years, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate describing and assessing the efforts of such department to implement the amendment made by this section.

SEC. 35. TRAINING UNDER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM ON EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ASSOCIATED WITH TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1144(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) Acting through the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, provide information on career opportunities for employment available to members with transportation security cards issued under section 70105 of title 46.”.

(b) DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—The program carried out under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, shall comply with the requirements of subsection (b)(10) of such section, as added by subsection (a), by not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKEL OF FLORIDA

At the end of title XXXV add the following:

SEC. . APPLICATION OF LAW.

Section 4301 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) For purposes of any Federal law except the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), any vessel, including a foreign vessel, being repaired or dismantled is deemed to be a recreational vessel, as defined under section 2101(25), during such repair or dismantling, if that vessel—

“(1) shares elements of design and construction of traditional recreational vessels (as so defined); and

“(2) when operating is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 1081, in the table of section 4102, strike “JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND” both places it appears and insert “JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEFEAT FUND”.

Page 1085, in the table of section 4103, strike “JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND” both places it appears and insert “JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND”.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 1191, after line 7, insert the following: “(F) Conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) that is punishable under section 881 of this title (article 81).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR FACILITIES FROM UNMANNED AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4509 the following new section:

“SEC. 4510. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR FACILITIES FROM UNMANNED AIRCRAFT.

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Energy may take such actions described in subsection (b)(1) that are necessary to mitigate the threat of an unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft that poses an imminent threat (as defined by the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation) to the safety or security of a covered facility.

“(b) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—(1) The actions described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) Disrupt control of the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft.

“(B) Seize and exercise control of the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft.

“(C) Seize or otherwise confiscate the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft.

“(D) Use reasonable force to disable or destroy the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft.

“(2) The Secretary of Energy shall develop the actions described in paragraph (1) in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation, consistent with the protection of information regarding sensitive defense or national security capabilities.

“(c) FORFEITURE.—(1) Any unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft described in subsection (a) shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture to the United States.

“(2) The Secretary of Energy may prescribe regulations to establish reasonable exceptions to paragraph (1), including in cases where—

“(A) the operator of the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft obtained the control and possession of such system or aircraft illegally; or

“(B) the operator of the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft is an employee of a common carrier acting in manner described in subsection (a) without the knowledge of the common carrier.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe regulations and issue guidance in the respective areas of each Secretary to carry out this section.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered facility’ means any facility that—

“(A) is identified by the Secretary of Energy for purposes of this section;

“(B) is located in the United States (including the territories and possessions of the United States); and

“(C) is owned by the United States, or contracted to the United States, to store or use special nuclear material.

“(2) The terms ‘unmanned aircraft’ and ‘unmanned aircraft system’ have the meaning given those terms in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–95; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4509 the following new item:

“Sec. 4510. Protection of certain nuclear facilities from unmanned aircraft.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I just want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the staff and the Members for putting together this piece of legislation. It is always a long process but I think a good process, in which we pull together a variety of different amendments. And, as the chairman has said many times, it is a bottom-up process. It starts with the Members offering their ideas in putting together the bill. I think, once again, we have done that process fairly well.

The problem and the challenge, as I had mentioned earlier, comes from the budget number and the problems that we face. I know the chairman has said earlier, you know, we can't solve all these problems; so let's help the troops now.

The problem is, it is like you have got a credit card and you say: wow, off in the future there may be problems, but let's just buy whatever we want, put it on the credit card now, and that will help everybody in the long run. But it doesn't. It is not helping the troops to pass a bill that has 6 months worth of funding for a yearlong's worth of overseas contingency operations, and it is not helping them to hope that the Budget Control Act goes away.

The chairman mentioned that last year we had this same problem and we did wind up getting an agreement, and that is true. Part of the reason we got that agreement, however, is because we, on this side, insisted on that agreement and did not merely accept the defense bill that was offered without resolving those issues.

And, once again, we have to insist upon that: that it does not make sense to have the Budget Control Act and continue to insist on spending more money on defense. Essentially, what the majority party wants is they want a Ferrari, but they only want to provide the money to pay for a Honda, and they keep hoping that somehow that extra money is going to appear. That hurts our troops.

We have heard all of these stories about the terrible state of our readi-

ness. Consistently, over the course of the last 4 years, the bill that has been passed in the House and the Senate has put less money into readiness than the President asked for. Why? Because they wanted to pay for a wide variety of programs, including the A-10, an important plane, we have heard.

I am not saying that there is anything in this bill that you can't make an argument for as being important. The problem is it doesn't add up, and it leaves us in a position where the military is continually having to stare at a cliff, knowing that the money is not going to be there and trying to figure out how to plan through that.

I want a more sensible process. We should fully fund the OCO and fund the base budget at the level that it is funded at. If we don't find that sufficient—and I know just about every member of the Armed Services Committee on the Republican side does not find that number sufficient—then provide the money. This isn't a matter of saying, well, what has that got to do with this? That has got everything to do with this.

If you are not willing to provide the money to pay for these programs, starting them, or telling the military that they have to have a fixed number of members of the Army and the Marine Corps, and then knowing that the money isn't going to be there a year from now, is not helpful. We have to bring some sanity to the budget process. This bill, artfully, just imagines that 6 months from now, we will magically make up the extra money in OCO. That is a big problem that, once again, we need to confront.

But just like last year, I am confident that we will come together in conference, we will talk about this, we will work it out, and we will come up with a bill. But I hope that we will start understanding the money a little bit better and making this actually work so that the bill we pass is helping the men and women of the armed services who serve us so well.

So it is not about whether or not you support the troops or not; it is a matter of whether or not you think this bill is the best way to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise to thank Ranking Member SMITH and Chairman THORNBERRY for an amendment that was included in one of the prior en bloc groups of amendments.

The amendment that I joined Mr. POMPEO in offering requires the DOD to report to Congress on the cooperation between Iran and the Russian Federation and the extent to which that cooperation affects our national security interests.

Even before the Iran nuclear deal, we watched Tehran and Moscow become

closer partners, as Russia announced it would lift its ban on selling advanced missiles to Iran and began military cooperation with Iran in Syria to prop up the Assad government.

This year, Russia and Iran have worked together to undermine U.N. Security Council ballistic missile resolutions and announced an \$800 million missile defense contract.

It is imperative that we fully understand the impact of this alliance on our national security interests because both nations continue to be hostile towards the U.S. and our allies. This amendment will help do just that.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time just to, again, emphasize that this is a very, very important piece of legislation, and it is important that we get it right. This is one step in the process.

At the committee level, we worked together and got the bill out. At the time, I raised the concerns that I am raising now. I voted in favor of the bill, hoping that we would make improvements on the floor. Instead, we went the other way.

We had one amendment that was supported in the committee that the Rules Committee stripped without allowing a vote, a rule that would have women sign up for the Selective Service, an amendment that was supported by my caucus. The Rules Committee didn't even allow us to have a vote on that. They just stripped it.

On another one, on the amendment that we didn't like that was in the bill, they went the other way and didn't allow a vote on that to keep it in place. That is not a fair process.

I will say that there are ultimately two objections to this bill and preface it with one thing. I think the chairman in committee has been very, very fair, has worked very well with Democrats, and I do appreciate that. The Rules Committee, on the other hand, has been the exact opposite. They have been completely and totally partisan in a way that is not in keeping with the tradition of the Armed Services Committee and the way we do business in a fair way: to allow members to have votes on amendments that are important to them. They didn't do that, and that made this bill even worse than it was when it came out of committee. I hope the Rules Committee will do better in the future. I don't think that is likely, but that is certainly one issue.

The second issue is, again, the funding. If we are really going to provide for the troops, we have to realistically look at the next 10 years and begin

building a national security strategy that can support them, based on the budget that we are prepared to provide. There is no new revenue coming. Even if the budget caps go away, typically the way the budget caps go away is they are extended for another year, and basically we use 10-year money to pay for 1 year's worth of goods and services, which only puts us in a further hole.

Lastly, I will point out those other portions of the budget. The defense budget has grown as a proportion of the discretionary budget. It is now over 55 percent of it.

□ 1915

Essentially, what the Republican party is trying to do is to spend all of the money on defense, and then there will be nothing left over for the other priorities. Those other priorities do matter, and it is wrong to ask: Well, what has the defense bill got to do with our crumbling infrastructure? What has the defense bill got to do with long lines at the TSA or at Homeland Security or at the Department of Justice or anywhere else?

It has got everything to do with it in a year when we don't have a budget resolution, so we don't have set amounts of money for each bill. Every dollar that we put into this is taking out of the overall allocation and is taking from all of those other priorities.

Yes, national security is incredibly important, but I think infrastructure is important as well. I think the Department of Homeland Security is important, as is the Department of Justice, as is the Department of the Treasury, which tries to stop terrorists from raising money. What we are doing here is refusing to pass a budget resolution, to put the numbers in place, and then spending all of the money on defense first—sorry. It is an exaggeration as it is not all of the money but more of the money than was agreed upon—and then what is left over goes to everything else. That is not a responsible way to budget. That is not a responsible way to provide for this country.

For those reasons, I am going to oppose the bill. I hope, again, as we did last year, we will work this out in conference, come up with a more sensible approach, and have a bill that we can all support.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments that he believes I have tried to be fair with Members of the minority in constructing this bill. I have tried to be; although I have to say, Mr. Chair, if one leans over backwards to make sure Members of the minority contribute to the bill even to the point at which some of the provisions Members of the minority are interested in are opposed by Members of the majority—if you still try to do that and yet Members of the minority vote against the bill—I

have got to ask myself: Why? Why do I do such things?

Just in the past hour and a half, maybe 2 hours, we have spent time with basically equal numbers of Members on the Republican and Democratic sides in their talking about their amendments—discussing very important issues—but none of those issues happen without having the bill pass. Yet I get the feeling that, at least for some Members, there may always be that next bridge that we have got to get to before they can support the bill.

Mr. Chair, the ranking member described my view really better than I did. He said that my opinion is we have to help the troops now, and that is exactly my view. Just think about what the alternative is: no, we are not going to help the troops now because we are not sure where the money is going to come from next year or 5 years from now or the next 10 years. In the meantime, while we are not sure about all of that, we are going to continue to let class A mishaps grow. What that means is more people stand in danger of losing their lives, but we are going to go ahead and allow that to happen because we don't know where the money is going to come from or we object to this provision, et cetera.

It is absolutely true. My view is to help the troops now because now is the time that they are cannibalizing the aircraft, not getting the minimum number of training hours, seeing class A mishaps go up, have only nine B-1s that are available to fly. The statistics go on and on.

Mr. Chair, the other point I would make is that readiness is not just a question of funding the operation and maintenance accounts. That is really what I have thought most of the time I have been here. What I have come to understand, however, is that you can cut end strength, you can cut the number of people in the military, down to the point that you can never get ready. I think that is part of what the Air Force is facing now. They have cut the number of people. We are 700 pilots short, and we are 4,000 maintainers short. It doesn't matter how much money you are putting toward them when you have only so many mechanics. The average experience of a mechanic in the military has dropped significantly just in the last 2 years. People are part of fixing readiness, and procurement is part of fixing readiness.

How many times do I have to explain that you can't fix a 1979 Black Hawk helicopter?

You have to get a new one. You can't replace an early 1980s F/A-18 model. There are no more parts for it. You have to replace it with an F-35. That is what we do in this bill.

Mr. Chair, I continue to be perplexed at how the funding approach that was good and passed by a Democratic majority in 2008, between Bush and Obama, is somehow unacceptable between Obama and whoever is next. None of us knows who is next. We don't

know who is going to be the next President. To fully fund the readiness requirements for the whole year so as to deal with those problems of maintenance and training and people and procurement, to fully fund those and then have the new President take a fresh look at the deployments, seems to make sense. It sure made sense in 2008. I think it makes sense in 2016 as well.

Mr. Chair, the Rules Committee made in order 180 amendments for consideration here on the floor. I understand not everybody's amendment was made in order, but it is a little hard for me to understand how people could complain about the process when 180 amendments were made in order, many by Democrats, many by Republicans. I realize not every amendment was made in order, but, surely, a lot of topics have been discussed.

Finally, Mr. Chair, I just have to take a moment and read one of the amendments that some Members have complained about that was placed into the bill in committee by Mr. RUSSELL of Oklahoma.

It reads:

Any branch or agency of the Federal Government shall provide protections and exemptions consistent with section 702(a) and 703(e)(2) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and section 103(d) of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

That is it. It is one paragraph. That is it. I don't know who is opposed today to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. That is the reason I just get this feeling, personally, that there may be those who are just looking for some excuse to vote against the bill. The price of that is that readiness problems—class A mishaps—will continue on the trend they are on.

Absolutely. Help the troops now. I can't predict the future. I don't know who is going to be elected President. I don't know who is going to be elected to Congress. I don't know what the budget will be in future times, but I know what I can do now. I know what I can do today. I can help the troops now. You bet. Sign me up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 119 printed in House Report 114-571.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE LXXIII—GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

SEC. 7301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act".

SEC. 7302. RECOGNITION OF THE SUFFERING AND LOYALTY OF THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM.

(a) RECOGNITION OF THE SUFFERING OF THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM.—The United States recognizes that, as described by the Guam War Claims Review Commission, the residents of Guam, on account of their United States nationality, suffered unspeakable harm as a result of the occupation of Guam by Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II, by being subjected to death, rape, severe personal injury, personal injury, forced labor, forced march, or internment.

(b) RECOGNITION OF THE LOYALTY OF THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM.—The United States forever will be grateful to the residents of Guam for their steadfast loyalty to the United States, as demonstrated by the countless acts of courage they performed despite the threat of death or great bodily harm they faced at the hands of the Imperial Japanese military forces that occupied Guam during World War II.

SEC. 7303. GUAM WORLD WAR II CLAIMS FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish in the Treasury of the United States a special fund (in this title referred to as the "Claims Fund") for the payment of claims submitted by compensable Guam victims and survivors of compensable Guam decedents in accordance with sections 7304 and 7305.

(b) COMPOSITION OF FUND.—The Claims Fund established under subsection (a) shall be composed of amounts deposited into the Claims Fund under subsection (c) and any other payments made available for the payment of claims under this title.

(c) PAYMENT OF CERTAIN DUTIES, TAXES, AND FEES COLLECTED FROM GUAM DEPOSITED INTO FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1421h), the excess of—

(A) any amount of duties, taxes, and fees collected under such section after fiscal year 2014, over

(B) the amount of duties, taxes, and fees collected under such section during fiscal year 2014,

shall be deposited into the Claims Fund.

(2) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply after the date for which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that all payments required to be made under section 7304 have been made.

(d) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS MADE FROM FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No payment may be made in a fiscal year under section 7304 until funds are deposited into the Claims Fund in such fiscal year under subsection (c).

(2) AMOUNTS.—For each fiscal year in which funds are deposited into the Claims Fund under subsection (c), the total amount of payments made in a fiscal year under section 7304 may not exceed the amount of funds available in the Claims Fund for such fiscal year.

(e) DEDUCTIONS FROM FUND FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from any amounts deposited into the Claims Fund an amount equal to 5 percent of such amounts as reimbursement to the Federal Government for expenses incurred by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and by the Department of the Treasury in the administration of this title. The amounts so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 7304. PAYMENTS FOR GUAM WORLD WAR II CLAIMS.

(a) PAYMENTS FOR DEATH, PERSONAL INJURY, FORCED LABOR, FORCED MARCH, AND INTERNMENT.—After the Secretary of the

Treasury receives the certification from the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission as required under section 7305(b)(8), the Secretary of the Treasury shall make payments, subject to the availability of appropriations, to compensable Guam victims and survivors of a compensable Guam decedents as follows:

(1) COMPENSABLE GUAM VICTIM.—Before making any payments under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall make payments to compensable Guam victims as follows:

(A) In the case of a victim who has suffered an injury described in subsection (c)(2)(A), \$15,000.

(B) In the case of a victim who is not described in subparagraph (A), but who has suffered an injury described in subsection (c)(2)(B), \$12,000.

(C) In the case of a victim who is not described in subparagraph (A) or (B), but who has suffered an injury described in subsection (c)(2)(C), \$10,000.

(2) SURVIVORS OF COMPENSABLE GUAM DECEDENTS.—In the case of a compensable Guam decedent, the Secretary shall pay \$25,000 for distribution to survivors of the decedent in accordance with subsection (b). The Secretary shall make payments under this paragraph only after all payments are made under paragraph (1).

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF SURVIVOR PAYMENTS.—A payment made under subsection (a)(2) to the survivors of a compensable Guam decedent shall be distributed as follows:

(1) In the case of a decedent whose spouse is living as of the date of the enactment of this Act, but who had no living children as of such date, the payment shall be made to such spouse.

(2) In the case of a decedent whose spouse is living as of the date of the enactment of this Act and who had one or more living children as of such date, 50 percent of the payment shall be made to the spouse and 50 percent shall be made to such children, to be divided among such children to the greatest extent possible into equal shares.

(3) In the case of a decedent whose spouse is not living as of the date of the enactment of this Act and who had one or more living children as of such date, the payment shall be made to such children, to be divided among such children to the greatest extent possible into equal shares.

(4) In the case of a decedent whose spouse is not living as of the date of the enactment of this Act and who had no living children as of such date, but who—

(A) had a parent who is living as of such date, the payment shall be made to the parent; or

(B) had two parents who are living as of such date, the payment shall be divided equally between the parents.

(5) In the case of a decedent whose spouse is not living as of the date of the enactment of this Act, who had no living children as of such date, and who had no parents who are living as of such date, no payment shall be made.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this title:

(1) COMPENSABLE GUAM DECEDENT.—The term "compensable Guam decedent" means an individual determined under section 7305 to have been a resident of Guam who died as a result of the attack and occupation of Guam by Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II, or incident to the liberation of Guam by United States military forces, and whose death would have been compensable under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 79-224) if a timely claim had been filed under the terms of such Act.

(2) COMPENSABLE GUAM VICTIM.—The term "compensable Guam victim" means an individual who is not deceased as of the date of

the enactment of this Act and who is determined under section 7305 to have suffered, as a result of the attack and occupation of Guam by Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II, or incident to the liberation of Guam by United States military forces, any of the following:

(A) Rape or severe personal injury (such as loss of a limb, dismemberment, or paralysis).

(B) Forced labor or a personal injury not under subparagraph (A) (such as disfigurement, scarring, or burns).

(C) Forced march, internment, or hiding to evade internment.

(3) DEFINITIONS OF SEVERE PERSONAL INJURIES AND PERSONAL INJURIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall promulgate regulations to specify the injuries that constitute a severe personal injury or a personal injury for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, of paragraph (2).

SEC. 7305. ADJUDICATION.

(a) AUTHORITY OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall adjudicate claims and determine the eligibility of individuals for payments under section 7304.

(2) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall publish in the Federal Register such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission under this title.

(b) CLAIMS SUBMITTED FOR PAYMENTS.—

(1) SUBMITTAL OF CLAIM.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1) and subject to paragraph (2), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission may not determine an individual is eligible for a payment under section 7304 unless the individual submits to the Commission a claim in such manner and form and containing such information as the Commission specifies.

(2) FILING PERIOD FOR CLAIMS AND NOTICE.—

(A) FILING PERIOD.—An individual filing a claim for a payment under section 7304 shall file such claim not later than one year after the date on which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission publishes the notice described in subparagraph (B).

(B) NOTICE OF FILING PERIOD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall publish a notice of the deadline for filing a claim described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the Federal Register; and
(ii) in newspaper, radio, and television media in Guam.

(3) ADJUDICATORY DECISIONS.—The decision of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission on each claim filed under this title shall—

(A) be by majority vote;
(B) be in writing;
(C) state the reasons for the approval or denial of the claim; and
(D) if approved, state the amount of the payment awarded and the distribution, if any, to be made of the payment.

(4) DEDUCTIONS IN PAYMENT.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall deduct, from a payment made to a compensable Guam victim or survivors of a compensable Guam decedent under this section, amounts paid to such victim or survivors under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 79-224) before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) INTEREST.—No interest shall be paid on payments made by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission under section 7304.

(6) LIMITED COMPENSATION FOR PROVISION OF REPRESENTATIONAL SERVICES.—

(A) LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—Any agreement under which an individual who provided representational services to an individual who filed a claim for a payment under this title that provides for compensation to the individual who provided such services in an amount that is more than one percent of the total amount of such payment shall be unlawful and void.

(B) PENALTIES.—Whoever demands or receives any compensation in excess of the amount allowed under subparagraph (A) shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(7) APPEALS AND FINALITY.—Objections and appeals of decisions of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall be to the Commission, and upon rehearing, the decision in each claim shall be final, and not subject to further review by any court or agency.

(8) CERTIFICATIONS FOR PAYMENT.—After a decision approving a claim becomes final, the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall certify such decision to the Secretary of the Treasury for authorization of a payment under section 7304.

(9) TREATMENT OF AFFIDAVITS.—For purposes of section 7304 and subject to paragraph (2), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall treat a claim that is accompanied by an affidavit of an individual that attests to all of the material facts required for establishing the eligibility of such individual for payment under such section as establishing a prima facie case of the eligibility of the individual for such payment without the need for further documentation, except as the Commission may otherwise require. Such material facts shall include, with respect to a claim for a payment made under section 7304(a), a detailed description of the injury or other circumstance supporting the claim involved, including the level of payment sought.

(10) RELEASE OF RELATED CLAIMS.—Acceptance of a payment under section 7304 by an individual for a claim related to a compensable Guam decedent or a compensable Guam victim shall be in full satisfaction of all claims related to such decedent or victim, respectively, arising under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 79-224), the implementing regulations issued by the United States Navy pursuant to such Act (Public Law 79-224), or this title.

SEC. 7306. GRANTS PROGRAM TO MEMORIALIZE THE OCCUPATION OF GUAM DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a grant program under which the Secretary shall award grants for research, educational, and media activities for purposes of appropriately illuminating and interpreting the causes and circumstances of the occupation of Guam during World War II and other similar occupations during the war that—

(1) memorialize the events surrounding such occupation; or
(2) honor the loyalty of the people of Guam during such occupation.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior may not award a grant under subsection (a) unless the person seeking the grant submits an application to the Secretary for such grant, in such time, manner, and form and containing such information as the Secretary specifies.

SEC. 7307. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GUAM WORLD WAR II CLAIMS PAYMENTS AND ADJUDICATION.—For the purposes of carrying out sections 7304 and 7305, there is authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this act, an amount equal to the amount

deposited into the Claims Fund in a fiscal year under section 7303. Not more than 5 percent of funds made available under this subsection shall be used for administrative costs. Amounts appropriated under this section may remain available until expended.

(b) GUAM WORLD WAR II GRANTS PROGRAM.—For purposes of carrying out section 7306, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 735, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I appreciate this amendment being made in order.

It is time that we bring resolution to the people of Guam and all U.S. citizens who have suffered under enemy occupation during World War II. We found an offset to address its costs, which was one of the problems. I look forward to adopting this amendment and working with the Senate during conference.

Again, I thank very much Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH and Chairman BISHOP for their support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the many contributions the gentlewoman from Guam has made to our committee as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Readiness, among other capacities. I think this is a good amendment, and I certainly hope our Members will support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4909) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:
To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2016.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 18, 2016.

ZIKA RESPONSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 736, I call up the bill (H.R. 5243) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, to strengthen public health activities in response to the Zika virus, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 736, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5243

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION
CDC-WIDE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM SUPPORT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “CDC-Wide Activities and Program Support”, \$170,000,000, which shall become available upon enactment of this Act and remain available until September 30, 2016, to prevent, prepare for, and respond to Zika virus, domestically and internationally: *Provided*, That products purchased with such funds may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F-2 of the Public Health Service (“PHS”) Act: *Provided further*, That such funds may be used for purchase and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 317S of the PHS Act shall apply to the use of funds appropriated in this paragraph as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”) to be appropriate: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph may be transferred by the Director of CDC to other accounts of the CDC for the purposes provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$50,000,000 may be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated under the heading “Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health” for an additional amount for the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant Program only for the following activities related to patient care associated with the Zika virus: prenatal care, delivery care, postpartum care, newborn health assessments, and care for infants with special health care needs: *Provided further*, That such transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided by law: *Provided further*, That such transferred funds may be awarded notwithstanding section 502 of the Social Security Act: *Provided further*, That such transferred funds may be awarded for special projects of regional and national significance to States, Puerto Rico, other Territories, Indian Tribes, Tribal Organizations and Urban Indian Organizations authorized under title V of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funding provided by a grant from funds in the fifth proviso may be used to make a grant to any other organization or individual.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases”, \$230,000,000, which shall become available upon enactment of this Act and remain available until September 30, 2016, for pre-clinical and clinical development of vaccines for the Zika virus: *Provided*, That such funds may be transferred by the Director of the National Institutes of Health (“NIH”) to other accounts of the NIH for the purposes provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That such transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided by law: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
EMERGENCY FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, \$103,000,000, which shall become available upon enactment of this Act and remain available until September 30, 2016, to develop necessary countermeasures and vaccines, including the development and purchase of vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostics, necessary medical supplies, and administrative activities to respond to Zika virus, domestically and internationally: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph may be used to procure security countermeasures (as defined in section 319F-2(c)(1)(B) of the PHS Act): *Provided further*, That paragraphs (1) and (7)(C) of subsection (c) of section 319F-2 of the PHS Act, but no other provisions of such section, shall apply to such security countermeasures procured with funds appropriated in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That products purchased with funds appropriated in this paragraph may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile under section 319F-2 of the PHS Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph may be transferred to the fund authorized by section 319F-4 of the PHS Act: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE
NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 101. Funds appropriated by this title shall only be available for obligation if the Secretary of Health and Human Services notifies the Committees on Appropriations in writing at least 15 days in advance of such obligation: *Provided*, That the requirement of this section may be waived if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare: *Provided further*, That in case of any such waiver, notification to such Committees shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable: *Provided further*, That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SEC. 102. Not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a consolidated report on the proposed uses of funds appropriated by this title for which the obligation of funds is anticipated: *Provided*, That such report shall be updated and submitted to such Committees every 30 days until all funds have been fully expended.

OVERSIGHT

SEC. 103. Of the funds appropriated by this title under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention”, up to—

(1) \$500,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds available under the heading “Office of Inspector General”, and shall remain available until expended, for oversight of activities supported with funds appropriated by this title: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided by this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority provided by law; and

(2) \$500,000 shall be made available to the Comptroller General of the United States,