



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2014

No. 77

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 21, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CELEBRATING MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, next Monday is Memorial Day, one of the most solemn holidays in America. We remember those who gave their lives in ultimate sacrifice to our country, those who were wounded, those who are veterans, and those who are still serving our country in dangerous occupations around the world to defend our freedoms.

This is a day that should be solemnly celebrated, and it will be in many

places. It could be better solemnly celebrated if the United States Congress would exert a little more oversight and get a little more funding to the VA, so that we don't have veterans dying on waiting lists. We have got to get to the bottom of that scandal, and we have got to adequately fund that agency and give them permanent funding.

Beyond that, there is another group in America who have a very special Memorial Day celebration every year, and that is the United States oil industry. They are, of course, very patriotic. They don't pay much in taxes in the U.S. They have over \$100 billion stashed overseas because they don't want to pay U.S. taxes, even though they pay a higher rate many places overseas.

They are very patriotic, and so every year, they have a special celebration where they run up the price.

Now, the oil companies and their handmaidens on the Republican side of the aisle will say: It is all about shortage. All we need is to drill in sensitive areas offshore. All we need to do is build the XL pipeline, and your prices will come down.

Well, that is pretty amazing except, of course, it is a huge lie. Today, the United States of America will export more than 450,000 barrels of gasoline, while they are running the price up on Americans, saying: Hey, don't you know there is a shortage?

Funny thing, I haven't seen any little red flags or yellow flags like they used to have at gas stations saying they have got no gas. No, they have got gas, but they have got it at an exorbitant price, so this is the annual celebration.

Now, ExxonMobil, last year, they were hurting. They only made \$32.6 billion. Their last CEO, when he retired, they gave him a \$500 million bonus. They are hurting. He went out and bought oil fields with it in Africa. That is pretty cute.

There is a shortage, and that is why you are paying over four bucks a gallon in many places, particularly in my district and in the Western United States, over four bucks a gallon because of this extraordinary shortage.

So here we are, it is Memorial Day. Wouldn't it be nice if we reined in the oil companies? Wouldn't it be nice if we stopped subsidizing them with tax breaks?

Well, not on the Republican side of aisle, they think that is patriotic to subsidize the oil companies' tax rates because they need them because there is a shortage. Well, no, there isn't a shortage, but, hey, they still need and want those tax breaks, and they want to price gouge people at the pump.

So I, for one, will celebrate Memorial Day appropriately, remembering those who have served our country, but for one Member of Congress, I would like to do something about what is going on with oil and gas prices.

I would like to take away their subsidies. I would like to get the speculators on Wall Street out of the oil and gas business. They are driving up the price.

Even according to ExxonMobil, 75 cents a gallon you pay at the pump today, 75 cents of that dollar—\$4—that is going to Wall Street speculators, something that didn't use to be allowed and a bill that I voted against which deregulated that commodities markets, which was supposed to be re-regulated under Dodd-Frank, but the Republicans are opposing any and every effort to re-regulate the commodities market.

Unfortunately, there are few on my side of the aisle who are in the pockets of the oil industry, too, so we could do better. We could do better for our veterans, and we could do better for the American consumers. Let's do it.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4687

RECOGNIZING CHANCELLOR MARK A. NORDENBERG, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Mark A. Nordenberg, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, which includes regional campuses in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, in Bradford, McKean County, Pennsylvania, and Titusville, Crawford County, Pennsylvania.

This August, Chancellor Nordenberg will step down after 19 years as chancellor, but will remain at the university that he has served for over 37 years.

During Chancellor Nordenberg's tenure, the university experienced tremendous growth. Annual applications for admission climbed from 7,825 to 27,626. Overall enrollments have steadily increased. Average SAT scores for incoming students are now 185 points higher, and the university continues to expand and to modernize.

Today, the University of Pittsburgh is ranked nationally and competing for the best students in the region, the country, and the world.

Chancellor Nordenberg joined the faculty of Pitt's School of Law in 1977, eventually serving as dean and interim provost of the university. In 1995, he was elected interim chancellor by the university's board of trustees, and in 1996, he was elected chancellor.

Through Chancellor Nordenberg's vision and leadership, the University of Pittsburgh now has an outstanding foundation for success which will last for years to come.

Tomorrow, Chancellor Nordenberg will receive Pitt-Bradford's highest honor, the Presidential Medal of Distinction, which recognizes individuals who have demonstrated outstanding long-term service to the university.

It is my honor to join Dr. Alexander, president of Pitt-Bradford, and the entire University of Pittsburgh team, in offering my congratulations on receiving this important distinction.

Mr. Speaker, we thank Chancellor Nordenberg for his commitment to educational excellence, for his drive and passion to build the University of Pittsburgh into a renowned institution of higher learning.

FREE AMIR HEKMATI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week, I and many others were in Lafayette Park joining the family of Amir Hekmati, my constituent, to commemorate a very sad anniversary.

For 1,000 days, Amir Hekmati, a young man born in the United States, grew up in my hometown of Flint,

Michigan. His parents emigrated to the United States long before Amir was born, in the late 1970s, from Iran. Amir Hekmati has been sitting in a prison—in Evin Prison in Tehran, for 1,000 days.

He traveled to Iran for the first time in August of 2011 because, like many other young men and young women, he wanted to explore his own roots. He had served in the United States Marine Corps, came home; and, before enrolling in school, he wanted to go visit family that he had never met and, in fact, wanted to meet his grandmother whom he had never seen before.

He was there for about 2 weeks before he was arrested. For months, nobody knew where he was, and then soon it was revealed that he had been arrested, tried, and convicted of espionage. Because he was an American who had served in the Marine Corps, he was convicted of espionage.

That death sentence that was initially executed on him was set aside, and that death sentence was suspended. Apparently, there had been a new trial, and he is now, according to a New York Times report, serving a 10-year sentence.

This is a young man who simply went to visit his family, traveled with permission, in a transparent fashion, and is now caught up in the geopolitical struggle as Iran, apparently, seeks to rejoin the international community.

One thousand days in prison—holidays have passed; we experience every one of these days, the changing of seasons. For all of us, we take these moments, these passages for granted.

For Amir Hekmati, every day is the same. Every day, he is in a cell, for many, many months, in a 3 by 3 cell, unable to even sit down for all but 10 minutes of every day.

If Iran truly seeks to rejoin the international community—of course, there are the P5+1 negotiations taking place right now. If Iran seeks to join the global community, and if this Congress is to take any agreement that might be struck seriously, Iran must now free Amir Hekmati. If they expect to be taken seriously, they cannot hold political prisoners.

Now, for most of us, we don't think there is much that we can do about this, but I think every American citizen, every Member of Congress—especially those who have joined me in a bipartisan fashion in calling upon Iran to release Amir Hekmati—can do something. We all can.

For those of you that use Twitter, #FreeAmir. Believe me, it sends a message. It sends a message across the globe. It sends a message to the Iranian people, to the Iranian Government. It sends a message to the friends and the family of Amir Hekmati that our country stands with him.

During those 1,000 days, Amir Hekmati's father has fallen ill. He has brain cancer. It is time, even if for just humanitarian purposes, it is time, long past time, for Iran to do what is right

and to release Amir Hekmati, so he can come home and be with his family.

SUPPORT OUR AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today's congressional business is to deal with the defense authorization legislation. This is a critical bill, a real opportunity to balance our needs for a strong defense and care for our men and women in uniform, with the hard budget realities and unsustainable trend lines that we are seeing across the budget categories.

But because we are ducking the hard tradeoffs in this Defense Authorization, tradeoffs that at least the administration—to its credit—and the Pentagon laid before Congress with their recommendations. We are going to have to resort to an amendment process on the floor to use these areas of opportunity to make longer-term savings and to use part of that money to address key priorities that are short-changed.

□ 1015

Now, I have an amendment that would help support our Air National Guard. The Guard and Ready Reserves are a cost-effective way to provide support for our military establishments. They have proven their worth time and time again overseas, like in Iraq and Afghanistan, and here at home as they help us deal with natural disasters.

The Air National Guard also operates a fleet of 130 F-15 fighter jets in installations across America, but more than half these planes rely on an outmoded, limited radar technology from the 1970s. That means that for many of our pilots, their radar is older than they are. It went out of production in 1986. It limits their capacity, and it breaks down more frequently. It is less reliable. That is why my amendment will actually save money over the next 10 years.

Soon we will be voting on whether or not we will do the right thing to support this vital work of the Air National Guard. Now, during the debate last night, the opponents couldn't argue against the wisdom of making the Air Guard more effective by upgrading this outmoded radar technology that is unreliable and limits their capacity. In fact, they admitted that the little bit that the budget will do to upgrade some of them actually was helpful. They had no good reason to continue to shortchange the Guard.

Instead, during the debate, they tried to make this modest proposal into a larger debate about the one-half to two-thirds of \$1 trillion we will be spending over the next 10 years for our whole nuclear weapons program. Now, that is a debate I will welcome on the floor of the House.

In fact, I have legislation that would save \$100 billion over the next 10 years and would start us on a much different path to rein in the bloated, expensive, unnecessary, and redundant nuclear deterrent that is many times more than we can afford or that we need. How many times do we have to completely destroy a country from how many different platforms in order to meet our objective of deterrence? We are spending more in inflation-adjusted terms than we spent at the height of the cold war with the Soviet Union. Not only is the program more than we need, but the costs are out of control.

I am pleased that later today we will debate an amendment that the Rules Committee made in order to make last year's Congressional Budget Office report on the reliability of the weapons costs an annual event. That is important because the first report that was issued in December showed that there is a \$150 billion underestimation from the administration's current program projections, and that is before the committee added more money and changed the timelines.

By all means, let's have that debate on the floor of the House, on how many of these weapons we need. We have never used these weapons in 69 years and are too expensive and actually, in and of themselves, are dangerous. Let's have the debate sooner rather than later so that we can set our priorities. In the meantime, let's not confuse the tiny reallocation under my amendment with a larger question that is 1,000 times greater.

What it does show is that the money is there to help the Air Guard do their job right. It would be a shame if we let them down and did not approve the Blumenauer amendment.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House. Keep them aware of Your presence as they face the tasks of this day, that no burden be too heavy, no duty too difficult, and no work too wearisome.

Help them and, indeed, help us all to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive, eager to work, and ready to serve You, our great Nation, and all our fellow brothers and sisters.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day to honor and remember the fallen heroes who paid the ultimate price while serving in the Armed Forces, it is vital for Congress to ensure appropriate funding for our troops.

With crises around the world and constant threats to our national defense, we ask a lot of those who wear the uniform. They shouldn't have to ask for anything in return.

In November 2009, an Islamic extremist opened fire on troops at Fort Hood, killing 14 and injuring dozens of others. The victims and survivors have been denied the benefits and honors granted to injured troops in combat zones because the President considers the massacre workplace violence, rather than a terrorist attack.

Nobody in America, but this administration, believes this was workplace violence. The men and women dressed in Army fatigues that day were targets simply because they were American soldiers.

H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act, brings the victims of

the Fort Hood shooting one step closer to receiving the Purple Heart medal, giving them the benefits they earned and the recognition they deserve.

They were victims of terrorism, and it is time for them to be recognized as such. I urge every Member to vote in favor of our troops. Vote for H.R. 4435.

In God we trust.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is just wrong. It is wrong that we have 2.8 million hardworking Americans who have lost their jobs and are looking every day for their next job.

They stand to lose everything that they have worked for, and this Congress has within its power the ability to act to save them from losing decades of hard work, losing their house, losing their car, losing the roof over their head; but this Congress fails to bring up a bill that has passed the Senate, that the President would sign, that would extend unemployment benefits to 2.8 million Americans who work hard every day.

There is one reason that this Congress has failed to act, and it is because the Speaker and the Republican leadership will not bring this bill to the floor.

This bill would not increase the deficit. It is paid for, but it would end the misery and the suffering of so many hardworking people who get up every day, wondering if today is the day that the foreclosure notice will come, if today is the day that the car will be repossessed.

We are all Americans. We have always stood together. We have always helped one another when times are tough. For 2.8 million people, times are tough.

Congress needs to act. I call on this House to bring up H.R. 4415. Let's do this now.

REVITALIZING THE CITY OF MORAINE, OHIO

(Mr. TURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, during the depths of the recession, a former General Motors plant closed in the city of Moraine, Ohio. The plant was set for demolition, which would have ended any hope of jobs returning to the site.

Moraine Mayor Elaine Allison, City Manager David Hicks, and Economic Director Michael Davis all worked very diligently to preserve this resource and make certain this plant was not a parking lot. Their tireless efforts paid off.

Last Thursday, the city of Moraine officially welcomed Fuyao, a thriving auto parts manufacturer, back to the

former GM facility, creating hundreds of new jobs throughout the region.

I want to congratulate the mayor, city council and city manager and economic director of Moraine for this great accomplishment and teamwork. They rallied the community behind this resource.

Congratulations to the leadership in Moraine. It was great working with you on this project.

ACCOUNTABILITY IS NEEDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the need for accountability and action in the Department of Veterans Affairs. I urge my colleagues to sign on to a letter I have written the Secretary that follows up my call on May 6 for a nationwide audit of all veteran medical facilities.

While the VA has stated that an audit is currently under way, I am very concerned about testimony in last week's Senate Veterans Affairs hearing. In that hearing, it was suggested that the audit under way may not be as thorough and comprehensive as what I called for.

I do not believe that a thorough, in-depth examination of patient scheduling in every VA facility can be accomplished in just a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, if we are dealing with a serious, systemic problem, then this audit is critical. We need a thorough and comprehensive review of scheduling practices at every VA medical facility. Anything less would be a disservice to our veterans who deserve a health care system they can trust.

CONGRATULATING THE RUN NOW RELAY TEAM OF CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Run Now Relay team of Cleveland, Tennessee. Run Now Relay ran more than 1,000 miles—from Cleveland to Boston—to support and raise money for the victims of the Boston bombings.

These extraordinary men and women ran nonstop through eight States in just over a week. Together, they surpassed their goal of \$50,000, raising more than \$63,000 for those impacted by the tragedy in Boston last year.

The Run Now Relay team pledged 100 percent of the funds to the One Step Ahead Foundation, which aids the children who underwent amputation because of the bombing; and Dream Big, a nonprofit dedicated to helping underprivileged girls through sports.

The team stopped in Washington last week, and my office had the pleasure of meeting with these remarkable folks. Thank you for sharing your mission with us.

Run Now Relay truly exemplifies the great volunteer tradition that defines the State of Tennessee, and I commend the group on their spirit and commitment to honor the victims of the Boston bombings.

They certainly illustrate the best of our great country. We are one Nation.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to remind my Republican colleagues that there are over 2.8 million Americans who have been cut off from unemployment insurance benefits since December 28, 2013.

We are back here in session for 2 weeks, the Senate has worked and passed a measure to renew unemployment insurance, yet Speaker BOEHNER refuses to bring up a bill.

Why, Mr. Speaker?

One of those 2.8 million Americans is Mitch from Nevada. He is 55 and lost his job of 8 years in March of 2013. Since his unemployment insurance ended, he has sold many of his belongings just to stay in his house and to feed his family.

Mitch is a Republican, but more importantly, he is an American, and he is pleading for congressional leaders to not turn their backs on him.

For all struggling Nevadans, I want you to know that we have not forgotten about you.

Mr. Speaker, schedule a vote to extend unemployment insurance benefits to the 2.8 million Americans, the 37,000 Nevadans.

My time may have expired, but it is more important that the unemployment insurance benefits that has expired be extended.

IMPRISONMENT OF SONIA GARRO

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out for Sonia Garro, a member of the pro-democracy group, Las Damas de Blanco—the Ladies in White—who has languished in one of Castro's prisons for over 2 years.

Her case is one of many that demonstrates the dismal condition of human rights under the Castro tyranny in my native homeland of Cuba.

In 2012, Sonia and the Ladies in White sought an audience with the Pope, but, unfortunately, were imprisoned in the wave of repression leading up to the visit of His Holiness.

I, along with many of our congressional colleagues, have asked Amnesty

International to designate Sonia as a prisoner of conscience. The Castros cannot tolerate dissent and use violence to silence calls for democracy by beating and imprisoning dissenting voices.

The Cuban people are courageous, Mr. Speaker, and they will continue to fight for liberty, for human rights; and we must help them in their struggle for freedom.

21ST CENTURY BUY AMERICA ACT

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, I will introduce the 21st Century Buy America Act with Senator CHRIS MURPHY, to modernize decades-old Buy American standards and help create new manufacturing jobs in the United States.

Congress should make sure that American taxpayer dollars are used to buy goods manufactured here at home, not overseas, whenever we can.

Our bill will strengthen existing Buy America standards and make a number of important changes to support our domestic manufacturing base. For example, it will make manufacturers of items in short supply here at home eligible for resources to help them compete against foreign manufacturers for U.S. government contracts.

In addition, this bill increases transparency requirements for agencies that provide waivers, and it increases the domestic content percentage requirement so that, to qualify as American-made, you have to prove that a majority of the materials are actually made right here in America.

Most importantly, this legislation will help grow our manufacturing sector and create new jobs by providing an increased demand for American-made products by the Federal Government.

It is time to bring manufacturing back to America and to support existing manufacturing, and the United States Government should lead by example.

VETERANS DESERVE BETTER FROM THE VA

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not only as a Member of Congress, but as a veteran and former prisoner of war, demanding answers on behalf of my fellow veterans.

Recently, reports surfaced that regional VA employees had secret lists to hide the lengthy wait times for patients, which may have resulted in the loss of lives of some of our veterans. This is unacceptable.

Our men and women in uniform serve their country admirably, risking their lives to keep us safe and protect our

freedoms. They deserve the highest standards of medical care available.

Last week, I urged the VA inspector general to investigate alleged misconduct at three VA clinics in Texas. We need answers and accountability for any wrongdoing.

A fellow POW in Vietnam etched the following on a prison cell. He said:

Freedom has a taste to those who fight and almost die that the protected will never know.

Veterans know that. That is why we owe them our deepest gratitude and the best possible care.

□ 1215

**BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION
ANNIVERSARY: MENDEZ V.
WESTMINSTER**

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 60th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education and the incredible impact it had on our Nation.

The ruling of Brown v. Board of Education ended segregation in schools across the United States, and it declared the doctrine "separate but equal" unconstitutional. It is truly something to be proud of, as Americans.

But as we celebrate, let us not forget the precedent case to that; and that was about a young Mexican American student who, along with her family and others in their community, truly set the stage in the fight to end segregation in all of our schools. This happened in my county, in my district, in my home. The case was Mendez v. Westminster.

In 1945, when Sylvia Mendez was not allowed to go to an all-white school in Orange County, California, her parents, Gonzalo and Felicitas Mendez, fought for integration. And guess what. They won. Segregation in Orange County ended, and the rest of our State followed, and 7 years later the entire country followed.

So as we commemorate the grand case of Brown v. Board of Education, let us also remember Mendez v. Westminster, two historic achievements that opened the doors for a better education for all our children throughout this great Nation.

**HOLDING VA EXECUTIVES
ACCOUNTABLE**

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, like many Montanans, I am outraged by reports that a number of VA clinics have failed to give our veterans the care and honor they deserve. These clinics deliberately covered up delays that may have led to

the preventable deaths of at least 40 veterans, yet the VA executives at these troubled facilities are more likely to be given a bonus than face any sort of accountability. This is disgraceful, and I stand with the millions of Americans who are demanding accountability from the VA.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act will ensure the VA is able to remove career appointees who are failing to do their jobs. And this is common sense. If you fail to do your job and fail the men and women you serve, you shouldn't be getting bonuses. You should be held accountable. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

**CELEBRATING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF NETJETS INC.**

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today, NetJets Inc., a worldwide leader in aviation, is celebrating its 50th anniversary at its headquarters in Columbus, Ohio, in my congressional district. NetJets has made notable contributions to our community in central Ohio by providing transportation services during medical emergencies and natural disasters.

Through the generous efforts of the aircraft owners, the hardworking employees, and intuitive management, NetJets has become the industry standard, by having flown more hours than all other fractional aircraft companies combined. This organization has thrived in meeting the complex transportation needs of American business through safe, reliable jet service, while creating jobs and contributing to central Ohio's economy.

The legacy that NetJets continues to build will enrich the lives of generations to come and shape a bright future in aviation. I commend NetJets on its 50th anniversary.

BOKO HARAM STRIKES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last month, over 200 Nigerian girls went to school and they never came home. They were stolen in the middle of the day by radical Islamic terrorists, the Boko Haram, and sold into sex slavery.

What is the Boko Haram? Mr. Speaker, this is a foreign terrorist organization, and it reigns terror over parts of Nigeria, primarily in the north. They get their funds by forcing people in areas they control to pay a tax to them, like a protection racket. They also get money from al Qaeda.

Boko Haram means "western education is sinful." They kill, rape, and pillage in the name of radical religion. They are not only a threat to Nigeria, but the rest of us as well.

This al Qaeda-affiliated group is a bunch of thugs, bandits, and outlaws, but they are to be reckoned with. Remember the name "Boko Haram." They are not going away. Boko Haram is determined to continue their terrorist lifestyle and steal little girls.

And that's just the way it is.

**A TRIBUTE TO REVEREND FRANK
MCRAE**

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the city of Memphis lost one of its greatest sons and leaders, Reverend Frank McRae.

Reverend McRae was a Memphian who took urban ministry to a new position in the city of Memphis. Before Dr. King was assassinated April 4, 1968, he marched with the sanitation workers and Dr. King. After Dr. King was assassinated, he led a group of ministers to city hall to urge the mayor to settle the strife.

He knew that the church needed to do good deeds and help people in a changing South and a changing America, and he helped found Friends for Life that dealt with people with HIV and AIDS. He helped found the Memphis Interfaith Association that provided food and clothing to people in need. And he turned his church into a place where they had soup kitchens and pantries, rather than a church of the most blessed and most privileged. He was a great man who made Memphis the "city of good abode," as it is well known.

He will be greatly missed. He leaves his wife, two children, and three stepchildren. I am fortunate to have known Frank McRae, and Memphis is fortunate he came our way.

**JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF
TRAFFICKING ACT**

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague from Texas (Mr. POE) and also as a proud cosponsor of the Justice for Victims Trafficking Act, which this House has passed. I join the ever-growing number of Americans who are standing up to the abhorrent practice of human trafficking.

Worldwide awareness concerning the trade in persons has increased significantly in recent years, but awareness is not enough. With an estimated 27 million persons in slavery around the world and hundreds of thousands within our own Nation, now is the time for action.

By doing so, we join those who have already taken action against modern-day slavery, folks like my constituent Vicki Moore. Ten years ago, Vicki was alarmed to read about the commercial

sex trade in India. But she wasn't just alarmed; she decided to do something about it. She founded a nonprofit called Rahab's Rope. Her organization gives hope and opportunity to women and girls who are at risk or have been forced into the commercial sex trade in India.

Women helped by Rahab's Rope in India have the opportunity to produce items that are then sold at the organization's store in Gainesville. Proceeds from those sales go to help even more women and girls in India. The Rahab's Rope store also serves an important function of raising awareness of the sex trade in India and worldwide.

In addition to its work overseas, Rahab's Rope works with local organizations in Georgia to help women break out of the cycle of poverty through education, skills and training, job coaching, and more.

As a longtime supporter of Rahab's Rope, I commend Vicki and others who have been on the front lines of the battle, and I hope that everyone in this body will continue to not only raise awareness of sex trafficking, but will do something about it.

JUSTICE FOR OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I stand here disappointed and heartbroken today as an American and as a soldier because Congress has missed an opportunity to stand up and fight for our troops, especially those who have been victims and survivors of violent sexual crimes that have occurred within our ranks.

These are the less than 1 percent of people in our country who have voluntarily put their lives on the line for us, yet what are we doing for them? It is our responsibility to hear the voices coming from within the ranks of our uniformed services and to let them know that we have their back.

The House this week had a chance to finally take action on a bipartisan effort to remove the chain of command from the decisionmaking process to prosecute a violent sexual crime that occurs within our ranks, but this legislation was blocked from even getting an up-or-down vote on the House floor.

This fight for justice is far from over because we will keep pushing for meaningful change that best serves our men and women in uniform, ensuring them justice and honoring their selfless service to our country.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the human trafficking legislation that was passed by

the House yesterday. These five bills will ensure justice for millions of victims and further the fight to end this vicious crime.

In the United States alone, human trafficking rakes in \$9.8 billion for the use and abuse of victims, many of whom are children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that each year 100,000 children are falling victim to this vile industry within our own borders.

Human trafficking isn't something that is occurring in other countries or other continents; it is happening here in America. I will be holding a summit later this week in West Virginia, in my district to bring together stakeholders to discuss how we can protect our most vulnerable.

These bills are a call to action: to prosecute offenders, to protect victims, to prevent future cases, and to educate. By passing these important bills, the House stood up for those whose voices have been silenced and have said, "No more." I urge the Senate to join us in passing these important bills.

THE ENLIST ACT

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the House Republican leadership for blocking the ENLIST Act.

The ENLIST Act is the type of legislation that should receive support from both parties, as it allows undocumented immigrants who enter the United States before they turned the age of 15 to join the military. After their service, they would become legal permanent residents and would be eligible to apply for citizenship. This legislation was introduced by a Republican Member and has 24 Republican cosponsors, including House Majority Whip MCCARTHY.

There are thousands of young people willing to serve and potentially die for our country, and the House Republican leadership has no desire to help them become citizens. This shows the depths of the dysfunction of the Republican Caucus. It must stop, and we must allow a path to citizenship to those who want to serve our country.

RECOGNIZING ABATE AND MOTORCYCLE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Motorcycle Awareness Month and Kane County's support of motorcycle safety initiatives and education. I also want to thank my great friends at ABATE, A Brotherhood Aimed Towards Education, for their efforts to promote motorcycle safety and education for the last 27 years. Their

enthusiasm and dedication to the well-being of the citizens of Illinois deserves the attention and praise of Kane County, the 14th Congressional District, and surrounding areas.

Keeping my constituents and streets safe is one of my highest priorities. With more than 350,000 licensed motorcyclists in Illinois, practicing proper road safety will significantly reduce the risk of an accident. ABATE recognizes this need and has played an essential role in providing motorcycle awareness programs to more than 100,000 participants in Illinois over the last 5 years.

Let's keep up the good work and continue our joint efforts to make our roads safer and more efficient.

PORT OF PALM BEACH

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, an expansion of the Port of Palm Beach was included in the bipartisan Water Resources Reform and Development Act, due to it receiving a timely chief's report. This port shares the Lake Worth Inlet with a popular recreational area known as Peanut Island as well as the internationally renowned town of Palm Beach.

Due to this proximity and feared damage to the environment, marine life, and dramatic change in the character of the waterway, the expansion is mired in controversy and a threatened lawsuit.

So I want to make it unequivocal that my positive vote for WRRDA is because it moved many, many important infrastructure projects forward for Florida and should not be construed as advocating for the Port of Palm Beach expansion. And I will not support Federal funding unless and until there is a clear community consensus of approval.

A HEARTFELT THANK YOU

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I had an opportunity to tour the newly opened 9/11 Memorial Museum. It stands as a moving tribute to all those who lost their lives at the World Trade Center, in Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon.

The experience is a powerful one. The sights and sounds bring back memories, and tears, as well. But not just tears for the terrible losses, but also tears of pride for the numberless acts of courage, tears of gratitude for the acts of human compassion, and tears of pride for the way this country stood—this body stood—united and determined to rebuild.

We in this body do not say thank you to each other as often as we should. So

I rise to say thank you to all of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and across this country for all you did to support my incredible city during its darkest hour.

Thanks to each and every one of you most humbly from the bottom of my heart. Thank you.

A CALL FOR A VOTE REGARDING ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night in the Rules Committee, we witnessed the very definition of political cowardice. For the second time in 3 years, the Republican leadership of this House refused to make a thoughtful, germane, and bipartisan amendment on Afghanistan in order to the defense authorization bill.

The rule we will debate later today makes in order 162 amendments—162. There were amendments on everything from deferred retirement for military chaplains to charging admission to air shows and to ensuring public access to Rattlesnake Mountain.

But we can't have a debate and a vote on holding the administration accountable for ending the war in Afghanistan?

Because we are at war, Mr. Speaker. I know that we don't like to talk about it around here, and I know that some of my colleagues would rather bury their heads in the sand and hope it goes away, but our troops and their families deserve a debate, and Congress has the responsibility to give it to them.

But no. But no. I don't know what the Republican leadership is afraid of, but this is outrageous, and I am not going to stand for it.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 7, nays 381, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—7

Honda
Jones
Lee (CA)

Moore
Pingree (ME)
Velazquez

NAYS—381

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis

DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee

Waters
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Masse
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan

Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.

Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Shock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—43

Bass
Bridenstine
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Cooper
Denham
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Grimm
Higgins
Holt

Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt
Johnson (GA)
Kingston
Labrador
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lewis
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
McIntyre
Meng
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Olson
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Perry
Ruppersberger
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Thompson (PA)
Wagner
Young (AK)

□ 1256

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, NUNES, Ms. LOFGREN, Messrs. CROWLEY, MCNERNEY, RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. NADLER, CONYERS, ELLISON, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today and missed roll No. 223. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:
Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 223. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4031) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of the Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4031

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR PERFORMANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 713. Senior Executive Service: removal based on performance

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may remove any individual from the Senior Executive Service if the Secretary determines the performance of the individual warrants such removal. If the Secretary so removes such an individual, the Secretary may—

“(1) remove the individual from Federal service; or

“(2) transfer the individual to a General Schedule position at any grade of the General Schedule the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after removing an individual from the Senior Executive Service under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives notice in writing of such removal and the reason for such removal.

“(c) MANNER OF REMOVAL.—A removal under this section shall be done in the same manner as the removal of a professional staff member employed by a Member of Congress.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“713. Senior Executive Service: removal based on performance.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4031.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs has uncovered, and continues to uncover, numerous instances of gross negligence and incompetence by senior VA officials that have led to delays in care, growing patient wait times, and lengthy backlogs of disability claims. Regrettably, some of these instances have resulted in lack of proper care for veterans and for preventable deaths.

Despite repeated promises of accountability and change, the committee has received nothing but disturbing silence from the White House and only one excuse after another from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the heartbreaking news or spoken personally to family after family coming forward, sharing their stories of how the VA has failed to fulfill their promise to our veterans. The time is past due for us, as the House of Representatives, to take action.

The troubling stories that have come out of Phoenix, Arizona, where whistleblowers allege that as many as 40 veterans died while waiting for care and alleged secret waiting lists are unconscionable if in fact proven true. We would not be doing our sworn duty if we sat idly by and allowed these preventable deaths of those who made sacrifices for this great country to become the status quo at the VA.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these incidents do not seem to be isolated. They are under the watch of not just one senior VA manager. Similar stories of mismanagement and negligence have arisen in Fort Collins, Colorado; San Antonio, Texas; Augusta, Georgia; Atlanta, Georgia; Memphis, Tennessee; Columbia, South Carolina; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Chicago, Illinois, with news stories being covered almost every single day.

Mr. Speaker, these stories were crystallized for me and other Members at a recent hearing that we had on patient wait times on April 9. Mr. Barry Coates, a veteran from Columbia, South Carolina, informed the committee that he waited almost a year to receive a colonoscopy at VA. When he finally received his appointment, it was revealed that he had stage IV colon cancer.

Mr. Coates testified: “The gross negligence and crippling backlog epidemic of the VA health care system has not only handed me a death sentence, but ruined my quality of life.”

Mr. Speaker, the need for accountability to help veterans like Mr. Coates is the reason why H.R. 4031 is so critically important. The VA Management Accountability Act of 2014 would give the Secretary the authority to fire or to demote VA Senior Executive Service or equivalent employees based on performance at any time. The current system is so calcified in bureaucratic red

tape that it is easier for someone to get a bonus than it is to be given some type of discipline at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Is this what our citizens want? Is this what our veterans deserve? I don’t think so, and neither do the 150 bipartisan cosponsors of this piece of legislation or the leading VSOs that support it.

Now, the actions of these few senior executives do not tarnish the hard work of 300,000 frontline VA employees who come to work every day and by and large provide excellent care and services to our veterans. Too many of these employees have in fact been continually let down by poor-performing senior executives. It is time to restore their trust and America’s trust in the leadership at VA.

Look, General Shinseki is a good man. He wants to hold others accountable, but he is being held back by a failed civil service that makes it nearly impossible to remove SES employees. If this bill becomes law, he and his successors will have no excuse. He will have every tool to hold managers accountable and restore faith in the VA.

I am truly grateful to the 150 sponsors from both sides of the aisle of this vital piece of legislation.

I also want to thank the following VSOs, veterans service organizations, who have tirelessly advocated on behalf of this bill, including the American Legion, Concerned Veterans for America, IAVA, AMVETS, the Reserve Officers, Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Military Officers Association of America.

Finally, I thank Leader CANTOR and Speaker BOEHNER for their help in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that VA’s status quo is upended, which is why I believe this bill, the House’s earlier action this year to suspend VA bonuses for 5 years, and my call on President Obama to establish a bipartisan VA medical care access commission is crucial to getting a resolution to this problem.

I believe the question presented before each Member here today is very clear: Do you stand with our veterans or do you stand with a bureaucratic-entrenched failing system?

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4031 and maintain our promises to our veterans and their families.

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation’s veterans and in support of action that will fundamentally address the systematic failures that are clearly occurring across the Department of Veterans Affairs. I reluctantly support this legislation because I believe we owe it to the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much for our Nation to do everything in our power to ensure the VA is accountable for its performance.

I share with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), my good friend and colleague, fundamental goals of addressing shortcomings in VA leadership. I am proud of our bipartisan working relationship. Not only does our working together usually allow us to get more done, but I believe it makes our efforts better.

I am disappointed, however, that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was not given the opportunity to consider this bill. I believe that members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, could have improved this bill before it was brought to the floor. I believe this bill would be stronger and more reflective of the substantive reforms necessary in the Department if it had been allowed to go through the committee markup process.

H.R. 4031 has been put forth as an accountability bill, but it falls short of providing substantive beneficial changes in the VA's executive performance management system.

The Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs already has the authority to fire any employee, including executives who are not doing their job. This bill will simply turn approximately 400 senior executive civil service positions across the VA into essentially at-will positions, of which 165 are in the Veterans Health Administration.

More importantly, H.R. 4031 does not adequately address the performance metrics of VA executives. It doesn't provide any framework for ensuring problems and failures don't occur in the first place.

I introduced H.R. 4399, which the American Legion also supports, which establishes upfront organizational goals and expected outcomes for veterans that every single VA senior leader must deliver. It would require these goals and their outcomes to be the driving factor in performance assessment for these executives and the basis for any awards or bonuses.

This bill before us today does not address the senior physicians and dentists, known as title 38 employees, who receive executive-level pay and have organizational-level responsibility for veteran care and services. This is important because one of the executives implicated in manipulating the wait times in Phoenix was a title 38 employee, which this bill does not cover that we are voting on today. So the very individual responsible for the catastrophic failures that we have seen across the VA recently may not even be impacted by the current legislation that we are dealing with.

My bill, H.R. 4399, does address title 38 physicians and dentists, which covers approximately 80,000 employees within the VA, title 38 employees, mandating standardized, rigorous performance management tools that hold employees accountable and justifies any performance pay.

Finally, my bill would prohibit one of the most egregious examples of the failure of the current system as it ap-

plies to title 38 employees. A doctor was provided partial performance pay even though he had failed to maintain a current license. That is correct. He received partial performance pay even though he failed to maintain a current license, because maintaining a valid license was not one of his performance objectives. This bill that we are dealing with today does not address that issue.

Good policy, good legislation comes from conversation, collaboration, and compromise. I am supporting moving this bill forward today because I believe we need to begin this discussion as how to best ensure VA employees are held accountable when they fail to perform.

Let me be clear. We can and we must do more to ensure that our veterans get the quality services that they deserve and have earned. I am hopeful that we can have the necessary dialogue in conference to ensure that any bill that we send to the President is a more comprehensive reform measure that is well-considered and actually has the desired and needed impact of changing the VA and ensuring the best outcomes for our Nation's veterans.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. The best way to reform the VA is to get rid of the deadwood, and that is what this bill actually gives the Secretary the opportunity to do, and that is to fire the people that aren't doing their job, especially—especially—those that are at the senior level.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents and veterans who are alarmed at recent reports of preventable deaths, manipulated records, and secret waiting lists within the VA health care system. These allegations span the country and have recently arisen in Colorado at the Fort Collins VA clinic. If these allegations are found to be true, the responsible individuals must be held accountable. It is unacceptable for individuals who have presided over negligence and mismanagement to go unscathed.

Astonishingly, past instances of similar failures have not only seen responsible individuals remain employed by the VA, but they have even been rewarded for their leadership failures in the form of bonuses and positive performance reviews. This only promotes the continuation of poor management, negligence, and possible preventable deaths.

This bill would help ensure that these trends do not continue by giving the Secretary of the VA the authority to remove or transfer senior executives of the VA. I ask for support of this bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the issue here before us on this bill—and first let me say I am a

proud cosponsor of this bill to replace and be able to fire people. The problem is the first person we need to fire is the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Shinseki himself. Now, we respect him; we respect his sacrifice for this country and everything else, but the buck stops at the top.

□ 1315

Here are the facts: 5,600 veterans are committing suicide every year. That is almost 20 every day under his watch—under his watch. In my own hospital in Atlanta, four of our soldiers committed suicide in the hospital, and the inspector general of the VA laid the blame directly at the foot of the VA administration for the lack of management of the death of these soldiers.

When Chairman MILLER and I went down and visited them, we asked: Is there one more, are there any more that have committed suicide? No, there have been no more. And they told a damn lie, because the very next day it was exposed there was another soldier that committed suicide and they covered it up.

This has been a pattern that has been going on ever since General Shinseki has been the chairman there. I respect a sacrifice, I respect what he did, but it is under his watch that we are in this situation in the hospital out in the western part of this country where The Washington Post has accurately reported that 40 of our soldiers lost their lives, died because they couldn't get service. Our veterans are the heart and soul of this country, they are precious, and we must not turn our back on them.

I listened to the President today, and I was very disappointed with President Obama today. There was no urgency. Mr. President, we need urgency. We need you to roll up our sleeves and get into these hospitals. We need you to set a pattern that if the VA hospitals can't handle it, let's give partnerships to some of the Republicans and the other public hospitals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. God bless you, because there are things I want to say.

Reports are out that the taxpayers are going to have to pay or have paid \$1 billion for medical malpractice. A reputable news organization, Cox Media's WSB Television down in Atlanta, it went all over this country: \$1 billion the taxpayer paying because the VA cut off the wrong arm, cut off the wrong leg, the wrong testicle, the wrong kidney.

Let me tell you all something, folks. Time—that is what I was just so disturbed about—we don't have time for any more investigations. The reports are in.

Jesus Christ himself said: There is no more greater sacrifice than to give your life for your friend. Our soldiers

have given their lives on the battlefield for them. We need to give our lives up here and give our veterans the respect that they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to refrain from using profanity in debate.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK, a former doctor within the Department of Veterans Affairs, somebody who serves his subcommittee as chairman of the Health Subcommittee very well.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in the real world, if you fail to do your job, you get fired. Not at the VA.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 4031, the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill because it simply allows the Secretary to fire senior VA executives when they fail to do their job.

I am sick and tired of hauling VA officials in front of the committee to hear tired excuses and explanations. President Obama has allowed the VA leadership to operate without accountability. Veterans are dying. The time for excuses has passed. The time for taking action to fix these problems is now.

This legislation is just the beginning. Severe mismanagement at the VA will not be tolerated by me or this Congress. We will overturn every rock and use every tool at our disposal in the pursuit of the truth of what is happening at the VA.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been on this committee for 21 years. I strongly support Secretary Shinseki and his leadership of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

It is very important as we go into Memorial Day that we let the veterans know that we appreciate their service. We also need to let them know that we are going to do all we can to make sure they have the quality health care that they deserve.

The VA operates 1,700 sites of care and conducts 85 million appointments each year, which comes to 236,000 health care appointments each day.

The latest American Customer Satisfaction Index, an independent customer service survey, ranked VA customer satisfaction at 95 percent among VA patients, among the best in the Nation and equal to or better than any private sector hospital.

Since its peak in March of 2013, the VA has reduced the benefits claims backlog by 50 percent, on track to eliminate the backlog in 2015. VA also implemented an automatic electric claims processing system to better serve veterans into the future. In 2013, VA paid out \$66 billion in compensa-

tion claims to 4.5 million eligible veterans. Under the leadership of the Secretary, we also expand access to earned benefits for veterans of all eras.

In addition, VA granted presumption of service connection for three Agent Orange-related conditions. Let me just say that for years the veterans in this category have been trying to get assistance from the VA and they were denied. This Secretary stepped up to the plate and let all of those veterans come in, millions of additional veterans.

Since 2009, VA has reduced the estimated number of homeless veterans. We have been trying to get them to do that since day one over 22 years ago, but this Secretary has reduced it by 24 percent. They have conducted over 6 million clinical visits with over 600,000 veterans who were homeless or at risk of homelessness, including the formerly homeless. In 2013 alone, VA served more than 240,000 veterans who were homeless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. In closing, the VA is like a big ship, one that I have been working on for 22 years—slow to turn. But under the leadership, the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership, we have funded the largest VA budget increase in the history of the United States. Like the first President said: We must make sure that the VA does what it can to serve those veterans and give them the service we demand. God bless America and continue to bless the veterans who have served America.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would add another statistic to those that my colleague from Florida just said. There have been 23—at least 23 preventable deaths within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), my friend, the chairman of the O&I Subcommittee.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4031 because I believe that systemic failures of the VA exist far beyond the issue of appointment wait times.

My subcommittee on VA Oversight and Investigations continues to uncover countless failures of leadership at the VA. This lack of leadership is the driving force behind the unacceptable delays and cost overruns in major VA construction projects, the tremendous backlog of veterans' disability claims, and the horrendous patient care practices that have resulted in preventable patient deaths.

The individuals with responsibility and authority in the VA are unable to lead and, as a result, our veterans have suffered.

It is time to usher in a new era of accountability at the VA, and I urge my colleagues to support the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand on this floor in the midst of Military Appreciation Month and be from a State that had the highest numbers of young men and women returning from Afghanistan and Iraq, comparing to States like California and certainly some others. We are grateful for all, in all States, who have gone and put on the uniform unselfishly and stood in the line of danger for us.

Let me thank the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this Congress. I have never seen a more bipartisan and dedicated group of men and women. If the committee was opened up to all of us, we would all stand up and serve.

Today, as a family in the United States Congress, we have a problem. We have a disease problem, whether it is a heart attack or stroke or cancer, or whether or not it is the terrible injuries of war, posttraumatic stress disorder, or those who have lost limbs, who have suffered traumatic brain injury. We have men and women who have worked, and our veterans have now come in their later years who suffer the illnesses of age.

All of us will take our fist and bang on this podium to be able to say that they are first and our priority. No one counters or accepts the death of those that may have died in Texas, died in Arizona, or places elsewhere.

If this is a measure to begin that healing, to give the Secretary the ability to be able to focus in on those beyond the surgeons that are in the operating rooms, the nurses that I visit with along the hallways when I go to the veterans hospital in my area, then we should go forward.

I stand with this legislation working toward making the system work. I want to make it work by curing the systemic and the problematic way that we have veterans wait on services. Let's cut it out, cut the red tape out. Embrace them this weekend, one of the most emotional days we serve with our veterans, and tell them we will not rest until we answer the concerns of families, until we pray over those who have lost their lives, until we cure this, not by one person or another. They may have to go, but let's fix the system that they will have no waiting time when they come with lung cancer or last stage, with their life to be extended if they just get in the door. I want all of them to be able to get in the door and to use those resources that we have expended, those large numbers that my colleague and friend from Florida, both from Florida, and from Maine, have spoken about, and we use those resources to break the barrier of confusion and red tape, and when they walk through those doors someone says: Come in, we are ready to serve.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from

Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a very capable member of the VA committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for his work to reform this mismanaged Department.

Our Nation's veterans and their families never hesitated to respond to the call to serve their country. Recent news reports of VA mismanagement across this country are disgusting and disgraceful. We know of dozens of wrongful deaths that were due to VA negligence, including 13 in my State of Indiana.

Senior executives who oversee this negligence are more likely to receive a bonus than to receive punishment. We cannot let this continue.

This bill would give the VA Secretary authority to fire senior employees responsible for failures within the Department.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill, and I will continue to do my part on the oversight and fighting for the Nation's 23 million veterans.

I also call on the Senate today to bring greater accountability and transparency to the VA by passing the numerous bipartisan bills that have left this House, including this one, that could be stalled in the Senate. Our veterans deserve nothing but the best.

□ 1330

Mr. MICHAUD. May I inquire from the Speaker how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY). He is the newest member on the VA Committee, somebody who just came to Congress, but who, as a staff member, had been an advocate for veterans prior to his arrival here.

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation, but also out of great concern for the shocking developments that we have learned of within the VA health care system. Perhaps more importantly today, after hearing the President's press conference, I rise out of concern over the complete failure of our President to address this issue.

The VA health care system is experiencing an historic crisis; yet, today, the President's solution seems to be business as usual bureaucracy. The President has done nothing to ensure that we, as a Nation, immediately address the systemic problems within the VA system or to address the threat to human life that has been created by incidents of bureaucratic incompetence.

Earlier today, the President spoke rhetorically about unacceptable wait times for veterans, but he did nothing to address the American people's wait

time for this administration to solve this problem now. It has been 23 days, and there is no sense of urgency.

What we heard today was of more bureaucracy, more investigations, more studying of the issue, and ultimately, a continuation of business as usual until the President and his Secretary determine in due time when they will act.

He spoke of holding personnel accountable, but he never once spoke of terminating personnel. That is why I rise today to support this legislation.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and I urge my Members to vote against it. I don't know that they will, but I urge them to do so.

All of us in this body need to be for accountability. None of us in this body, however, ought to be for turning a civil service system into a patronage system. None of us ought to be for turning a civil service system—one of the best in the world, if not the best in the world—into a system which allows for no reason that needs to be articulated to turn senior executives into at-will employees.

I am disappointed that this bill has been brought to the floor with little notice and with no markup in committee. We talk about considered judgment. We talk about thoughtfulness. We talk about reading the bills. Then we bring them to the floor without hearings.

We must ensure that those who serve our veterans in the VA system do so with accountability and oversight. All of us are outraged at the allegations that have been made. Not one of us should step back and say we should not respond vigorously to the offenses that have allegedly taken place because, if the allegations are true, heads ought to roll, period; but that is not what this legislation is about.

This legislation is about a knee-jerk reaction to a bad situation, painted with a very broad brush, and undermining a system that can work, has worked, and has the mechanism to work.

I cannot support this bill as written, and I believe it opens the door to a slippery slope of undoing the careful civil service protections that have been in place for decades. This is about due process.

Now, due process is put under stress at critical times. Pursuing due process at times when there is no stress is not difficult. The test of a society is whether, at times of stress, it can follow due process and the law. This bill does not provide for that.

With regard to protections that have been put in place for decades to ensure that politically appointed managers cannot fire nonpolitical senior executives in Federal service without proper cause, neither party ought to be for that. The civil service reforms adopted decades ago were there for a purpose.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this premature and not-thought-out piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that Republicans brought this bill to the floor with little notice and no markup in committee.

We must ensure that those who serve our veterans in the VA system do so with accountability and oversight, especially in light of recent allegations of misconduct at certain VA offices.

However, I cannot support this bill as written, and I believe it opens the door to a slippery slope of undoing the careful civil service protections that have been in place for decades to ensure that politically appointed managers cannot fire non-political senior executives in federal service without proper cause. Already, the Secretary has the power to remove employees who are not performing their jobs properly—and it is a power he employs whenever called for.

I will continue to stand up for our Nation's veterans and work to ensure they receive the benefits and care they have earned through their service.

I hope that the Congress and Administration can work together in a bipartisan way over the coming weeks to ensure the egregious behavior that has been reported is never repeated and that any VA officials proven to have acted inappropriately continue to be held accountable—without undermining the Civil Service System that has served us so well for so long.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have just been told that this is a knee-jerk reaction to a crisis. It is the only action to a crisis.

The President, for 3 weeks, has said nothing until today. He still said nothing today. The Secretary has not been involved. We have to take care of the veterans we have fighting for our freedoms every single day.

Nothing in this bill takes away the recruitment process through SES, and if the Secretary does fire somebody or demote somebody because of this law, he has to provide notice to Congress within 30 days. If you don't do your job, you get fired.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that, when I first got here, people said: KELLY, you expect the government to work as a business. I said: No, no, no, that is not true because there is no way any business can work as the government works.

This bill is a commonsense way of taking care of people who don't perform at a level that is expected. The taxpayers—the citizens of this country—should expect nothing less and to be constantly told that, gee, you can't touch these folks even if they perform so badly—and, instead of doing that, we give them a bonus—that doesn't make sense.

Accountability is absolutely needed at this time. We give people authority. We give people responsibility. When

they don't do their jobs, they need to be held accountable for it.

I represent not only the State of Pennsylvania, but over 1 million Pennsylvanians who are veterans. If we can't fix this now with a commonsense approach, then—my goodness—what are we doing on the floor of this great House?

This just makes sense. I thank the chairman for bringing it forward. It is long overdue, and it needs to be done now.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in supporting H.R. 4031, which brings sorely needed accountability to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The President said, today, that he would hold those accountable who are responsible for the wrongdoing at the VA, but we have heard that tune before. As a candidate, the President denounced delays and poor care at VA facilities.

He pledged to build a 21st century VA and to confront what he called the broken bureaucracy of the VA. We can hope to hear more than platitudes here in the near future, but I am a little skeptical.

The President has done very little to hold this VA staff accountable, and now, we have seen the deadly consequences of the broken VA system in Arizona. Like other administration staff who have violated the law, those responsible for these acts are simply on paid leave.

Unfortunately, the VA's problems are not unique to Arizona. With VA employees actually coming forward in helping us to expose these problems, we have learned of similar efforts to conceal huge problems at the Oakland VA regional office, including cooked books, hidden files, and a refusal to meet veterans' needs.

Some bureaucrats seem more interested in receiving bonuses than in serving our veterans. It is time for that to end. Mr. Speaker, we need to do this now. Pass H.R. 4031.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the 12th District of Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who has been very involved in issues as they relate to Pittsburgh.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, in having stepped forward to defend our country with their very lives, our veterans deserve a health care system and a claims process that are both of high quality and that are accountable. Unfortunately, the VA has failed veterans in Pittsburgh, Phoenix, and across the Nation.

William Nicklas, a World War II veteran from western Pennsylvania, sur-

vived Guam, Saipan, and Okinawa, but fell victim to Legionnaires' disease at the Pittsburgh VA. It has been 1½ years since Mr. Nicklas died, and the Nicklas family is still waiting for answers and accountability, so are the families of John Ciarolla, Clark Compston, John McChesney, Lloyd Wanstreet, and Frank "Sonny" Calcagno.

Unfortunately, the world now knows that these are not isolated incidents. Significant changes in accountability must be made at the VA to solve these problems. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act. This bill is an important step in that direction.

Thank you to Chairman MILLER for conducting the oversight necessary to bring these issues into the light.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, is the gentleman from Florida ready to close?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker I have been told is on his way, but he is not here at this point, so we are prepared to close.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank the chairman, but I will reiterate that the Secretary currently does have the authority to fire any Senior Executive Servicemember if he is not performing his job. This bill does not address the problem systemically within the VA. We are dealing with the Veterans Health Administration. This bill only covers 165 SES's who work in the Veterans Health Administration, but there are 400 throughout the VA.

The legislation that I would much prefer voting on today deals with not only the SES's, but also with the title 38 employees.

The reason it is important to deal with the title 38 employees—and it is important to note—is that one of the executives implicated in manipulating the wait times in Phoenix is a title 38 employee. This bill does not address that employee.

The bill also does not address some of the most egregious examples of failure in the system within the Department. As I mentioned earlier, a doctor was provided partial performance pay, even though he had let his license expire, because that was not part of the performance objective.

I will be supporting this legislation, so we can move it through the process and so we can go to conference to actually address some of these issues. I hope that we will be able to address these issues. They are very serious issues, and they are issues that are important to our veterans.

It is important for us on the committee that we deal with this, and I

hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will work together like we have in the past, but I am disappointed that this bill is before us, as we were not able to improve upon the bill.

I would also hope that the President would look very seriously at the performance evaluations within the Department of Veterans Affairs and that he would immediately issue an executive order, similar to the legislation that I have submitted, which will address a lot of the systemic problems within the Department of Veterans Affairs. This is unacceptable, and we must move forward to deal with this issue.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a request of the gentleman from Maine.

My speaker has now shown up. May I yield him 1 minute?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Gainesville, Florida, Dr. Yoho, who has a facility that, in fact, is in question at this point and from which several people have been put on administrative leave.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4031, the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014.

For far too long, problems of patient neglect have persisted at the VA. These problems will continue to persist until the employees there can be held accountable for their poor performances. In recent weeks, the full extent of staff incompetence has begun to be made clear.

Serious allegations have arisen that lengthy wait times and secret waiting lists at the three Phoenix VA medical centers have led to the deaths of 40 or more of our Nation's veterans. This is unacceptable. There are stories of secret waiting lists and of employee negligence at the VA that are popping up all over the news.

As these reports are investigated, it is necessary that we give the Secretary of the VA the power to not only reprimand, but to remove the negligent employees. If we do not, then the problem will persist.

□ 1345

For these reasons and more, I have cosponsored Chairman MILLER's bill, which will authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove or demote any senior executive employee whose performance has been found lacking.

Mr. Speaker, caring for our veterans is of paramount importance. I urge my colleagues to stand up for our veterans and vote to pass the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. First, I want to say thank you very much to the gentleman from Maine, who in fact has

been very bipartisan in the way that we have approached this. Our committee has in fact worked in a very bipartisan way in trying to get to the bottom of the issue that lays out there.

I would like to say that it has been said on the floor that there were no hearings on this bill. In fact, it has been heard in subcommittee. It has also been said that the Secretary has the tools that he needs in order to hold people accountable.

Folks, here is where we are.

Back in January, I went to Augusta, Georgia, and Columbia, South Carolina, at the request of Congressman JOE WILSON and Congressman JOHN BARROW. We know—and VA has said—that there were deaths that occurred. There were some 5,000 veterans that were on waiting lists for colonoscopies. I talked about one of those veterans who testified before our committee today.

Shortly after that, I wrote a letter to the Secretary and I asked him to please provide me the names of the people, what their positions were, and what type of accountability, what disciplinary actions have you taken.

We are now in the closing weeks of the month of May, and I have heard absolutely nothing out of the Department of Veterans Affairs. He may have the tools, but he won't use the tools that he has at his disposal to get rid of or to discipline the very people who are at the crux of the problem that we are talking about all across this Nation today.

Let me tell you something else.

The very director of the Phoenix hospital that is now on administrative leave, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs today, got an \$8,500 bonus in April of this year, even though they knew that there was an open Office of Inspector General investigation ongoing at the time. He got a bonus while there was an ongoing investigation.

In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the director of the health care system up there knew that there was Legionella inside the water system that led to the death of at least six veterans—they knew it for a year—that person got a \$63,000 Presidential bonus.

It is easier to get rewarded at VA than it is to be disciplined.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4031, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4031.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 590 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 590

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3361) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are

waived. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 27, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 590.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same act. House Resolution 590 waives all points of order against further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules.

Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426, that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night, a bipartisan group, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina; Congressman ADAM SMITH, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee from Washington State; Congressman GARAMENDI; and Congresswoman LEE from California; and I, offered an amendment to be able to have a debate on a vote on our policy in Afghanistan—the longest war in American history.

It seemed odd to me that a bill like the Department of Defense authorization bill would come to the floor without the ability for Members to have a vote on Afghanistan. We are at war, and you would never know it by the actions of this House.

I am ashamed of this House that a bill like this would come to the floor and the leadership would block any attempt to be able to have a debate and a vote on what our policy should be in Afghanistan.

The rule that we are going to debate later today makes in order 162 amendments. There are amendments on everything from deferred retirement for military chaplains to charging admission to air shows to public access to Rattlesnake Mountain. I am sure public access to Rattlesnake Mountain is a big deal, but it is not as big a deal as the war in Afghanistan, where we have brave men and women in harm's way because we put them there.

The question is whether or not our policies should remain the same or whether it should change.

The President of the United States has said that he wants to draw down American forces in 2014. I hope he does. But there are also reports that we may be there for a considerably longer period of time.

I don't know what the policy is going to be, but let me read to you what this amendment that the Republican leadership blocked says. This is basically what we are asking here. It says:

In the event that the United States Armed Forces remained deployed in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, then no later than March 31, 2015, the President shall send to Congress a determination describing the purpose and expected duration of such deployment and the projected number of troops to be deployed.

Who could possibly object to that? Basically, it is having the White House inform us of what the policy is. Where is the problem?

The second part of it goes as follows:

No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President's determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to improve the content of the President's determination.

Should Congress vote against the President's determination, the President is directed to remove all troops not required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel in a safe, orderly, expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.

Does anybody really object to that? Does anybody object to doing what we are supposed to do—to have a say on issues like war? It astounds me that Members of Congress would want to hide behind the Rules Committee blocking bringing this to the floor as though it is a way to avoid a serious debate and a vote on this policy.

By the way, the sponsors of this amendment have different opinions on Afghanistan. Some of us believe we should get out of there right now. That is where I am. Some of those who co-sponsored this amendment believe that we should be there and have at least a small force in Afghanistan beyond 2014.

So this is not about right now saying we want to get out of Afghanistan. What this is saying is that if the President decides to change his promise of keeping us there no later than December 2014, then we ought to have a vote. We ought to be informed of what is

going on and we ought to have a vote. Who could object to that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I could not agree more. How in the world can the Congress of the United States, which has an obligation to declare war, continue to abdicate its right to debate our young men and women going to Afghanistan to die?

We have already spent over \$1.5 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan. Iraq was an unnecessary war.

□ 1400

The previous administration intentionally manufactured the justification. It was absolutely unnecessary. And all we are asking—and that is why I will vote against the rule. There is much in this bill that I will vote for.

But as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, this is a bipartisan amendment.

I have signed over 11,000 letters to families and extended families who lost loved ones in Iraq and Afghanistan. This past weekend I signed four letters. I am not trying to single myself out, but I feel the pain of my mistake of giving the authority to the previous President to bypass Congress to send our young men and women to die in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN is right. If President Obama believes it is necessary in the next couple of years to increase the numbers, then let him come to Congress so that we can meet our constitutional responsibility and vote either "yes" or "no," and then, with pride, know that we did what the Constitution required.

Next Wednesday, I will go to Walter Reed at Bethesda to see three marines who were severely injured in Afghanistan in the last month. I don't know how severely they are. It might be legs are gone. It might be brain injuries.

Yet, we, in Congress, continue to abdicate our constitutional responsibility to these young men and young women. I will tell you that the marines down at Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point, which is in my district, are sick and tired of this involvement in Afghanistan.

One last point. The former Commandant of the Marine Corps has been my adviser for the last 5 years on Afghanistan, and he has said: Why doesn't Congress understand history? You will never change Afghanistan. No matter how much blood or money you send to Afghanistan, you will never change it.

I am disappointed in the Rules Committee. So many, and every one of them, Republican and Democrat, I have the greatest respect for. But not to allow us to debate whether a young man or young woman from America should die or lose their legs, their arms, or their mind is a disappointment and a failure of this House of

Representatives not to follow the Constitution.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The question before the House is, Should the House now consider H. Res. 590?

While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any point of order.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that, while the two underlying bills contained in the rule would impose intergovernmental and private sector mandates as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, the mandates would fall well below the threshold in that act.

That said, I know my friend is using this point of order to debate a very important issue that he cares passionately about. I am glad he has had the opportunity to bring it forward because we tend to agree on a lot of what he has said, and he knows that. We have talked on numerous occasions.

But in order to allow this House to continue its scheduled business of the day, I urge our Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want my colleagues to understand one thing. The amendment that we are talking about is germane. I spent a great deal of time working with the Parliamentarian to make sure that the concerns that the Republican majority had about the germaneness of this amendment were addressed. It is a germane amendment. There is absolutely no reason at all for this not to be on the floor.

Let me just say that it doesn't take any courage to praise the troops and then hide from the vote. It is an act of cowardice, quite frankly. The fact that we are debating a Defense Department authorization bill, we are at war, and we are not allowed to be able to consider an amendment about what our policy should be in Afghanistan, well, what do you tell the troops? What do you tell their families? This war is on auto-pilot and we will just let it go?

I mean, we have a responsibility. This Chamber voted to send young men and women into harm's way. We have a

responsibility and we are not living up to it. There is no reason in the world why this amendment should not be made in order. It is germane. It complies with all the rules.

The only reason why it isn't made in order is because someone in the Republican leadership said, no, we are not going to have a debate; we are not going to have a vote. Maybe they are afraid they are going to lose. I heard last night that they don't want to embarrass the President.

Really?

I mean, select committees on Benghazi, 53 votes to overturn the Affordable Care Act. They don't want to embarrass the President? Well, with friends like you, the President doesn't need any enemies.

The bottom line is this an important issue, and how dare we come to the floor on the defense bill and be silent and indifferent when it comes to Afghanistan.

I am ashamed of this process. There is no reason in the world why we shouldn't be debating this issue. We owe it to those young men and women who are over there, those who have sacrificed their lives, those who are at Walter Reed Hospital.

How dare we bring a bill like this to the floor without addressing this most important issue. We are at war, and no one in this place seems to want to talk about it.

Well, it is our responsibility just as much as it is the President's responsibility. To do nothing means we are complicit in continuing this war. I have had enough, and I think Members of this Chamber who agree with us ought to stand with us and vote against this rule.

This process stinks. We played by the rules, we did everything right, and we got nothing—nothing on this issue.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, like I said before, I don't disagree with a lot of what my friend from Massachusetts said. As we voted last time, we are not going to have the opportunity to do that this time.

But I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of the rule, House Resolution 590.

Clause 9(c) of rule XXI of the rules of the House specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the earmark disclosure rule prescribed by paragraphs (a) or (b) of clause 9 of rule

XXI. House Resolution 590 waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 3361.

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to clause 9(c) of rule XXI that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(c) of rule XXI.

Under clause 9(c) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Following that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: "Will the House now consider the resolution?"

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What I found interesting about the exchange that we have just had is that nobody can explain to me why we cannot have a vote on the bipartisan amendment that Mr. JONES and Mr. SMITH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE and myself have brought before the House. Nobody can give us a reason why, other than it is not in order because they have the power to not make it in order.

I want my colleagues to understand a few facts. 2,320 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan since 2001.

19,718 U.S. troops have been wounded in Afghanistan since 2001.

127 soldiers were killed in 2013.

1,687 have been killed since the surge of 2009.

An estimated 30,000 Afghan civilians have been killed since 2001.

The VA estimates that approximately 22 veterans will die by suicide every day. At least 30 percent of veterans have contemplated suicide.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a say in the future of America's longest war. We all know that there is no military solution in Afghanistan. The American public is sick and tired of war. American interests are not advanced by another decade of war.

And yet, what does this House of Representatives do when we consider the Department of Defense authorization bill? We do nothing. We do nothing. The only thing that happens is we bring germane amendments to the Rules Committee to be able to debate this issue so the Members will have a say when the President outlines his policy for Afghanistan beyond 2014.

But it seems that the leadership of this House is perfectly satisfied just sitting back and just being okay with whatever happens.

All we are asking for is that if we are going to stay beyond 2014, the President has to tell us what his plan is. That is not radical. That is not out there. He needs to tell us what his plan is, and we need to vote on it. That is our job. And if you don't want to take responsibility for issues like this, maybe you ought to think about retiring because it is an insult to the men

and women who are serving our country for us to be silent and indifferent, to not do the proper oversight, to not debate these issues.

It is an insult to the American taxpayer that we are letting the most corrupt government in the world—that is how the Karzai government has been rated, the most corrupt government in the world—continue to steal our money.

We cut food stamps for poor people. We don't have enough money to take care of our veterans in the VA facilities. We are cutting back on moneys for roads and bridges. We can't extend Unemployment Compensation for people who have lost their jobs, and yet we just hand over millions and millions and millions of dollars.

Let me just tell you this, Mr. Speaker. Right now, we authorized in FY13 spending \$87.2 billion for Afghanistan. We authorized in FY14 spending \$85.2 billion. Proposed FY15 spending, \$79.4 billion. Total since 2001, \$778 billion. And when you add in the cost of the veterans care that will be needed and all the other associated costs, the total cost of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq are about \$4- to \$6 trillion. And we are not even paying for most of it. We are borrowing it. It is going on our credit card.

My friends wail about the deficit and the debt, but when it comes to just dumping money into this money pit called Afghanistan, they say nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

You know, it is kind of amazing that many of us on my side are considered conservatives. I hope that I am considered a conservative.

Pat Buchanan has written so many articles about the new war party. The new war party is the Republican Party. It is the Republican Party because of the reason that Mr. MCGOVERN is talking about today.

We sit here and we allow all these other spending issues involving our military, and much of it they deserve: pay increases, taking care of their families, doing the good things for our military.

But when it comes to sending our young men and women to give their life and limbs, we don't debate it. We just don't debate it.

I don't know if the military industrial complex that Eisenhower warned the Congress about—do they control Congress? I don't know. I haven't checked the campaign finance donations from the military industrial complexes.

But something has changed my party from understanding our constitutional responsibilities. Nothing is more important—nothing in the House of Representatives is more important than sending a young man or woman to die for this country. If this amendment allows us to have a debate on whether

that young man or young woman should give their life, then we owe it to the families of America.

□ 1415

This amendment that Mr. MCGOVERN and myself and Ms. LEE and Mr. SMITH and Mr. GARAMENDI offered is very simple. It just says that after 2014, if the President decides that he needs to increase the number of troops in Afghanistan, then we will vote on it.

Do you know how pathetic this is that we are asking for this?

A few years ago, President Obama proposed to the Afghan Government—President Karzai, who is a crook—that we will have an agreement, that we will stay there 10 more years, and that we will send them \$2 billion or \$3 billion a month just to take care of their needs in Afghanistan. This, when we are cutting food programs for children, senior citizens, and we can't even fix the potholes and can't fix the bridges in America.

And then you will not allow us to have a debate on our responsibility, based on the Constitution, that a young man or a young woman who would die for this country or lose a leg, an arm, or their mind, that we can't have a debate? What a pathetic time for the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 590?

While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order. All of the relevant committees have included earmark statements in their reports filed with the House, so there is no violation of the House earmark rule.

That said, I know my friend is using this point of order to debate an important issue—and I have said this earlier—that he passionately cares about. So I am glad that he has had that opportunity.

But in order to allow this House to continue with the scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote “yes” on the question of consideration, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, when Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of the House, he made a pledge that he would allow the House to work its will on major issues.

This is a major issue. This is a major issue. If my friends want to know why the majority of the American people think that this place is dysfunctional, this is the reason: we can't get a vote on an issue as important as the war in Afghanistan.

Now, there is really no excuse. It is germane. We spent a lot of time work-

ing with the Parliamentarian to make sure it is germane to satisfy the concerns of the majority. We did that. It is bipartisan. It is bipartisan. And of people who are cosponsors of the amendment, some want to end the war now and some believe that we need to keep troops there for a period beyond 2014. I mean, we have jumped through every hoop. What else can we possibly do?

And for some reason, somebody in the leadership here said, no, the House of Representatives will not be able to work its will when it comes to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article entitled “CNN Poll: Afghanistan war arguably most unpopular in U.S. history.”

[From CNN Political Ticker]

CNN POLL: AFGHANISTAN WAR ARGUABLY MOST UNPOPULAR IN U.S. HISTORY

(Posted by CNN Political Unit)

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Support for the war in Afghanistan has dipped below 20%, according to a new national poll, making the country's longest military conflict arguably its most unpopular one as well. The CNN/ORC International survey released Monday also indicates that a majority of Americans would like to see U.S. troops pull out of Afghanistan before the December 2014 deadline.

Just 17% of those questioned say they support the 12-year-long war, down from 52% in December 2008. Opposition to the conflict now stands at 82%, up from 46% five years ago. “Those numbers show the war in Afghanistan with far less support than other conflicts,” CNN Polling Director Keating Holland said. “Opposition to the Iraq war never got higher than 69% in CNN polling while U.S. troops were in that country, and while the Vietnam War was in progress, no more than six in 10 ever told Gallup's interviewers that war was a mistake.”

The U.S. timetable for Afghanistan calls for the removal of nearly all troops by roughly this time next year, and that can't come fast enough for the vast majority of Americans. Just over half would rather see U.S. troops withdrawn earlier than December 2014. Only a quarter say that America should still have boots on the ground in Afghanistan after that deadline.

Fifty-seven percent say the conflict is going badly for the U.S. and only a third say America is winning the war in Afghanistan.

“Independents have a much gloomier view of the war in Afghanistan than Republicans or Democrats,” Holland said. “That may be because a Republican president started the war and a Democratic president has continued it, so there may be some residual support among people who identify with either party.” Some 2,300 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan since the war began in the autumn of 2001. The U.S. is quickly drawing down its forces in Afghanistan. If a bilateral security agreement that would keep up to 10,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan after the end of 2014 isn't signed in the near future, the U.S. could withdraw all forces from Afghanistan at the end of next year.

The poll was conducted for CNN by ORC International between December 16 and 19, with 1,035 adults nationwide questioned by telephone. The survey's overall sampling error is plus or minus three percentage points.

The discontent evident in the CNN poll is also seen in two other national surveys conducted earlier this month.

Two-thirds of those questioned in an ABC News/Washington Post poll said the war has

not been worth fighting, and an Associated Press/GfK survey showed 57% saying the U.S. did the wrong thing in going to war in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The American people deserve better than what is on display here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal not just to Democrats but to Republicans. I want to appeal to the fairness of Members in this Chamber. I want to appeal to their sense of making sure that what we do here is right.

On this issue, we ought to have a vote, and the only way to get a vote is if you vote down the rule so we can go back to the Rules Committee and insert this amendment, that is totally germane, into the Department of Defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close by simply saying, it is moments like this where I feel a great sadness for this institution. Again, there are a lot of things in this Defense Department bill that we are going to debate that really, I think, one would fairly characterize as somewhat trivial, and I mentioned some of them earlier.

The fact that we are at war and we can't vote on this war—we are being told that we can't have a say on what the future of our policy is—that is shameful. I am ashamed of this place for running such a closed system on the war.

This is the defense bill. We are not talking about the education bill. We are not talking about the small business bill. This is the Department of Defense authorization bill. This is where we should have the debate. It is germane, and it should be made in order.

I will just finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we are approaching Memorial Day. We are all going to go home and give great speeches. When people ask, What are you doing for our troops in Afghanistan, what are you doing to try to get them home, you will be able to say, nothing, because that is exactly what we are going to do if we can't consider this amendment. Nothing. What a shame. What a tragedy. What an insult to those men and women who are serving. What an insult to their families. What an insult to the American people.

When you are in charge, you can do whatever you want, but I would urge my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to reject this rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said. As I said earlier, I agree with a lot of what has been said.

I will be honest with you, I am disappointed. I have sons that have been sent off to war for this Nation: two of them in Iraq at the same time and one in Afghanistan. They didn't ask to go. They went because, long before I got here, a majority of the Members here voted for it.

Now, you can have disagreements about whether or not we should have been involved in Iraq. I have some serious reservations. Or about what our

continued involvement in Afghanistan should be. I actually voted for an amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) put up last year in regards to getting out of Afghanistan.

Listen, what I say is not hallowed words. I have had blood and flesh of my own in those countries. And I agree, there is nothing we can do to change where Afghanistan is going to go in the future. You can't change history, as has been brought up here.

But I will tell you that if you don't vote for the underlying rule, then we won't have the opportunity to support our troops. We won't have an opportunity to override what the President is doing in regards to cutting the COLA for our troops and adding additional costs to our troops that they have to bear out of their own pockets.

So you want to make a statement. Let's not forget about what the NDAA is all about. It is about supporting our troops and giving our warfighters the equipment and the training and the compensation that they and their families richly deserve for what that 1 percent gives to this Nation, the freedom to stand down here and have a difference of opinion.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to allow this House to continue with its scheduled business for the day, I urge all Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 590 provides for House consideration of two separate pieces of legislation. The first of these bills, H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, will be considered for 1 hour under a closed rule. This legislation will prohibit the bulk collection of all tangible things, not just telephone records. It will end a practice that, in my sincere belief and in the belief of so many other Americans, violated our privacy and our con-

stitutional rights. This isn't the end of the issue for me and, I suspect, for a lot of our Members as well.

And secondly, the reason I am proud to be here to sponsor this particular rule is because it provides further consideration of this year's National Defense Authorization Act. The NDAA passed for 52 consecutive years, and I am confident that this will be the 53rd consecutive year that it passes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the very definition of a bipartisan effort. This year's NDAA was reported out of the House Armed Services Committee with unanimous support, 61-0.

For all the infighting that exists in Congress, it is nice to know that we can unite around the common cause of supporting our troops and fulfilling our constitutional responsibility of providing for the common defense of our homeland.

Part of the reason this legislation received so much support is that so many Members have had input into the process, from the committee to the floor. The committee alone, this bill was amended 155 times in committee. And the rule will allow for the consideration of over 160 more amendments, with over 70 of those amendments coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Of course, no piece of legislation is perfect to each Member. Even as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I didn't get everything I wanted in this legislation. But I am extremely proud of the work that we have done and the product that we have put forward.

One of the things I would like to highlight in this bill is the 1.8 percent pay raise for our troops. It is definitely more modest than I had hoped, but it is still a good step. And I think we all know our brave men and women have earned it.

We have also rejected, for 4 years in a row now, the President's proposed benefit cuts to our warfighters and their families. In the President's FY12 budget request, he proposed cuts to TRICARE. In the NDAA that year, the committee fully restored those cuts. In the President's FY13 budget proposal, he proposed compensation cuts once again. And, once again, our NDAA restored much of the funding and required the President to find other sources for the remaining funds.

Fiscal year '14 was no different. This President proposed TRICARE cuts and actually reduced the military's pay raise from 1.8 to just 1 percent. Congress again rejected those TRICARE cuts and worked to restore the program with other resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to say the President's proposed cuts this year were the most sweeping to date. Those cuts would have included TRICARE, housing allowances, and commissary benefits. These cuts add costly out-of-pocket expenses to those military families, that 1 percent who protect our freedoms, and he was will-

ing to cut that. Our warfighters deserve better, and the NDAA before us ensures that those damaging cuts will not happen.

This NDAA also rejects the administration's insistence on one or more rounds of base closure to conserve resources. It is our opinion that Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, is an ineffective way to produce true savings. Instead, they add large up-front costs. And so in this year's NDAA, we have prohibited another round of BRAC.

We have also expanded sexual assault prevention by reviewing the discharge status for victims who separate from the military. And this is so important to all of us. What we want to do is to ensure that no servicemembers were prosecuted for reporting a crime, and we want to make sure that we hold those responsible for the crime to the highest level that we can.

Finally, the underlying bill ensures the preservation of the National Guard. In every State and territory in this Union, guardsmen are exceptionally well trained and must retain equipment to respond to disasters in their States.

□ 1430

These brave men and women are critical to the operational Reserve of this country—ready to deploy to combat zones in defense of the entire Nation, as they have proudly done over the last 12 years. These are active members of our community who risk their own safety to come to our rescue when we are in need the most.

The Guard also provides for some of the most effective and efficient dollars spent, and that is why it is always frustrating to see proposals that could dramatically cut from their budget.

The NDAA recognizes the importance of the National Guard and the Reserves and preserves their capability to protect us here at home and abroad.

I support the rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree completely with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). How can we possibly be having a meaningful debate about our national defense policy when we are not even allowed to have a vote or a debate on the war that this country happens to be engaged in at this given time? It is a pretense for a discussion that while still important is omitting the single largest public policy issue that our constituents are interested in and that men and women are putting their lives at risk for related to defense.

There were 131 germane amendments, including the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JONES, relating to the war in Afghanistan, and 130 others that are rejected

under this rule—not even allowed a minute of discussion on the floor, no less a vote. What would it take to allow a full discussion of those issues? Well, 131 amendments, and customarily, even if we gave each 10 minutes, that is just 2 or 3 days of legislative time about our entire national defense policy. Isn't that what we owe this country as our Nation's deliberative body here, as Representatives of the United States Congress, to discuss for 2 or 3 days all the issues that Members on both sides of the aisle have brought forward relating to defense? I am including, first and foremost, the obvious issue of the war that we are currently engaged in and the demands from our constituents that whatever side prevails in that vote—and in the past, I have joined my colleagues, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JONES, on that issue—at least we should be able to debate and discuss whether an ongoing American presence in Afghanistan is in our national security interests.

The process under which these bills have come to the floor prevents open dialogue and debate, and, frankly, continues to undermine the reputation of this body, the United States Congress, as a deliberative and representative body. One need not wonder why congressional approval ratings are so low. Here we are having a debate for a day on national defense, and we are prohibited from debating and voting on the single largest issue relating to national defense.

In addition, this bill brings up a very weakened form of the USA FREEDOM Act. Not only was this bill weakened in the Judiciary Committee, but, in addition, it was weakened just 24 hours ago before the Rules Committee. Nonetheless, Members from both sides of the aisle submitted amendments to improve the bill, but, unfortunately, every single one of those 20 amendments are blocked under this rule. So we block 131 amendments by Members on both sides of the aisle from debate and from a vote, and we blocked 20 amendments for Members on both sides of the aisle with regard to the USA FREEDOM Act.

Look, this underlying rule also blocked amendments relating to military preparedness. It blocked a widely popular amendment that I think would have more than enough votes on the floor of the House, according to its chief sponsor, Mr. DENHAM, that would allow our aspiring Americans to enlist in the military to ensure that we have the very best and most capable aspiring men and women to defend our country. Absent that amendment, the military will have to essentially go to the next best person on their list, have a harder time meeting their recruitment goals, and have to accept something less than the very best to defend our country and protect our national security. The majority blocked this important bipartisan amendment that would allow aspiring Americans who seek to serve our country and know no

other country and owe no other allegiance to any other country to earn their legal status through military service.

The majority also blocked an amendment by Mr. CASTRO that would have allowed aspiring Americans who are DACA-qualified to become eligible to attend, train, and serve at U.S. service academies. I have had the deep honor of having been appointed by then-Speaker and now-leader Pelosi to serve on the board of governors along with my colleague, Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado, of the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs.

Members from across the country undergo—like we do in our office—a selection process where we interview the very best and brightest young men and women from across our districts for appointment to that academy, and one of the greatest honors I have as a Representative is being able to make the phone calls to the talented young individuals that our panelists have chosen to say, yes, we are providing you an appointment to one of our officer universities, and you will be able to serve as an officer in the United States military, one of the U.S. service academies. However, again, as a result of the failure of this rule to allow for even a debate or a vote on the Castro amendment, once again, our military academies are being forced to accept the next best, the less prepared student, rather than the most prepared and the very best officer that we need in today's and tomorrow's military to keep our Nation's national security interests safe.

Both the Denham and Castro amendments would strengthen our service morale, our national defense, and our military preparedness. And those are an example of the 131 amendments to this bill that are blocked from discussion or votes under this restrictive rule.

In addition, this rule makes in order H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act. Now, this bill was supposed to rein in the NSA's illegal and far-reaching wiretapping programs. Though I have never in my time here supported the PATRIOT Act, even many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have believe that the interpretation of that act was overly broad, and therefore, it is desirable for Congress to assert itself on behalf of the American people and rein in some of the worst excesses. But I am dismayed to find that the final text on the floor was not only weakened in the committee process but was weakened just 24 hours ago behind closed doors with less than just about 24 hours for Members of this body to even read the new version of the weakened USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. Speaker, last year's revelations that the NSA had been collecting detailed information about our communication patterns have undermined the trust that my constituents and Americans across the country have in our government. It has created conflicts

with our allies abroad, threatening jobs in our country by sully the reputation of American companies and rifling our international trade waters. The NSA collection of metadata is a clear violation of our constitutional guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure, and it simply can't continue.

Now, while I am pleased that the Chamber is finally taking up legislation that is aimed at reining in the NSA's activities, however, while this bill does take baby steps towards restoring some of Americans' freedoms that are so inherently part of our constitutional system, I am very disappointed that it doesn't require the government to fully meet the standard, nor does it resolve this issue in any way, shape, or form to the American people.

The USA FREEDOM Act curtails the NSA's ability to monitor Americans' private communications under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. And the legislative intent is clear: to prohibit the collection of bulk data such as the type that was occurring under the secret program revealed by Edward Snowden. However, the language in the bill falls short of accomplishing that, and none of the amendments that were designed to improve this bill and make it work to secure our privacy rights were even allowed to be discussed under this rule here on the floor of the House, which is another reason that this rule simply must be brought down.

This legislation amended the definition of "specific selection term," which is required to conduct surveillance under FISA in a way that creates the possibility that the NSA could misuse the bill. Now, again, a secret government agency that we have acknowledged has had oversight problems in the past, having overly broad discretion, has shown and demonstrated that it has been unable to provide the proper oversight.

So the bill's new definition of "specific selection term" can be read to create a loophole permitting intelligence agencies to use selection terms that could permit the collection of large segments of data associated with the particular email domain or IP address.

The American people have seen how broadly in the past the intelligence community has interpreted their authority under surveillance law. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. The new definitions provided in the underlying bill provide a potential loophole almost as wide as the initial loophole in the PATRIOT bill itself and fails to address the privacy concerns of the American people.

In addition, the new language eliminated provisions that strengthened and clarified the ban on reverse targeting in 702 and the minimization provisions for both the 215-based CDR program and the FISA pen register statute.

The language is a major departure from the bill that passed out of two committees. So you might hear Members on both sides of the aisle say, oh,

the bill passed by voice on committee. To be clear, this is not the bill that passed in committee. This bill was changed 24 hours ago and severely weakened. Were the proponents of these changes hesitant to bring these changes forward in committee because they knew they would engender bipartisan opposition? Perhaps. But let it not be said without refutation that these bills have passed committee by a voice vote unanimously. The bill has changed significantly since it passed committee.

Again, while I am encouraged that this Congress is finally taking up a bill designed with the intent of reining in the excesses of the NSA, this process is flawed. Twenty amendments were offered; none are allowed under this rule. If we can defeat this rule, Members from both sides of the aisle will be able to move forward to improve upon the USA FREEDOM Act to ensure that it can be examined and that Congress can engage in their proper oversight role with regard to this bill.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) whom I serve with on the Armed Services Committee, but he also serves on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, if you listen to some of the debate on this rule, you would not realize that both the underlying pieces of legislation here were enormously bipartisan.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee—Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Congressman NADLER, Congressman SCOTT, and Congressman SENSENBRENNER, the original author—for their hard work in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

The bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 32-0 and as amended passed the Intel Committee by a voice vote.

The underlying bill takes important steps toward reforming our Nation's intelligence-gathering programs by banning the bulk collection of data. The bill enhances civil liberty protections for all Americans while at the same time preserving our ability to protect the national security of this country.

National security and international terrorism investigation will now be conducted on a case-by-case basis, using specific selection terms and with permission from the FISA court, thereby ending the vacuuming up of data by the NSA.

Finally, the bill creates more transparency and provides more information to the American people. Companies will now be able to publicly report on the requests for information they re-

ceive from the government. The bill also requires new comprehensive reviews and extensive public disclosure.

The act includes legislation that I offered with my colleagues, the Intelligence Oversight and Accountability Act, which requires the government to provide to Congress, within 45 days, a copy of each FISA court decision, order, or opinion that includes a significant construction or interpretation of FISA.

The Federal Government has the responsibility to ensure that the intelligence community is taking appropriate action to root out threats to the security of the American people within the boundaries of the U.S. Constitution.

Today, we are striking this balance between safeguarding privacy and protecting Americans from terrorist threats in today's post-9/11 world.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have heard talk about the NDAA bill and amendments that weren't allowed. What you did not hear is that from 10 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 the next morning, the amendments were offered—over 155—and the chairman of that committee was so gracious he continued to ask, "Are there any additional amendments?" until there were none, when we finally passed on a bipartisan basis the NDAA bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that is a good bill that strengthens and supports our men and women in uniform. I hope that my colleagues will support the rule and support the underlying bills.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, rise in strong opposition to this rule, which fails to make in order the bipartisan McGovern-Jones-Smith-Garamendi-Lee amendment on Afghanistan, and I will include the text of my amendment following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a very straightforward amendment. We worked very hard to make it thoughtful, bipartisan, and germane. It reiterates the President's commitment to complete the transition of U.S. combat, military, and security operations to Afghan authorities by the end of this year.

□ 1445

It requires the President to send to Congress by the end of March next year a determination that describes the mission, duration, and level of troops of any post-2014 deployment of U.S. troops in Afghanistan, and the Congress then has 30 days to enact a joint resolution to approve the President's determination.

In the event that Congress votes against the President's determination, then the remaining U.S. troops in Afghanistan would be withdrawn in a safe, orderly, and expeditious manner,

taking into consideration the security of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel.

Last year, 305 Members of this House voted in support of an amendment calling for just such a vote, but under this rule, those same Members will be denied the opportunity to make sure that the President presents clearly to Congress what he intends our troops to do in Afghanistan after the end of this year and for how long. Under this rule, Congress is denied the opportunity to vote on whether they approve the President's plan or not.

I don't know how a vote on our amendment would turn out, and I certainly have no idea how a vote next year on keeping our troops in Afghanistan would turn out, but here is what I do know: I know that the men and women who will be asked to serve and perhaps to die in Afghanistan deserve a debate and a vote. I know their families deserve a debate and a vote.

I know that the American people, who have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars on this war, deserve a debate and a vote; and I know that this Congress has not only the right but the responsibility to make our views known on this important issue.

We are at war, Mr. Speaker. I know that some of my colleagues would rather not think about that. They would rather the issue of Afghanistan just go away, but wishing and hoping doesn't make it so.

This is already the longest war in American history. The American people are tired of it. Our troops and their families have been stretched to their very limits. We have lost over 2,000 servicemembers and spent over \$700 billion.

What in the world is the Republican leadership afraid of, Mr. Speaker?

Last night, some of my Republican colleagues told me that they were refusing to make this amendment in order because they didn't want to upset the President. Are you kidding me? Since when does this leadership care one iota about upsetting the President?

We can vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act over 50 times. We can have investigation after investigation after investigation about Benghazi, but we can't take 10 minutes to debate the war in Afghanistan? Give me a break.

Besides, this amendment doesn't upset any plans or negotiations the President is currently carrying out on Afghanistan—not a one. It doesn't interfere with funding for the war, and it doesn't interrupt the deployment of our troops.

I know, in their hearts, that many of my Republican colleagues agree with me, so I am going to give them one more chance to do the right thing. I urge you to support the McGovern-Jones-Smith-Garamendi-Lee amendment on Afghanistan.

Strike section 1217 and insert the following:

SEC. 1217. COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN; REQUIREMENTS TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.

(a) COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN.—In coordination with the Government of Afghanistan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and other allies in Afghanistan, the President shall—

(1) complete the accelerated transition of United States combat operations to the Government of Afghanistan by not later than December 31, 2014;

(2) complete the accelerated transition of United States military and security operations to the Government of Afghanistan and redeploy United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan (including operations involving military and security-related contractors) by not later than December 31, 2014; and

(3) pursue robust negotiations leading to a political settlement and reconciliation of the internal conflict in Afghanistan, to include the Government of Afghanistan, all interested parties within Afghanistan and with the observance and support of representatives of donor nations active in Afghanistan and regional governments and partners in order to secure a secure and independent Afghanistan and regional security and stability.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In the event that United States Armed Forces remain deployed in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, then no later than March 31, 2015, the President shall send to Congress a determination describing the purpose and expected duration of such deployment, and the projected number of troops to be deployed.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President's determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to approve the content of the President's determination. Should Congress vote against the President's determination, the President is directed to remove all troops not required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel in a safe, orderly and expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to include my amendment calling for a vote on keeping troops in Afghanistan after 2014, and that this amendment receive 10 minutes total debate like every other germane amendment made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has been yielded for the purpose of debate by the gentleman from Florida. Does the gentleman from Florida yield for this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 23, nays 361, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—23

Castor (FL)	Israel	Moore
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Jones	O'Rourke
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Fudge	Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Pocan
Hinojosa	Meeeks	Velázquez
Honda	Miller, George	

NAYS—361

Aderholt	Cotton	Graves (GA)
Amash	Courtney	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cramer	Grayson
Bachus	Crawford	Green, Al
Barber	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Barletta	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Barr	Cuellar	Griffith (VA)
Barrow (GA)	Culberson	Grijalva
Barton	Cummings	Grimm
Beatty	Daines	Guthrie
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
Bentivolio	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Bera (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Hall
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Harris
Black	DeLauro	Hartzler
Blackburn	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bonamici	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Boustany	Deutch	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Holding
Bridenstine	Doyle	Horsford
Brooks (AL)	Duckworth	Huffman
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hunter
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Hurt
Buchanan	Ellmers	Issa
Bucshon	Enyart	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Eshoo	Jeffries
Bustos	Esty	Jenkins
Butterfield	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fattah	Jolly
Campbell	Fincher	Jordan
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Capps	Fleischmann	Keating
Capuano	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Flores	Kennedy
Carney	Forbes	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Cartwright	Foster	Kind
Castro (TX)	Fox	King (IA)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Kline
Cleaver	Garamendi	Kuster
Clyburn	Garcia	Labrador
Coble	Gardner	LaMalfa
Coffman	Garrett	Lamborn
Cohen	Gerlach	Lance
Cole	Gibbs	Langevin
Collins (NY)	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Gohmert	Latham
Conyers	Goodlatte	Latta
Cook	Gosar	Levin
Cooper	Gowdy	Lewis
Costa	Granger	Lipinski

LoBiondo	Pearce	Sessions
Loeb sack	Pelosi	Sewell (AL)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Shea-Porter
Long	Perry	Sherman
Lowenthal	Peters (CA)	Shimkus
Lowey	Peters (MI)	Shuster
Lucas	Peterson	Sinema
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Sires
Luján, Ben Ray	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
(NM)	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Lummis	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Lynch	Polis	Smith (TX)
Maffei	Pompeo	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	Posey	Southerland
Carolyn	Price (GA)	Speier
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Stewart
Marchant	Quigley	Stivers
Marino	Rahall	Stockman
Massie	Rangel	Stutzman
Matheson	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
Matsui	Reichert	Takano
McAllister	Renacci	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McCaul	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Rigell	Thornberry
McCollum	Roby	Tiberi
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Tierney
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Titus
McKinley	Rogers (MI)	Tonko
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
Rodgers	Rokita	Turner
McNerney	Rooney	Upton
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Meehan	Roskam	Van Hollen
Mica	Ross	Veasey
Michaud	Rothfus	Vela
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wagner
Moran	Ruiz	Walberg
Mullin	Runyan	Walden
Mulvaney	Ruppersberger	Walorski
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Wasserman
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Neal	T.	Weber (TX)
Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster (FL)
Neugebauer	Sanford	Welch
Noem	Sarbanes	Wenstrup
Nolan	Scalise	Westmoreland
Nugent	Schiff	Whitfield
Nunes	Schneider	Williams
Nunnelee	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Olson	Schrader	Wittman
Owens	Schweikert	Wolf
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Womack
Pascarell	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Yoder
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Payne	Serrano	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—47

Bachmann	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Meng
Becerra	Hanna	Messer
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Camp	Holt	Ryan (OH)
Cantor	Hoyer	Schakowsky
Carter	Hudson	Schwartz
Cassidy	Huelskamp	Simpson
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Slaughter
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Vargas
Conaway	Kingston	Waters
DelBene	Lankford	Waxman
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Duffy	Lujan Grisham	Woodall
Engel	(NM)	Young (AK)

□ 1511

Mses. MCCOLLUM, BROWN of Florida, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. BARTON, STIVERS, GARCIA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. CHU and Mr. PALLONE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) has 16 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time to address the subject of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this House is considering a combined rule. It is a rule that addresses the NDAA and it is a rule that addresses the USA FREEDOM Act wrapped up together.

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate the point that we are addressing a combined rule between the National Defense Authorization Act and the USA FREEDOM Act.

The first component that I would like to address with the time that I have is an expression of appreciation to the Rules Committee for going through all the amendments of the NDAA, taking a look at that and coming down with a rule that recognizes that the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee is immigration policy, not Armed Services.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for the decision that they made on the NDAA. Even though there were dozens and dozens, actually scores of amendments to consider last year, there was an amendment that addressed the immigration issue that was made in order on the bill. That brought about a debate and a discussion here on the floor.

Instead, that debate took place this time in the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee declined to approve essentially amendment number 58 that dealt with the immigration issue. It is the proper jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. Additionally, it was bad policy.

So I rise to thank the Rules Committee for that decision and transition into a discussion about the USA FREEDOM Act, which I am troubled by; and that is the process of regular order in this Congress, and the idea that, as the Congress put together a bill that blocked the Federal Government from collecting metadata on telephone bills, there was a negotiation that took place over the weekend, a substitute amendment was delivered, announced at 12:35 p.m. on a Monday, we took up the bill

I believe the next day quickly, no amendments were accepted, we didn't have an opportunity to have a serious discussion about the national defense, national security implications of a bill that addressed the civil liberties.

I support the underlying bill, I support the effort to protect the civil liberties of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The amendment that I offered, even though it was voted on, the debate really didn't consider this proposal that the head of an element of the intelligence community may enter into an agreement to compensate for retaining call detail records for a period of time.

What the underlying bill does in section 215 is it limits the amount of time that we can get a FISA warrant to do a query of existing records in the private hands of the telecommunications companies to the 18 months that is required by the FCC. We need to have the opportunity for this Commander in Chief, the intelligence community, or a subsequent Commander in Chief to be able to expand that period of time while still protecting that data within the possession of the private sector companies, which we have confidence in.

That is an issue that I would like to see before this Congress. It is not going to be voted on in this bill. I am troubled by the national security implications of it, which brings me to the floor. I will support this rule. I do thank the Rules Committee. But I wanted to make that point that when national security issues come up, somebody has got to put the marker down.

I urge all to consider the point I have made here today.

Mr. POLIS. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this rule does not even allow a discussion of the war that we are currently engaged in in Afghanistan. How can we have a discussion about our national defense when being prohibited from any amendments relating to the war in Afghanistan?

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

First, the underlying National Defense Authorization Act continues wasteful spending at the Pentagon and won't allow, as Congressman POLIS said, a full debate on the longest war in American history.

This bill continues the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and it is a slush fund at a time when the administration still hasn't decided on how much the Afghanistan war is going to cost or how many troops will be there.

Yet the Republican leadership of this House has failed to allow the American people to have a say in the future of America's longest war, while maybe, quite frankly, some of these amendments probably would pass.

Finally, we would be reflecting the views of the majority of the American people.

For many years, we have known that there is simply no military solution in Afghanistan, and our constituents are sick and tired of war. This bill simply ignores 82 percent of the Americans who oppose the war and 74 percent favoring all U.S. troops out by 2014.

I want to just read the authorization that we are talking about today. The Authorization for Use of Military Force was passed sorrowfully. Let me tell you, after the horrific events of 9/11—some were not here during that period—it was passed September 14, and we had probably about maybe 1 hour of debate, maybe 1 hour of debate.

That resolution said—which is what we are talking about today, which is what we are insisting on a debate on—it said:

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. LEE of California. We are 13 years into this war without end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I authored H.R. 4608. I had an amendment to come here on this bill that would really get us back to the drawing board so that we could have this full debate to determine whether or not this resolution, the one of 9/14/2001, should still hold. Minimally, we should have a full debate on this.

I am really pleased though to see that the administration finally agreed to release a secret drones memo. That is a good thing. That is happening I think today. But we need to have a debate on this resolution, and we need to have it today.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), whom I have the honor of serving not only on the Rules Committee with, but also in Armed Services.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The underlying defense authorization bill is a good bill. This is a good rule with maybe one caveat that there are too many amendments that are in here.

Henry Clay, as the first Speaker of the House who went from the Senate over here and was elected Speaker on the first day and served as Speaker every day he served in the House, he is

given credit for starting the standing committee process where people with expertise discuss all these issues before they actually come to the floor. Some of these amendments we have had have not gone through that process and will be given 10 minutes of debate time on the floor, which is rather small when you compare it to the process of each subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee: having established their bill, going to the full committee, with a full day of debate on the bill before it comes here.

There is, for example, one amendment that is made in order, has a great sponsor, a wonderful Member of this body, but it has untold side consequences that probably need that experience of being explored. Let me give you a simple example. It starts with the words “notwithstanding any other provision of law.” That should be something that scares someone. It means this bill, except for section B, which it exempts, takes precedent over everything else that already exists in law, and not only for the military issue, but also in every element of Federal Government.

I am only going to talk about the military side because that is the only expertise I actually have. The one part that is not exempt deals with the concept known as “inherent governmental functions.” Unfortunately, the reference this makes is to title 31. Most of the military stuff, especially dealing with our depots, is in title X. There is a reason those are in different titles—because they have a different substance and a different purpose.

At the end of this reference, there is also the provision put in there—actually, it is in the first of this reference—that what is an inherent governmental function can be changed by any official of OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, which simply means, I assume, that is one of the reasons the Defense Department is opposed to this particular amendment, because it removes decisions from the Defense Department over to the President through OMB. That is not the way we wish to go.

When it deals with programs, weapons, and systems that we have, there is an acquisition side and a sustainment side. On the acquisition side, often competition is extremely important to driving down cost. When it comes to sustainment, the maintenance of those provisions, sometimes that saving has a detrimental effect that is an unintended consequence because the maintenance is directly tied to the readiness issue, which is why we define in title X what is a core workload, which would be overturned by the very first phrase in this particular piece of legislation, this particular amendment.

Core workload by law has to be brought into the depots for work once every 4 years, or at least at one time in the initial 4 years of operating capability. Prior to that time, maintenance is usually done by the contractor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. But after that, it goes into what is known as an endangered mission readiness that is determined by the military, and should be determined by the military.

What it simply means is we have military depots for a military reason. There is a direct extension, or these depots are a direct extension, of the soldier on the field. Civilian workers at these depots cannot go on strike, they cannot undertake a work stoppage. Sometimes, especially in times of war, Federal civilian employees have been ordered to work around-the-clock or do other kinds of dangers.

All of these things which have been worked out traditionally in title X are overturned by the first phrase in this amendment: A wonderful amendment in its purpose and goal, has a wonderful sponsor, but it has unintended consequences. As we go through this bill, as we go through these amendments, we should consider what those unintended consequences may or may not be. It is one of the reasons why the Committee process was so wisely established by Henry Clay back in the 1800s and should be respected today.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the rather elucidating discussion on the way in which the committee system is supposed to work.

Unfortunately, in the Armed Services Committee, the most expensive single project was never allowed to be discussed, and that is the war in Afghanistan—\$79 billion in the NDAA for Afghanistan and not 1 second of discussion about the role of America in Afghanistan and about the ongoing war.

The committee structure did not work. Therefore it is to this floor, it is to the membership of this House to take up this critical issue of what is the role of America in Afghanistan. Are we to continue this war or not? If we are to continue it, how are we going to do that? That is our business. That is the business that we were elected to do, and we have been prevented by the actions of the majority in the committee and on this floor to even deal with this issue, to even discuss it for one moment, except in this issue of how the rule is to be written.

This is not right, it is not fair to those of us who want to have a legitimate debate on the role of America in Afghanistan, and it is not in the interest of this country that this House forsake and forgo its responsibilities.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good colleague for yielding.

I rise in support of the rule, as well as the underlying bill, the National Defense Authorization Act.

One of the provisions in there is the addition of a defense audit advisory

panel. It comes as no shock to anyone in this room that the Department of Defense is unauditabile, or their financial statements are unauditabile. There are Herculean efforts going on across the river at the Pentagon and throughout the entire system to try to correct this issue. There are millions and millions of dollars being spent to try to make this happen and try to get to a point, in fact, where they can.

The current law requires that the Defense Department be auditabile by the end of 2017 and that the fiscal 2018 books and records be audited and a report provided to Congress by 2018. There will be important decisions going on throughout that timeframe. We need a canary in the coal mine. We need an early warning system in this House that tracks that process, and this panel will do that. I was pleased that it was included in the underlying bill. It is important that Congress watch this process throughout.

The Department of Defense gives us a report every 6 months, but we need better insight, we need a line of sight into what is going on on a much more relevant basis quicker so that we don't wait until the end of 2017 and suddenly discover that the Department is not achieving that goal, or we don't get to the end of 2018 and can't, in fact, audit the books and records of the Department of Defense.

This is a stunningly difficult problem to fix. For decades, the Department of Defense has had an accounting system that was set up to meet its needs and the needs of providing the mission support. It was not set up to be audited. Consequently, in order to be able to audit something, they have got to go back and rebuild all these legacy systems that are out there. This is hard work and a lot of it.

The Department of Defense, as my colleague earlier said, this is one of the largest enterprises on the face of Earth. It is not easy, and it takes good hardworking people to get it done, and that is what has been going on.

□ 1530

Our Congress, though, needs to have the insight into that process to make sure that they get it right. This effort doesn't fall, really, within the structure of the committee or of the subcommittees, naturally, so this defense audit panel will correct that oversight, and it will allow us to see the progress in as real time a basis as we can get.

If we do need to take corrective actions and if we do need to do something to make that happen, then this will give us a quicker insight into that.

For this reason and for a whole lot of others, I support the underlying bill, and I support this rule. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and, when it comes time for the bill itself, to vote “yes” on the National Defense Authorization Act, which would be the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is critical that this House reject this rule because it is impossible to have a discussion about meeting our national security needs and defense without this body's being able to issue any guidance or to even debate the ongoing war in which this Nation is engaged in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for two amendments I am submitting to the National Defense Authorization Act.

The first I am offering would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress no later than 30 days after the enactment of this law on the barriers to implementing audit reporting requirements and recommendations in order to ensure reporting deadlines are met. This would ensure that taxpayer money is being well spent.

The second, offered by me and Mr. COOK, would create a pilot program to take the California National Guard's Work for Warriors job placement program nationwide.

Since the State of California created the program in 2012, more than 2,500 Guard members have been placed in jobs and at only \$500 per placement, far cheaper than any other employment programs, which can cost as much as \$10,000 per placement.

Placing 2,500 California guardsmen in jobs is a great start, but I know that that number can multiply many times over if the Work for Warriors program is expanded nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there are few greater threats to the security of American families than those which could arise from the failure of the ongoing nuclear negotiations with Iran.

Parts of this bill seek to disrupt the administration's tough, persistent diplomacy. Some would even assign to Israel the job of starting what could become World War III. Even the Bush-Cheney administration rejected that approach.

Iranian Revolutionary Guard hardliners may ultimately doom these negotiations. Our responsibility is to ensure that hardliners here don't do the obstruction for them.

Our arsenal of democracy includes more than bombs. It includes tough negotiations and strong sanctions to reach a carefully monitored, verifiable agreement that will protect our families and our allies.

Given the high cost of failure, we certainly cannot afford to surrender to defeatists, who capitulate on the negotiations before they are even completed. It is too soon to wave the white flag and give up in favor of war.

The obstinate objections raised last year to the interim agreement were

proven to be unjustified. The International Atomic Energy Agency has determined that Iran has taken verifiable actions to halt the progress of its nuclear program.

Let's give peace a chance.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield a minute and 15 seconds to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that there are many reasons to be concerned about the rule. I am certainly concerned that we are not able to debate a very important issue dealing with Afghanistan.

Having spent almost a decade-plus in dealing with provision 215 under the PATRIOT Act and in helping to construct the Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet Collection, and Online Monitoring Act, it is imperative that we move the USA FREEDOM Act forward.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013. Specifically, my bill would require the Attorney General to expose the FISA Court, allowing Americans to know the broad, illegal authority it had, even having an advocate for the American people in sections 402 and 604. This is in the bill.

In addition, I strongly support this act because section 301 of the bill continues the prohibition against reverse targeting, which is an amendment that I had in the RESTORE Act; then, of course, it goes forward with ensuring that this megadata—this bulk collection—does not occur.

I am grateful that the Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee amendment that deals with Boko Haram is in this national defense bill because we have to stop the tragedy that is going on, but more importantly, the devastation of Boko Haram.

Finally, I would have wanted the amendment that deals with the contracting out of our intelligence services. I believe it is too extensive. I believe that my amendment would have been effective in determining how much we use outside contractors. This is a rule that is, unfortunately, without a lot of point to it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 590, the rule governing debate on H.R. 3361, the "USA Freedom Act," and amendment to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Regarding H.R. 3361, I support the rule and am a co-sponsor of the the underlying bill, the USA Freedom Act, which stands for "Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act."

The USA Freedom Act is the House's unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013 regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone

records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative.

There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

In response, many Members of Congress, including the Ranking Member CONYERS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and myself, introduced legislation in response to the disclosures to ensure that the law and the practices of the executive branch reflect the intent of Congress in passing the USA Patriot Act and subsequent amendments.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the "FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013," bipartisan legislation, that much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or "FISA Court."

Specifically, my bill would require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT ACT and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

I am pleased that these requirements are incorporated in substantial part as Sections 402 and 604 of the USA Freedom Act, which requires the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA court that includes a significant construction or interpretation of law and to submit a report to Congress within 45 days.

Significantly, the USA Freedom Act contains an explicit prohibition on bulk collection of tangible things pursuant to Section 215 authority. Instead, the USA Freedom Act provides that Section 215 may only be used where a specific selection term is provided as the basis for the production of tangible things.

Finally, I strongly support the USA Freedom Act because Section 301 of the bill continues the prohibition against "reverse targeting," which became law when an earlier Jackson Lee Amendment was included in H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act of 2007.

"Reverse targeting" is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, codified in Section 301 of the USA Freedom Act, reduces even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by requiring the Administration to obtain a regular, individualized FISA warrant whenever the "real" target of the surveillance is a person in the United States.

I support the the USA Freedom Act because it will help keep us true to the Bill of Rights and strikes the proper balance between liberty and security.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying USA Freedom Act.

Finally, I am pleased that the rule also makes in order the Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee

Amendment to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2015.

This amendment makes three important contributions to the bill:

1. First, it strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the kidnapping of the more than 200 young schoolgirls kidnapped from the Chibok School by Boko Haram;

2. Second, it expresses support for the people of Nigeria who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic Nigeria; and

3. Third, it requires that not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment, the Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress on the nature and extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my serious concern about the USA FREEDOM Act.

First, it is important for all of the Members to know that what is being considered is not the bill that was marked up by the House Judiciary Committee. After it was reported out unanimously by the House Judiciary Committee, certain key elements of this bill were changed.

I think it is ironic that a bill that was intended to increase transparency was secretly changed between the committee markup and its floor consideration, and it was altered in worrisome ways.

The definition of “selector,” rather than being narrowed, has been defined in such a way that it would allow for the large-scale acquisition of data. This is a concern that has been expressed to me by both Republicans and Democrats.

The way the definition is lodged, you could get first the southern half of the United States, then the eastern half of the United States, then Missouri. Those could be the selectors.

I offered nine amendments. None were put in order. We should insist that we do better than this.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as Ms. LOFGREN said, the bill under consideration is not the bill that passed committee. It is a different bill that was changed 24 hours ago in secret, behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight my amendment, which will be considered later today, to improve TRICARE for our military moms and their families.

Doctors are now recommending that new moms exclusively breastfeed their

babies, but we know that, despite their intentions, far too many women who want to breastfeed these infants find the cost of lactation supplies and support to be a barrier to that choice. While most women covered by private health insurance have access to these services, women with TRICARE do not.

That is why I introduced the TRICARE Moms Improvement Act, which will be on the floor today as an amendment. My amendment would end this discrepancy—this disparity—and would create a parity of access to health care for servicemembers, along with private civilians.

I urge my colleagues to join the many medical groups, women’s organizations, and military family associations which support this effort.

Please vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule.

This legislation would authorize over \$520 billion to the Department of Defense, not including over \$79 billion in war funding, which I oppose; yet, for such a large bill, there are many amendments that my colleagues wanted to offer that will never see the House floor because of this very limited rule.

One issue that, I think, deserves discussion is the inclusion of an \$800 million authorization for an unbudgeted 12th LPD-17 class ship. While we are still addressing the effects of the sequester, which I voted against, I have concerns about this provision.

In particular, I am concerned that the committee does not address the fact that there is a Navy shipbuilding agreement in place regarding the DDG-51s and the LPDs.

This agreement requires that the Navy obligate funding and support for another DDG-51 destroyer if another LPD is awarded. Under a different rule, we may have been able to have had an open discussion about this issue and about so many others.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

Here are the facts, Members: We have a crisis in the military when it comes to sexual assault cases. We have a 50 percent increase in the number of persons filing claims for sexual assault in the military as a result of the most recent study.

Here are the facts, Members: There are more than 200 Members in this

House right now who support taking sexual assault cases out of the chain of command, and yet we do not have the ability to have a vote on the floor of this House on whether or not Members of this House support taking sexual assault cases out of the chain of command and putting them in the hands of a chief prosecutor, who has legal training.

Members, the elephant is in this room. It is time for us to have the guts to stand up and be counted on whether or not we want all members of the military to be safe or only those who do not file claims for sexual assault.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in support of Representative SPEIER’s amendment.

I am unique in this Chamber. I have served as a military prosecutor, a military defense attorney, a staff judge advocate; and, indeed, before coming to Congress, I served as a commanding general. I understand the impact of sexual violence in the military.

Justice needs to be properly served to victims of sexual assault and to all members of our military. Decades ago, military defense attorneys were taken out of the chain of command. We must do the same with the prosecution. It is the only way that justice can be properly served, without influence, perceived or real.

My fellow colleagues, I urge you to join us in ending the appearance of undo influence in military prosecutions.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Mr. POLIS. I thought, perhaps, they had been holding their tongues all along, wanting to speak after ours. Very well then. I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am grateful that this rule does include several of the amendments that I have had the opportunity to work on.

One is a bipartisan amendment with my colleagues Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. WHITFIELD, with regard to Rocky Flats in my district, which will help increase transparency to ensure that cold war nuclear workers will have their benefit applications reviewed expeditiously.

There are many survivors in my district who have been exposed to radiation and who are suffering from severe

health effects. If they had been on the military side, they would have been taken care of. They are on the civilian side, but have put their lives in harm's way, and they deserve to be taken care of for their service to our country.

I am also pleased with my amendment with Mr. BLUMENAUER, which would defund the midlife nuclear refueling and overhaul of the *George Washington* aircraft carrier, which would save \$5 billion. The administration released a statement of administrative policy, expressing concern about this unneeded reoverhaul of an aircraft carrier that we do not need as we shrink our carrier fleet permanently to 10 vessels.

Finally, I am pleased with my amendment with Representative NADLER, which is to encourage the Department of Defense to ensure that our ground-based missile defense systems actually work and that there are operational, realistic tests before additional purchases are made of systems that do not keep Americans safe.

This will also be permitted on the floor of the House today.

□ 1545

However, 131 ideas—good, bad, and other—from my colleagues on both side of the aisle are not even allowed to be debated or voted on under this bill.

The single biggest issue, the pressing national issue of the ongoing war in which this Nation is engaged is not even able to have 10 minutes or 1 minute of floor debate, as it has that very same issue, the ongoing presence in Afghanistan. And I have my opinions; my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, has his; and folks on the other side and both sides of the aisle have theirs.

This is not a partisan issue. It is simply one that we as representatives of the American people deserve to be able to be their voice on: How long and in what capacity should we continue to send American men and women to Afghanistan?

The only way that we can ensure that this body is allowed to have their voice—Democrats, Republicans, people who want us to stay there, people who don't—is to bring down this rule and to bring forward a rule that allows a debate of the single most significant pressing national policy issue.

In addition, there are a number of amendments around military preparedness and making sure our military has the very best and brightest aspiring Americans to draw from to keep our country safe that is not even allowed to be discussed under the rules of the bill.

And finally, the USA FREEDOM Act, which is no longer the USA FREEDOM Act but a bill that has a loophole as wide as the Grand Canyon that was not in the original USA FREEDOM Act, passed on a bipartisan basis on a voice vote out of committee, and yet 20 amendments—again, good, bad, indifferent, some of which would have addressed the flaws—not even allowed 10

minutes, not allowed 1 minute, not allowed 30 seconds, not allowed 10 seconds, not allowed a vote.

Why are we scared of letting the Members of this body, Republican and Democrat, have a voice in addressing the very legitimate privacy concerns about the NSA?

If people think this bill will somehow address the concerns and they are gone, they are wrong.

I plan on voting against this stripped version, which is no longer the USA FREEDOM Act, to show that it no longer even comes remotely close to addressing the concerns that my constituents have about the NSA overreach with regard to their privacy.

We need to reject this rule to ensure that this body, representatives of the American people, Republican and Democratic, can bring forward the issues that pertain to national defense and our privacy.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, the rule today, before us today, continues the process of allowing Members to provide input on the NDAA. That process is important.

This rule makes in order 162 amendments to the NDAA. I know some of the other side don't think that is enough. Remember, in committee, we were there from 10 o'clock in the morning until after midnight, and we heard another 155 amendments from both sides of the aisle. And 155 amendments were considered in order and were voted on or added to the NDAA.

So it is not like there hasn't been any input. It is just the opposite. It has been impressive this year as compared to other years, and unprecedented.

It is also important to stress that both of these underlying pieces of legislation are bipartisan agreements. They include the input of Members on both sides of the aisle. Any time you get agreements like this, no one is going to get everything they want. I sure didn't. But it doesn't have to be all or nothing. That approach doesn't work, not for this body and not for the American people.

But what this rule allows is for debate on both of these issues. On the USA FREEDOM Act there will be a separate hour of debate to debate the merits of that particular piece of legislation, and we are going to have debate on the remaining amendments that have been made in order that we are bringing forward today as relate to the NDAA.

That is a lot of input. Is it ever enough? It probably could never be enough. But for this body, it is kind of unprecedented the amount of debate that we have had already on the NDAA.

I have only been here 3 years, but it is long enough to know that if you insist on all or nothing 99 percent of time, you know what you are going to get? You are going to get nothing. And that is not what we want.

We have an opportunity here to debate the USA FREEDOM Act and the merits of it or not, but we also have the ability to debate amendments to the NDAA that support our troops.

We need to recognize that when this happens, the American people win when this body works its will in committee. They are American people, and this body has a voice in regard to what occurs in the future.

We have made significant progress on issues central to American rights and freedoms. Trust me; I have been the biggest opponent of the massive collection of metadata that was going on in the United States. I thought it was unconstitutional and a violation of our privacy rights. I absolutely do.

What we have today is a vast improvement on what we have now. I wish we would come together more often and we wouldn't let our differences outweigh our common goals.

Like I said before, is the USA FREEDOM Act perfect? By no means. But it is certainly better than what we have today when this government has the right—and is doing it up to this moment—and is collecting an unprecedented amount of data, metadata, on all of us, which I believe is directly against the Constitution.

But I am particularly encouraged once again that we are united around our constitutional requirement as it relates to the NDAA on common defense. That is one of the responsibilities this body has is the common defense of this country, and nothing more. That is paramount. Because if we don't have common defense, we don't have anything that we enjoy today, whether it is back home or here in Washington, D.C. We don't have the ability to have freedom of speech. We don't have the ability to sit here and debate back and forth and have differing opinions. But at the end of the day, we move forward, and that is what makes America great. What has made America great is that 1 percent that protect us today.

Mr. Speaker, like I said, I have three sons. They all currently serve. They do it willingly and not just because Mom or Dad wanted them to. Probably just the opposite. Because when we had them deploy to Iraq and Afghanistan—and now our youngest just came back from a deployment to Africa—we would rather them not be in harm's way.

But they have made a decision that this country is worth it. Those that have led the way before them made that decision, and some have paid the ultimate sacrifice. We owe it to them to finish up the NDAA and move this rule forward so we can have a common debate, particularly as it relates to the USA FREEDOM Act.

I don't know how we can look our servicemen and -women in the eye. I hear this all the time. We have a debt we can never repay. They are looking at what we do today. They are looking at what we do on the NDAA, in how we are supporting them.

If you think back to the Armed Services Committee, it was 61-0 in support of this particular piece of legislation. That is pretty good coming out of this place that is dysfunctional, to say the least.

But we can unite on one singular cause, and we have. We have the ability to continue to support our troops. We have the ability to continue to support the families that support our troops.

Let me tell you, they listen and they watch. They wonder where we are in the whole process. Do we really support them or is it just lip service. Do we just give speeches and say how much we appreciate their service and sacrifice, or is it lip service?

I would suggest to you that the Armed Services Committee stepped up to the plate, and it is not lip service from them. They went above and beyond what the President requested to support our troops, our warfighters, and that is the right thing to do.

I would hope that we would do this now and in the future. We want to make sure that they have the best possible equipment and the best possible training.

When my kids were in Iraq and Afghanistan, the one thing that gave my wife, Wendy, and me solace was the fact that we knew they were the best equipped, best fighting force on the face of the Earth that give them the best opportunity to come home. And that is what we want. It is as simple as that. These are real people.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 567, 113th Congress, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi:

Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland;
Mr. SMITH, Washington;
Mr. SCHIFF, California;
Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California;
Ms. DUCKWORTH of Illinois

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 585 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4435.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1702

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 20, 2014, amendment No. 7 printed in House report 113-455 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) had been disposed of.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 to the end that the amendment stand rejected by the earlier voice vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn, and the amendment, as modified, stands rejected in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-455 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. DAINES of Montana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, yeas 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—192

Bachmann	Fudge	Michaud
Barber	Gabbard	Miller, George
Beatty	Gallego	Moore
Becerra	Garamendi	Moran
Benishek	Garcia	Murphy (FL)
Bentivolio	Grayson	Nadler
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Neal
Bishop (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Negrete McLeod
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Nolan
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Owens
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Payne
Capps	Higgins	Pelosi
Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Carney	Honda	Peters (MI)
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Cartwright	Hoyer	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Poe (TX)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Polis
Chu	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Ciulline	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rangel
Cleaver	Kaptur	Richmond
Clyburn	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Connolly	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	T.
Crowley	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davis, Danny	Lee (CA)	Schneider
DeFazio	Levin	Schrader
DeGette	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Lipinski	Scott, David
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Serrano
DelBene	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Deutch	Lowe y	Shea-Porter
Dingell	Lynch	Sherman
Doggett	Maffei	Sinema
Doyle	Maloney,	Sires
Duckworth	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Duncan (TN)	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Edwards	Marchant	Takano
Ellison	Massie	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Enyart	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Eshoo	McCollum	Titus
Esty	McDermott	Tonko
Farr	McGovern	Tsongas
Fattah	McNerney	Van Hollen
Foster	Meeks	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchson
Burgess
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Connelly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Cantor
Holt
Huelskamp

Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Rush

Schwartz
Slaughter

□ 1737

Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. WOLF and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. JONES, CLEAVER, FATTAH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. PINGREE

of Maine, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. MURPHY of Florida, MICHAUD, CUELLAR, and RUIZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

AYES—194

Amash
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Cummings
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn

Fattah
Fortenberry
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Cummings
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Sinema

Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema

Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney

Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Wilson (FL)
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchson
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Klaine
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lumms
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Cantor
Holt
Huelskamp

Kingston
Lankford
Miller, Gary
Rush

Schwartz
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1744

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 196, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

AYES—222

Aderholt	Gardner	McKeon
Amodi	Garrett	McKinley
Bachmann	Gerlach	McMorris
Bachus	Gibbs	Rodgers
Barletta	Gohmert	Meadows
Barr	Goodlatte	Meehan
Barton	Gosar	Messer
Benishek	Gowdy	Mica
Bentivolio	Granger	Miller (FL)
Billrakis	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Black	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney
Blackburn	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)
Boustany	Grimm	Neugebauer
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Noem
Bridenstine	Hanna	Nugent
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Nunnelee
Broun (GA)	Hartzler	Olson
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Paulsen
Byrne	Hensarling	Pearce
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Camp	Holding	Petri
Campbell	Hudson	Pittenger
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Carter	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Cassidy	Hunter	Pompeo
Chabot	Hurt	Posey
Chaffetz	Issa	Price (GA)
Coble	Jenkins	Reed
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Ribble
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Joyce	Rigell
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Cotton	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Cramer	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kline	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Daines	LaMalfa	Rokita
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Rooney
Denham	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Latham	Roskam
DeSantis	Latta	Ross
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Diaz-Balart	Long	Royce
Duffy	Lucas	Ruiz
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Runyan
Ellmers	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	(NM)	Salmon
Fincher	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sanford
Fitzpatrick	(NM)	Scalise
Fleischmann	Lummis	Schock
Fleming	Marchant	Schweikert
Flores	Marino	Scott, Austin
Forbes	McAllister	Scott, David
Fortenberry	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Fox	McCauley	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Shuster

Simpson	Tiberi
Smith (MO)	Tipton
Smith (NE)	Turner
Smith (NJ)	Upton
Smith (TX)	Valadao
Southerland	Wagner
Stewart	Walberg
Stockman	Walden
Stutzman	Walorski
Terry	Weber (TX)
Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Thornberry	Wenstrup

NOES—196

Amash	Garamendi
Barber	Garcia
Barrow (GA)	Gibson
Beatty	Grayson
Becerra	Green, Al
Bera (CA)	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hahn
Bonamici	Hall
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa
Bralley (IA)	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Higgins
Burgess	Himes
Bustos	Hinojosa
Butterfield	Honda
Capps	Horsford
Capuano	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Huffman
Carney	Israel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Jones
Cicilline	Kaptur
Clarke (MA)	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)
Clay	Kennedy
Cleaver	Kildee
Clyburn	Kilmer
Cohen	Kind
Connolly	Kirkpatrick
Conyers	Kuster
Cooper	Langevin
Costa	Larsen (WA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)
Crowley	Lee (CA)
Cuellar	Levin
Cummings	Lewis
Davis (CA)	Lipinski
Davis, Danny	Loebsack
DeFazio	Lofgren
DeGette	Lowenthal
Delaney	Lowe
DeLauro	Lynch
DeBene	Maffei
Deutch	Maloney,
Dingell	Carolyn
Doggett	Maloney, Sean
Doyle	Massie
Duckworth	Matheson
Duncan (TN)	Matsui
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)
Ellison	McCollum
Engel	McDermott
Enyart	McGovern
Eshoo	McIntyre
Esty	McNerney
Farr	Meeks
Fattah	Meng
Foster	Michaud
Frankel (FL)	Moore
Fudge	Moran
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Gallego	Nadler

NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Kingston	Schwartz
Cantor	Lankford	Slaughter
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Stivers
Holt	Miller, George	
Huelskamp	Rush	

□ 1749

Mrs. ELLMERS changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.

Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adopting House Resolution 590; Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4031.

Each electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 590) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 190, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Buchanan	Cramer
Amash	Bucshon	Crawford
Amodi	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bachmann	Byrne	Culberson
Bachus	Calvert	Daines
Barber	Camp	Davis, Rodney
Barletta	Campbell	Denham
Barr	Capito	Dent
Barton	Carter	DeSantis
Benishek	Cassidy	DesJarlais
Bentivolio	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Billrakis	Chaffetz	Duckworth
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Duffy
Black	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Ellmers
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Conaway	Fincher
Brooks (AL)	Cook	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Cotton	Fleischmann

Fleming Long
 Flores Lucas
 Forbes Luetkemeyer
 Fortenberry Lummis
 Foxx Marchant
 Franks (AZ) Marino
 Frelinghuysen McAllister
 Gardner McCarthy (CA)
 Garrett McCaul
 Gerlach McClintock
 Gibbs McHenry
 Gibson McIntyre
 Gingrey (GA) McKeon
 Gohmert McKinley
 Goodlatte McMorris
 Gosar Rodgers
 Gowdy Meadows
 Granger Meehan
 Graves (GA) Messer
 Graves (MO) Mica
 Griffin (AR) Miller (FL)
 Griffith (VA) Miller (MI)
 Grimm Mullin
 Guthrie Mulvaney
 Hall Murphy (FL)
 Hanna Murphy (PA)
 Harper Neugebauer
 Harris Noem
 Hartzler Nugent
 Hastings (WA) Nunes
 Heck (NV) Nunnelee
 Hensarling Olson
 Herrera Beutler Owens
 Holding Palazzo
 Hudson Paulsen
 Huizenga (MI) Pearce
 Hultgren Perry
 Hunter Petri
 Hurt Pittenger
 Issa Pitts
 Jenkins Poe (TX)
 Johnson (OH) Pompeo
 Johnson, Sam Posey
 Jolly Price (GA)
 Jordan Reed
 Joyce Reichert
 Kelly (PA) Renacci
 King (IA) Ribble
 King (NY) Rice (SC)
 Kinzinger (IL) Rigell
 Kline Roby
 Labrador Roe (TN)
 LaMalfa Rogers (AL)
 Lamborn Rogers (KY)
 Lance Rogers (MI)
 Latham Rohrabacher
 Latta Rokita
 LoBiondo Rooney

NAYS—190

Barrow (GA) Davis (CA)
 Beatty Davis, Danny
 Becerra DeFazio
 Bera (CA) DeGette
 Bishop (GA) Delaney
 Bishop (NY) DeLauro
 Blumenauer DelBene
 Bonamici Deutch
 Brady (PA) Dingell
 Braley (IA) Doggett
 Broun (GA) Doyle
 Brown (FL) Edwards
 Brownley (CA) Ellison
 Bustos Engel
 Butterfield Enyart
 Capps Eshoo
 Capuano Esty
 Cárdenas Farr
 Carney Fattah
 Carson (IN) Foster
 Cartwright Frankel (FL)
 Castor (FL) Fudge
 Castro (TX) Gabbard
 Chu Gallego
 Cicilline Garamendi
 Clark (MA) Garcia
 Clarke (NY) Grayson
 Clay Green, Al
 Cleaver Green, Gene
 Clyburn Grijalva
 Cohen Gutiérrez
 Connolly Hahn
 Conyers Hanabusa
 Cooper Hastings (FL)
 Costa Heck (WA)
 Courtney Higgins
 Crowley Himes
 Cuellar Hinojosa
 Cummings Honda

Ros-Lehtinen Matheson
 Roskam Matsui
 Ross McCarthy (NY)
 Rothfus McCollum
 Royce McDermott
 Runyan McGovern
 Ruppenger McNeerney
 Ryan (WI) Meeks
 Salmon Meng
 Sánchez, Linda Michaud
 T. Miller, George
 Sanchez, Loretta Moore
 Sanford Moran
 Scalise Nadler
 Schock Napolitano
 Schweikert Neal
 Meadows Negrete McLeod
 Granger Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner Nolan
 Sessions O'Rourke
 Shimkus Pallone
 Shuster Pascrell
 Simpson Pastor (AZ)
 Smith (MO) Payne
 Smith (NE) Pelosi
 Smith (NJ) Perlmutter
 Smith (TX) Peters (CA)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA) Thompson
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Peters (MI) Smith (WA)
 Peterson Speier
 Pingree (ME) Stockman
 Pocan Swalwell (CA)
 Polis Takano
 Price (NC) Thompson (CA)
 Quigley Thompson (MS)
 Rahall Tierney
 Rangel Titus
 Richmond Tonko
 Roybal-Allard Tsongas
 Ruiz Van Hollen
 Ryan (OH) Vargas
 Sarbanes Veasey
 Schakowsky Vela
 Schiff Velázquez
 Schneider Visclosky
 Schrader Walz
 Scott (VA) Wasserman
 Scott, David Schultz
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL) Waters
 Shea-Porter Waxman
 Sherman Welch
 Sinema Wilson (FL)
 Sires Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bass Kingston
 Cantor Lankford
 Holt Miller, Gary
 Huelskamp Rush

Schwartz
 Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1758

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes on May 21, 2014: on rollcall vote 223, a motion to Adjourn, I would have voted “no;” on rollcall vote 224, a motion to Adjourn, I would have voted “no;” on rollcall vote 225, on agreeing to the Blumenauer Amendment to H.R. 4435, I would have voted “yes;” on rollcall vote 226, on agreeing to the Loretta Sanchez Amendment Number 3 to H.R. 4435, I would have voted “yes;” on rollcall vote 227, on agreeing to the Daines Amendment, I would have voted “no;” on rollcall vote 228, on passage of H. Res. 590, I would have voted “no.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4031) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 33, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

YEAS—390

Aderholt	Costa	Green, Gene
Amash	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Amodei	Courtney	Griffith (VA)
Bachmann	Cramer	Grijalva
Bachus	Crawford	Grimm
Barber	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barletta	Crowley	Hahn
Barr	Cuellar	Hall
Barrow (GA)	Culberson	Hanna
Barton	Cummings	Harper
Beatty	Daines	Harris
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Hartzler
Bentivolio	Davis, Danny	Hastings (WA)
Bera (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hensarling
Bishop (NY)	Delaney	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Higgins
Black	DelBene	Himes
Blackburn	Denham	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Dent	Holding
Bonamici	DesSantis	Honda
Boustany	DesJarlais	Horsford
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Hudson
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Huffman
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Huizenga (MI)
Bridenstine	Doyle	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Duckworth	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hurt
Broun (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Israel
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Buchanan	Ellmers	Jackson Lee
Bucshon	Engel	Jeffries
Burgess	Enyart	Jenkins
Bustos	Eshoo	Johnson (OH)
Butterfield	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Byrne	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Farr	Jolly
Camp	Fattah	Jones
Campbell	Fincher	Jordan
Cantor	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Capito	Fleischmann	Keating
Capps	Fleming	Kelly (IL)
Capuano	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Forbes	Kennedy
Carney	Fortenberry	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Foster	Kilmer
Carter	Fox	Kind
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	King (IA)
Cassidy	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Castor (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Chabot	Gallego	Kline
Chaffetz	Garamendi	Kuster
Chu	Garcia	Labrador
Cicilline	Gardner	LaMalfa
Clark (MA)	Garrett	Lamborn
Clay	Gerlach	Lance
Cleaver	Gibbs	Langevin
Coble	Gibson	Larsen (WA)
Coffman	Gingrey (GA)	Larson (CT)
Conaway	Gohmert	Latham
Connolly	Goodlatte	Latta
Conyers	Gosar	Levin
Cook	Gowdy	Lewis
Cooper	Granger	Lipinski
	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
	Graves (MO)	Loeb sack
	Grayson	Lofgren
	Green, Al	Long

Lowenthal	Paulsen	Sherman
Lowe	Pearce	Shimkus
Lucas	Pelosi	Shuster
Luetkemeyer	Perlmutter	Simpson
Lujan Grisham	Perry	Sinema
(NM)	Peters (CA)	Smith (MO)
Luján, Ben Ray	Peters (MI)	Smith (NE)
(NM)	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Lummis	Petri	Smith (TX)
Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Maffei	Pittenger	Southerland
Maloney,	Pitts	Speier
Carolyn	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Maloney, Sean	Polis	Stivers
Marchant	Pompeo	Stockman
Marino	Posey	Stutzman
Massie	Price (GA)	Swalwell (CA)
Matheson	Price (NC)	Takano
Matsui	Quigley	Terry
McAllister	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (CA)	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Reed	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Reichert	Thornberry
McClintock	Renacci	Tiberi
McCollum	Ribble	Tierney
McGovern	Rice (SC)	Tipton
McHenry	Richmond	Titus
McIntyre	Rigell	Tonko
McKeon	Roby	Tsongas
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Turner
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
McNerney	Rogers (MI)	Vargas
Meadows	Rohrabacher	Veasey
Meehan	Rokita	Vela
Meeks	Rooney	Visclosky
Meng	Ros-Lehtinen	Wagner
Messer	Roskam	Walberg
Mica	Ross	Walden
Michaud	Rothfus	Walorski
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Walz
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wasserman
Moore	Ruiz	Schultz
Mullin	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Mulvaney	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Wenstrup
Napolitano	Salmon	Westmoreland
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
Negrete McLeod	Sanford	Williams
Nengebauer	Scalise	Wilson (FL)
Noem	Schiff	Wilson (SC)
Nolan	Schneider	Wittman
Nugent	Schock	Wolf
Nunes	Schrader	Womack
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Woodall
O'Rourke	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Olson	Scott, David	Yoder
Owens	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Palazzo	Sessions	Young (AK)
Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Young (IN)
Pascrell	Shea-Porter	

NAYS—33

Becerra	Hoyer	Sánchez, Linda
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Dingell	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Miller, George	Serrano
Ellison	Moran	Sires
Fudge	Nadler	Van Hollen
Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Hanabusa	Payne	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Pocan	Waxman
Holt		

NOT VOTING—8

Bass	Lankford	Schwartz
Huelskamp	Miller, Gary	Slaughter
Kingston	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1808

Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1189

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1189, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4286

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4286.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to House Resolution 590 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4435.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1811

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113-455 pursuant to House Resolution 585 offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 590, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113-460 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 590.

Each further amendment printed in part A of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report,

may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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, insert the following:

SEC. 318. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT CERTAIN CLIMATE CHANGE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to implement the U.S. Global Change Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from spending money on climate change policies forced upon them by the Obama administration.

We shouldn't be diverting our financial resources away from the primary missions of our military and our national security in pursuit of an ideology.

For example, earlier this year, the President diverted crucial funding on rural sewer and water line grants to promote his climate change initiatives.

□ 1815

Let's make it clear. I acknowledge that climate change is occurring. The climate has always been changing. The question is whether or not, given the global unrest from these rogue nations and our war on terrorism, whether we

should be diverting our funds to support an ideology instead of maximizing our investments in national security.

Now, climate change alarmists contend that man-made CO₂ is the cause of climate change. Most people may not realize that 96 percent of all the CO₂ emissions occur naturally, and America's CO₂ emissions' contribution to the global community is actually less than 1 percent, Mr. Chairman. But even with these facts, decarbonizing America's economy is still a long-term goal of the climate alarmists. But to what end?

If America totally stopped burning coal—I mean this, Mr. Chairman. If every coal-fired powerhouse, factory, school, institution, if every institution in America stopped burning coal today, we would reduce the emissions of CO₂ in the globe around the world by 0.2 percent. Think about that, Mr. Chair, 0.2 percent. Within 5 years, the rest of the world's CO₂ emissions would make up the difference while our entire economy would have been turned upside down. We would have gained nothing in America at considerable cost to our country's economy.

Yesterday, Secretary of State John Kerry was quoted saying: "If we make the necessary efforts to address climate change, and supposing we are wrong, what's the worst that can happen?"

"What's the worst that can happen?" What about spending trillions of dollars, the loss of millions of jobs, more expensive electric bills, and making our economy less competitive?

People like this talk about these issues as if there is no downside or cost to what they are advocating. Mr. Chairman, you and I know that is not the case.

Germany is switching back to coal-fired power, and China and India are building coal-fired power plants every week. America is the only industrialized nation discouraging the use of coal and other fossil fuels.

Leadership expert John Maxwell once said: "He who thinks he leads but has no followers is only taking a walk."

The President should look around. He is alone on this issue. We shouldn't be putting our funds for the military and our defense at risk by diverting funds for an ideologically motivated agenda.

If this administration truly wishes to address the problem of CO₂ emissions, they should help the rest of the world tackle the deforestation of our tropical rain forests.

Al Gore and the Sierra Club acknowledge that deforestation in Africa and the Amazon is five to six times more of a polluter than the combination of every coal-fired powerhouse in America—five to six times worse. These tropical forests are being destroyed because developing nations don't have access to affordable electricity for heating and cooking and clean water.

Unfortunately, the debate on this issue has turned to name-calling. One of my colleagues today has called those of us who disagree with the President

over this issue "irresponsible," "Republican science deniers," and "members of the Flat Earth Society." Al Gore called people who question climate change policies "immoral, unethical, and despicable."

Mr. Chairman, you and I are old enough to know that bullying and name-calling are just childish tactics and don't have a place in this debate. Let's stop the name-calling. It is time for an adult conversation.

We should not sacrifice our economy and our national security by diverting funds in pursuit of an ideological crusade. This is not the time to divert our financial resources from our military for climate change purposes when we are confronting Syria, Iran, Russia, Libya, and other rogue nations around the world. In addition, we have Boko Haram, Hamas, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups promoting instability and threatening liberty and freedom around the world.

Consequently, this amendment will ensure we maximize our military might without diverting funds for a politically motivated agenda. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the McKinley amendment provides that the Department of Defense may not make decisions based on science. Imagine, the Department of Defense should not make decisions based on science. They should ignore that there may be a cost from climate change. This amendment waves a magic wand and decrees that climate change imposes no costs at all. Therefore, they would block the Defense Department from recognizing the damage caused by climate change.

This is incredible, because the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review called climate change "an accelerant of instability or conflict" that "could have significant geopolitical impacts around the world, contributing to poverty, environmental degradation, and the further weakening of fragile governments." But the McKinley amendment tells the DOD to ignore these impacts.

Numerous national security experts with unimpeachable credentials—Democrats and Republicans alike—have warned that climate change threatens our national security. Just this month, a panel of retired three- and four-star generals and admirals released a report calling for action to address this problem.

It will be too late for action when they see some of their facilities being overwhelmed by the increase in rising seas or by storms that may destroy some of our defense installations. But according to this amendment, they

can't look at that. They can't make decisions based on the science that may come from these governmental and other scientific agencies.

Well, I think that is science denial at its worst to say that the Defense Department cannot recognize damage caused by climate change. It looks like it is trying to overturn the laws of nature.

So we would tie the hands of the Defense Department and tell them that even though we might have exacerbated heat waves, droughts, wildfires, floods, water- and vector-borne diseases, diseases which will pose greater risk to human health and lives around the world, and wheat and corn yields are already experiencing the negative impact and we have a larger risk of food security globally and regionally, if scientists tell us that, we are not allowed to have our Defense Department pay any heed to it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to call anybody names, but I think this is a seriously flawed amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

And I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Catholic Church is still trying to live down condemning Galileo for suggesting that the Sun, instead of the Earth, was the center of the universe. But fortunately, our military and our President is on the right side of history and science.

Our military is listening to the facts and acting on the fact of climate change by ensuring that its assets are capable of withstanding more frequent and severe weather conditions, building resiliency in their command and control structures, planning military response contingencies that recognize the effects climate change is having on people, countries, and organizations around the world that may wish us harm. That is what this amendment would prevent the military from doing, because they are now reacting to the facts from these studies.

Climate change is a national security concern. It is a new form of stress on military readiness. The Navy, for example, just last week identified 128 naval installations that are going to be underwater in the near future if we don't take steps now to deal with it. It is a catalyst for instability and conflict around the world.

As my friend from California mentioned, the military's Quadrennial Defense Review states that "the pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world."

The results will be a higher demand for American troops abroad, even as we struggle to deal with the devastating impacts caused by flooding and extreme weather events at home. We have volatile regions around the world that are going to be driven to desperation and resort to terrorist activity in

response to the impacts of climate change and the resulting resource competition.

This is what the military is telling us. Climate change's "effects are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad, such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions." It is a catalyst for conflict.

For the sake of our military, for the sake of our national security, we have got to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 2, 3, 5, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 32, 33, 60, 72, 82, 86, 100, 113, and 147 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 3. OFF-INSTALLATION DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATURAL RESOURCES PROJECTS COMPLIANCE WITH INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Section 103A of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c-1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) COMPLIANCE WITH INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—In the case of a cooperative agreement or inter-agency agreement under subsection (a) for the maintenance and improvement of natural resources located off of a military installation or State-owned National Guard installation, funds referred to in subsection (b) may be used only pursuant to an approved integrated natural resources management plan."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

At the end of subtitle B of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 3. RECOMMENDATION ON AIR FORCE ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES.

Congress recommends that the Secretary of the Air Force take action on identified energy conservation measures in a comprehensive and timely manner using an array of available funding mechanisms.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 5. REVISED REGULATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) REVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSTRUCTION 1300.17.—

(1) REVISION REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue a revised instruction to replace Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17.

(2) PURPOSE.—The revision of Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17 shall address the Congressional intent and content of section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1727; 10 U.S.C. prec. 1030 note), as amended by section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 759), to ensure that verbal and written expressions of an individual's religious beliefs are protected by the Department of Defense as an essential part of a the free exercise of religion by a member of the Armed Forces.

(b) REVISION OF AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 1-1.—

(1) REVISION REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall issue a revised instruction to replace Air Force Instruction 1-1.

(2) PURPOSE.—The revision of Air Force Instruction 1-1 shall reflect the protections for religious expressions contained in—

(A) section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1727; 10 U.S.C. prec. 1030 note), as amended by section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 759); and

(B) the revised Department of Defense instruction referenced in subsection (a) if revision of that instruction is completed before the revision of Air Force Instruction 1-1.

(3) TERMINATION.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force issues a revised instruction to replace Air Force Instruction 1-1 and such revision is consistent with the purpose specified in paragraph (2), the requirement imposed by paragraph (1) shall no longer apply.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER OF MISSOURI

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

Subtitle H—World War I Memorials

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "World War I Memorial Act of 2014".

SEC. 1092. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MUSEUM AND MEMORIAL IN KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, is hereby designated as the "National World War I Museum and Memorial".

(b) CEREMONIES.—The World War I Centennial Commission (in this subtitle referred to as the "Commission") may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies to recognize the designation of the Liberty Memorial of Kansas City as the National World War I Museum and Memorial.

SEC. 1093. REDESIGNATION OF PERSHING PARK IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS THE NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL AND ENHANCEMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—Pershing Park in the District of Columbia is hereby redesignated as the "National World War I Memorial".

(b) CEREMONIES.—The Commission may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies for the rededication of Pershing Park, as it approaches its 50th anniversary, as the National World War I Memorial and for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work as authorized by subsection (c).

(c) AUTHORITY TO ENHANCE COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may enhance the General Pershing Commemorative Work by constructing on the land designated by subsection (a) as the National World War I Memorial appropriate sculptural and other commemorative elements, including landscaping, to further honor the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I.

(2) GENERAL PERSHING COMMEMORATIVE WORK DEFINED.—The term "General Pershing Commemorative Work" means the memorial to the late John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States, who commanded the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, and to the officers and men under his command, as authorized by Public Law 89-786 (80 Stat. 1377).

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, applies to the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under subsection (c).

(2) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) SITE SELECTION FOR MEMORIAL.—Section 8905 of such title does not apply with respect to the selection of the site for the National World War I Memorial.

(B) CERTAIN CONDITIONS.—Section 8908(b) of such title does not apply to this subtitle.

(e) NO INFRINGEMENT UPON EXISTING MEMORIAL.—The National World War I Memorial may not interfere with or encroach on the District of Columbia War Memorial.

(f) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(1) USE FOR OTHER WORLD WAR I COMMEMORATIVE ACTIVITIES.—If, upon payment of all expenses for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under subsection (c) (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for such purpose, the Commission may use the amount of the balance for other commemorative activities authorized under the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2448).

(2) USE FOR OTHER COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—If the authority for enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work and the authority of the Commission to plan and conduct commemorative activities under the World War I Centennial Commission Act have expired and there remains a balance of funds received for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work, the Commission shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(3) of such title, except that funds in such account may only be obligated subject to appropriation.

(g) AUTHORIZATION TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION AFTER TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—Section 8 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "The Centennial Commission" and inserting "Except as provided in subsection (c), the Centennial Commission"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMPLETION OF NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL.—The Centennial Commission may perform such work as is necessary to complete the rededication of the National World War I Memorial and enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under section 1093 of the

World War I Memorial Act of 2014, subject to section 8903 of title 40, United States Code.”.

SEC. 1094. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT.

(a) **EX OFFICIO AND OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.**—Section 4 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2449) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **EX OFFICIO AND OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.**—

“(1) **POWERS.**—The individuals listed in paragraphs (2) and (3), or their designated representative, shall serve on the Centennial Commission solely to provide advice and information to the members of the Centennial Commission appointed pursuant to subsection (b)(1), and shall not be considered members for purposes of any other provision of this Act.

“(2) **EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.**—The following individuals shall serve as ex officio members:

- “(A) The Archivist of the United States.
- “(B) The Librarian of Congress.
- “(C) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.
- “(D) The Secretary of Education.
- “(E) The Secretary of State.
- “(F) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
- “(G) The Administrator of General Services.

“(3) **OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.**—The following individuals shall serve as other advisory members:

“(A) Four members appointed by the Secretary of Defense in the following manner: One from the Navy, one from the Marine Corps, one from the Army, and one from the Air Force.

“(B) Two members appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security in the following manner: One from the Coast Guard and one from the United States Secret Service.

“(C) Two members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, including one from the National Parks Service.

“(4) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in a member position under paragraph (3) shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.”.

(b) **PAYABLE RATE OF STAFF.**—Section 7(c)(2) of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2451) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “level IV” and inserting “level II”.

(c) **LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.**—

(1) **LIMITATION.**—Section 9 of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2453) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

“No Federal funds may be obligated or expended for the designation, establishment, or enhancement of a memorial or commemorative work by the World War I Centennial Commission.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 7(f) of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2452) is repealed.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The item relating to section 9 in the table of contents of such Act (Public Law 112–272; 126 Stat. 2448) is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 9. Limitation on obligation of Federal funds.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1107. PAY PARITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED AT JOINT BASES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term “joint military installation” means 2 or more military installations reorganized or otherwise associated and operated as a single military installation;

(2) the term “locality” or “pay locality” has the meaning given that term by section 5302(5) of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) the term “locality pay” refers to any amount payable under section 5304 or 5304a of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **PAY PARITY AT JOINT BASES.**—Whenever 2 or more military installations are reorganized or otherwise associated as a single joint military installation, but the constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality, all Department of Defense employees of the respective installations constituting the joint installation (who are otherwise entitled to locality pay) shall receive locality pay at a uniform percentage equal to the percentage which is payable with respect to the locality which includes the constituent installation then receiving the highest locality pay (expressed as a percentage).

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.**—

(1) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall be effective with respect to pay periods beginning on or after such date (not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section) as the Secretary of Defense shall determine in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section shall apply to any joint military installation created as a result of the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission in the 2005 base closure round.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the appropriate place in subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUTURE OF NATO AND ENLARGEMENT INITIATIVES.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—Congress declares that—

(1) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and around the world for over 65 years;

(2) the incorporation of the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Albania, and Croatia has been essential to the success of NATO in this modern era;

(3) these countries have over time added to and strengthened the list of key European allies of the United States;

(4) since joining NATO, these member states have remained committed to the collective defense of the Alliance and have demonstrated their will and ability to contribute to transatlantic solidarity and assume increasingly more responsibility for international peace and security;

(5) since joining the alliance, these NATO members states have contributed to numerous NATO-led peace, security, and stability operations, including participation in the International Security Assistance Force’s (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan;

(6) these NATO member states have become reliable partners and supporters of aspiring members and the United States recognizes their continued efforts to aid in further enlargement initiatives; and

(7) the commitment by these NATO member states to Alliance principles and active participation in Alliance initiatives shows the success of NATO’s Open-Door Policy.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) at the September 2014 NATO Summit in Wales and beyond, the United States should—

(A) continue to work with aspirant countries to prepare such countries for entry into NATO;

(B) seek NATO membership for Montenegro;

(C) continue supporting a Membership Action Plan (MAP) for Georgia;

(D) encourage the leaders of Macedonia and Greece to find a mutually agreeable solution to the name dispute between the two countries;

(E) seek a Dayton II agreement to resolve the constitutional issues of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(F) work with the Republic of Kosovo to prepare the country for entrance into the Partnership for Peace (PIP) program;

(G) take a leading role in working with NATO member states to identify, through consensus, the current and future security threats facing the Alliance; and

(H) take a leading role to work with NATO allies to ensure the alliance maintains the required capabilities, including the gains in interoperability from combat in Afghanistan, necessary to meet the security threats to the Alliance.

(2) NATO member states should review defense spending to ensure sufficient funding is obligated to meet NATO responsibilities; and

(3) the United States should remain committed to maintaining a military presence in Europe as a means of promoting allied interoperability and providing visible assurance to NATO allies in the region.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. . REPORT, DETERMINATION, AND STRATEGY REGARDING THE TERRORISTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ATTACK AGAINST UNITED STATES PERSONNEL IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA, AND OTHER REGIONAL THREATS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) On September 11, 2012, United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya were attacked by an organized group of armed terrorists, killing United States Ambassador Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Glen Doherty, and Tyrone Woods.

(2) On September 14, 2012, President Obama stated that: “We will bring to justice those who took them from us. . .making it clear that justice will come to those who harm Americans.”.

(3) On May 1, 2014, White House spokesman Jay Carney stated that: “I can assure you that the President’s direction is that those who killed four Americans will be pursued by the United States until they are brought to justice. And if anyone doubts that, they should ask. . .friends and family members of Osama bin Laden.”.

(4) In testimony before Congress in October 2013, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, asserted that the President lacks the authority to use military force to find and kill the Benghazi attackers.

(5) Since the Benghazi attacks, the President has not requested authority from Congress to use military force against the Benghazi attackers.

(6) No terrorist responsible for the Benghazi attacks has been brought to justice.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the persons and organizations who carried out the attacks on United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya on September 11 and 12, 2012, pose a continuing threat to the national security of the United States;

(2) the failure to hold any individual responsible for these terrorist attacks is a travesty of justice, and undermines the national security of the United States; and

(3) the uncertainty surrounding the authority of the President to use force against the terrorists responsible for the attack against United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya, undermines the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(c) REPORT AND DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress—

(A) a report that contains—

(i) the identity and location of those persons and organizations that planned, authorized, or committed the attacks against the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya that occurred on September 11 and 12, 2012; and

(ii) a detailed and specific description of all actions that have been taken to kill or capture any of the persons described in clause (i); and

(B) a determination regarding whether the President currently possesses the authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States against all persons and organizations described in subparagraph (A)(i).

(2) FORM.—The report and determination described in this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form to the maximum extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(d) STRATEGY TO COMBAT REGIONAL TERRORIST THREATS.—

(1) TIMING AND CONTENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive strategy to counter the growing threat posed by radical Islamist terrorist groups in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel, which shall include, among other things—

(A) a strategy to bring to justice those persons who planned, authorized, or committed the terrorist attacks against the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya that occurred on September 11 and 12, 2012;

(B) a description of the radical Islamist terrorist groups active in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel, including an assessment of their origins, strategic aims, tactical methods, funding sources, leadership, and relationships with other terrorist groups or state actors;

(C) a description of the key military, diplomatic, intelligence, and public diplomacy resources available to address these growing regional terrorist threats; and

(D) a strategy to maximize the coordination between, and the effectiveness of, United States military, diplomatic, intelligence, and public diplomacy resources to counter these growing regional terrorist threats.

(2) FORM.—The strategy described in this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form to the maximum extent possible, and may contain a classified annex.

(3) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

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

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1793, George Washington said, “The constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.”

(2) In a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1798, James Madison wrote: “The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.”

(3) In 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Resolution which states in section 2: “The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.”

(4) With respect to United States military intervention in Syria, President Obama said, “But having made my decision as Commander-in-Chief based on what I am convinced is our national security interests, I’m also mindful that I’m the President of the world’s oldest constitutional democracy. I’ve long believed that our power is rooted not just in our military might, but in our example as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And that’s why I’ve made a second decision: I will seek authorization for the use of force from the American people’s representatives in Congress.”

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any use of military force.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title XII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1266. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN NIGERIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the jihadist organization Boko Haram;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Nigeria who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic Nigeria; and

(3) calls on the President to support Nigerian and International Community efforts to ensure accountability for crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram against the people of Nigeria, particularly young girls kidnapped from educational institutions by 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 shall submit to Congress a report on crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

(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 to develop its own capacity to deploy specialized police and army units rapidly to bring Boko Haram leader Abubakar Shekau to justice and to prevent and combat sectarian violence in cities and areas in Nigeria where there has been a history of sectarian violence.

(B) A description of violations of internationally recognized human rights and crimes against humanity perpetrated by Boko Haram in Nigeria, including a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such crimes and, where possible, the origins of the weapons.

(C) A description of efforts by the Department of Defense to ensure accountability for violations of internationally recognized human rights and crimes against humanity perpetrated against the people of Nigeria by Boko Haram and al-Qaeda affiliates and other jihadists in Nigeria, including—

(i) a description of initiatives that the United States has undertaken to train Nigerian investigators on how to document, investigate, and develop findings of crimes against humanity; and

(ii) an assessment of the impact of those initiatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. DAINES OF MONTANA

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

SEC. 1636. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR TRIAD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review stated—

(A) “After considering a wide range of possible options for the U.S. strategic nuclear posture, including some that involved eliminating a leg of the Triad, the NPR concluded that for planned reductions under New START, the United States should retain a smaller Triad of SLBMs [submarine launched ballistic missiles], ICBMs [intercontinental ballistic missiles], and heavy bombers. Retaining all three Triad legs will best maintain strategic stability at reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems or vulnerabilities.”;

(B) “ICBMs provide significant advantages to the U.S. nuclear force posture, including extremely secure command and control, high readiness rates, and relatively low operating costs.”;

(C) “a survivable U.S. response force requires continuous at-sea deployments of SSBNs [ballistic missile submarines] in both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, as well as the ability to surge additional submarines in crisis.”; and

(D) nuclear-capable bombers—

(i) “[provide] a rapid and effective hedge against technical challenges with another leg of the Triad, as well as geopolitical uncertainties”; and

(ii) “are important to extended deterrence of potential attacks on U.S. allies and partners.”.

(2) In a letter to the Senate on February 2, 2011, regarding the New START Treaty, President Obama stated that “I intend to modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems: a heavy bomber and air-launched cruise missile, an ICBM, and a nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) and SLBM.”.

(3) In the Resolution Of Advice And Consent To Ratification of the New START Treaty, the Senate stated that “it is the sense of the Senate that United States deterrence and flexibility is assured by a robust

triad of strategic delivery vehicles. To this end, the United States is committed to accomplishing the modernization and replacement of its strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and to ensuring the continued flexibility of United States conventional and nuclear delivery systems.”.

(4) On June 19, 2013, the Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, stated, “First, the U.S. will maintain a ready and credible deterrent. Second, we will retain a triad of bombers, ICBMs, and ballistic missile submarines. Third, we will make sure that our nuclear weapons remain safe, secure, ready and effective.”.

(5) Section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 495 note) states that—

(A) “It is the policy of the United States to modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems”; and

(B) “Congress supports the modernization or replacement of the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems consisting of a heavy bomber and air-launched cruise missile, an intercontinental ballistic missile, and a ballistic missile submarine and submarine launched ballistic missile”.

(6) On March 6, 2014, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that “our recommendation is to remain firmly committed to the triad, the three legs of the nuclear capability, and that any further reduction should be done only through negotiations, not unilaterally, and that we should commit to modernizing the stockpile while we have it.”.

(7) On April 2, 2014, the Commander of United States Strategic Command, Admiral Cecil Haney, testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that “First and foremost, I think it is important that we as a country realize just how important and foundational our strategic deterrent is today for us and well into the future. As you have mentioned, there is a need for modernization in a variety of areas. When you look at the credible strategic deterrent we have today, that includes everything from the indications and warning, to the command and control and communication structure that goes all the way from the President down to the units, and to what frequently we talk about as the triad involving the intercontinental ballistic missiles, the submarines, and the bombers—each providing its unique aspect of deterrence.”.

(8) In the June 2013 Report on Nuclear Employment Strategy of the United States required by section 491 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the President, stated that “the United States will maintain a nuclear Triad, consisting of ICBMs, SLBMs, and nuclear-capable heavy bombers. Retaining all three Triad legs will best maintain strategic stability at reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems or vulnerabilities. These forces should be operated on a day-to-day basis in a manner that maintains strategic stability with Russia and China, deters potential regional adversaries, and assures U.S. Allies and partners.”.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems consisting of—

(A) heavy bombers equipped with nuclear gravity bombs and air-launched nuclear cruise missiles;

(B) land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads

that are capable of carrying multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles; and

(C) ballistic missile submarines equipped with submarine launched ballistic missiles and multiple nuclear warheads.

(2) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace a capability to forward-deploy nuclear weapons and dual-capable fighter-bomber aircraft;

(3) to deter potential adversaries and assure allies and partners of the United States through strong and long-term commitment to the nuclear deterrent of the United States and the personnel, systems, and infrastructure that comprise such deterrent; and

(4) to ensure the members of the Armed Forces that operate the nuclear deterrent of the United States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL OF VIRGINIA

Page 53, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 318. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AT FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION, CHINCOTEAGUE, VIRGINIA.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECT.—Notwithstanding the administrative jurisdiction of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration over the Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia, the Secretary of Defense may undertake an environmental restoration project in a manner consistent with chapter 160 of title 10, United States Code, at the property constituting that facility in order to provide necessary response actions for contamination from a release of a hazardous substance or a pollutant or contaminant that is attributable to the activities of the Department of Defense at the time the property was under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy or used by the Navy pursuant to a permit or license issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the area formerly known as the Naval Air Station Chincoteague, Virginia. Any such project may be undertaken jointly or in conjunction with an environmental restoration project of the Administrator.

(b) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the Administrator may enter into an agreement or agreements to provide for the effective and efficient performance of environmental restoration projects for purposes of subsection (a). Notwithstanding section 2215 of title 10, United States Code, any such agreement may provide for environmental restoration projects conducted jointly or by one agency on behalf of the other or both agencies and for reimbursement of the agency conducting the project by the other agency for that portion of the project for which the reimbursing agency has authority to respond.

(c) SOURCE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS.—Pursuant to section 2703(c) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary may use funds available in the Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, account of the Department of Defense for environmental restoration projects conducted for or by the Secretary under subsection (a) and for reimbursable agreements entered into under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

Page 66, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 342. LIMITATION ON FURLOUGH OF CERTAIN WORKING-CAPITAL FUND EMPLOYEES.

Section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(s) The Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the military department concerned,

as appropriate, may not carry out a non-disciplinary furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5) of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense whose performance is charged to a working-capital fund unless the Secretary—

“(1) determines that failure to furlough the employee will result in a violation of subsection (f); and

“(2) submits to Congress, by not later than 45 days before initiating a furlough, notice of the furlough that includes a certification that, as a result of the proposed furlough, none of the work performed by any employee of the Government will be shifted to any Department of Defense civilian employee, contractor, or member of the Armed Forces.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Add at the end of title V the following new section:

SEC. 5 ____ . AUTHORITY FOR REMOVAL FROM NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF REMAINS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO HAVE NO KNOWN NEXT OF KIN.

(a) REMOVAL AUTHORITY.—Section 1488 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) REMOVAL WHEN NO KNOWN NEXT OF KIN.—(1) The Secretary of the Army may authorize the removal of the remains of a member of the armed forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in an Army National Military Cemetery from the Army National Military Cemetery for transfer to any other cemetery.

“(2) The Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, may authorize the removal of the remains of a member of the armed forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in a cemetery of the National Cemetery System from that cemetery for transfer to any Army National Military Cemetery.

“(3) In this section, the term ‘Army National Military Cemetery’ means a cemetery specified in section 4721(b) of this title.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by inserting before “If a cemetery” the following:

“(a) REMOVAL UPON DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTALLATION CEMETERY.—”;

(2) by striking “his jurisdiction” and inserting “the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned”; and

(3) by inserting before “With respect to” the following:

“(b) REMOVAL FROM TEMPORARY INTERMENT OR ABANDONED GRAVE OR CEMETERY.—”.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the appropriate place in title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7 ____ . RESEARCH REGARDING BREAST CANCER.

In carrying out research, development, test, and evaluation activities with respect to breast cancer, the Secretary of Defense shall implement the recommendations of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee to prioritize prevention and increase the study of chemical and physical factors in breast cancer.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the appropriate place in title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8 ____ . SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (m) of section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m))

is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(7) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women meeting the requirements of paragraph (2)(A) if—

“(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

“(B) the anticipated award price of the contract (including options) will not exceed—

“(i) \$6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

“(C) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.

“(8) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women that meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(E) and is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are substantially underrepresented (as determined by the Administrator) if—

“(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

“(B) the anticipated award price of the contract (including options) will not exceed—

“(i) \$6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

“(C) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.”

(b) REPORTING ON GOALS FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—Clause (viii) of subsection 15(h)(2)(E) of such Act is amended—

(1) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subclause (V) as subclause (VIII); and

(3) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclauses:

“(V) through sole source contracts awarded using the authority under subsection 8(m)(7);

“(VI) through sole source contracts awarded using the authority under section 8(m)(8);

“(VII) by industry for contracts described in subclause (III), (IV), (V), or (VI); and”.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES ACCELERATED.—Paragraph (2) of section 29(o) of such Act is amended by striking “5 years after the date of enactment” and inserting “2 years after the date of enactment”.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title IX, insert the following new section:

SEC. 924. PUBLIC RELEASE BY INSPECTORS GENERAL OF REPORTS OF MISCONDUCT.

(a) RELEASE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Inspector General of the Depart-

ment of Defense shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O-6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who is—

“(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”

(b) RELEASE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE ARMY ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 3020 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Inspector General of the Army shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O-6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who is—

“(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”

(c) RELEASE OF NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 5020 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Naval Inspector General shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O-6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Naval Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’), section

552a of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who is—

“(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”

(d) RELEASE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE ADMINISTRATIVE MISCONDUCT REPORTS.—Section 8020 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Within 60 days after issuing a final report, the Inspector General of the Air Force shall publicly release any reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct, including violations of Federal law and violations of policies of the Department of Defense, of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O-6 or above. In releasing the reports, the Inspector General shall ensure that information that would be protected under section 552 of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’), section 552a of title 5 (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is not disclosed.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who is—

“(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

Section 1075 is amended by adding at the end the following:

(d) UAS TEST RANGE CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this section, the test range program authorized under section 332(c) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note) shall include test ranges selected by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and any additional test range not initially selected by the Administration if such range enters into a partnership or agreement with a selected test range.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title XI, add the following:
SEC. 11 . **RATE OF OVERTIME PAY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY EMPLOYEES PERFORMING WORK ABOARD OR DOCKSIDE IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER FORWARD DEPLOYED IN JAPAN.**

Section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Page 519, line 23, insert “operationally realistic” before “intercept flight test”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL), my friend and colleague, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend from California, Chairman McKEON, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in 1793, George Washington said: "The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure."

In a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1798, James Madison wrote: "The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrate, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the legislature."

That is why it is right for President Obama to announce in the Rose Garden that he would seek congressional authorization before taking any military action against Syria. He said: "I've long believed that our power is rooted not just in our military might, but in our example as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And that's why I've made a second decision: I will seek authorization for the use of force from the American people's representatives in Congress."

It is deeply encouraging tonight, Mr. Chairman, to see such strong bipartisan support for my amendment, which advances the just cause of ensuring that the Obama administration and future administrations adhere to the Constitution and the grave matter of engaging U.S. forces in hostilities.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment includes two provisions that I authored. The first provision ensures that Navy employees, like those in Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, can continue to earn the overtime pay that they deserve when working overseas.

This amendment supports our national security and ensures that we are standing up for our civilian workforce. It allowed nuclear engineers to earn the same amount of money when they work in Japan as they would when they work in the United States.

Without that authorization to pay overtime to the civilian personnel serv-

ing the mission, we will lose the ability to attract and retain qualified and experienced men and women to step up and serve in this capacity. The inclusion of this provision helps ensure our Navy's readiness and fairness to our civilian employees.

□ 1830

I am honored to have worked with Representative FORBES on this provision, but I would also like to thank Chairman ISSA for his cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, this package also includes a provision that is aimed at saving taxpayer money, improving military readiness, and preventing needless delays and cost overruns that could harm our servicemen and -women.

Simply put, working capital fund employees should not be furloughed due to a lack of appropriated funds. They are not dependent on direct appropriations from Congress. As a result, furloughing working capital fund employees would save no money. Furloughing working capital fund employees would delay critical maintenance, drive up costs, and delay the availability of ships, planes, and other necessary tools that are critical to our national defense.

I am honored to have worked with Representative COLE on this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues' support for this package and the underlying bill.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), my friend and colleague and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, religious freedom and defending freedom should not be mutually exclusive. America was founded on religious liberty, and it is part of what makes our country so great. The men and women in uniform who have volunteered to keep our country safe and to protect our Constitution should not see their own liberties violated.

My amendment ensures that all servicemembers—no matter their religion or rank or leadership—are afforded their constitutional right to free exercise of religion.

One of the driving factors behind recent violations of religious freedom in the military is simply bad rules. My amendment requires the Pentagon to rewrite their rules on free exercise of religion, both for the whole Department of Defense, and particularly for the Air Force.

I would like to thank Chairman McKEON for supporting this amendment, as well as Mr. FORBES and Mr. FLEMING, who are cosponsors.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, before you is a picture, a contemporary picture of the World War I monument in Kansas City, Missouri, the tallest and most majestic of the World War I monuments. Today, we are here in an unprecedented show of bipartisanship

on this amendment, the World War I Memorial Act. This is the product of both sides of the aisle working together to do what is right to honor the memory of veterans who served long ago.

I especially want to thank Congressman TED POE, Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the National Park Service, and the entire Missouri delegation for their work on this amendment.

As you know, this summer marks the 100th anniversary of the start of World War I. The United States formally joined the war in April of 1917. During that time, more than 4.7 million Americans served, and of those brave men and women, more than 116,000 soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice. It is our job as Members of Congress to honor their memory and show our appreciation to the veterans of that Great War.

This amendment would honor that service by redesignating Pershing Park here in Washington, D.C., as the National World War I Memorial and will designate the Liberty Memorial as America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. I want to thank you, Chairman McKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, and the Armed Services Committee staff for your fine efforts in bringing this important measure to the floor for our military.

I also want to take a moment, and this opportunity, to highlight the importance of modeling and simulation and the role it plays in maintaining our military readiness while being, of course, most cost effective.

Last year, in fact, in the National Defense Authorization Act, we put in language, report language, that highlighted modeling and simulation as a cost-effective tool in maintaining a high level of readiness for our military. In response, our armed services have followed suit in utilizing modeling and simulation effectively and continue to do so in current and future programs.

While that report language does not appear in this bill, it is important that our military continue utilizing this most cost-effective tool for manpower training.

As our Nation faces future threats, it is also critical that we are able to meet those threats with a force that is more capable and more ready for the challenge. Modeling and simulation enables our Nation's fighting men and women to do so, while decreasing costs during a time of budget uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I would just like to ask that you join me in support of utilizing this vital tool that saves taxpayer dollars and assists our Nation's heroes in training for our defense.

Mr. McKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. I want to assure my good friend from Florida that I look forward to working with you to ensure that modeling and simulation remains an essential part in maintaining our military readiness.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. SMITH, and staff. I look forward to working with the committee and you and others ensuring that modeling and simulation remains being utilized as a cost-effective tool for our military readiness.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you to the ranking member and to Chairman McKEON for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to highlight three amendments that have been accepted en bloc. One is the public release of substantiated reports of misconduct. These reports that show substantiated misconduct by the highest-ranking officials in the Department of Defense are only released when there is a leak or there are tips to reporters. It is incumbent upon us to make sure that the public knows when the Department's highest level officials commit misconduct and shouldn't depend on leaks for accountability.

The second amendment is a significant amendment for women-owned businesses in this country. For 20 years now, we have set a governmentwide goal of 5 percent. For 20 years, we have not met that 5 percent. This particular amendment takes away the extra obstacle that is imposed on women-owned businesses and not on others when sole-source contracting is provided.

The third amendment provides for breast cancer research. The Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee has recommended prioritizing prevention and intensifying the study of chemical and physical factors. This amendment urges that implementation.

A 2009 study at Walter Reed Medical Center found that breast cancer rates among military women are significantly higher—in fact, 20 to 40 percent higher—than they are in women in similar age groups. This is also a problem at Camp Lejeune, where we found that 85 men also were impacted by breast cancer because of contaminated drinking water.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time as well.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman McKEON for allowing me to come before you today to speak on the necessity of preserving Pope Airfield's 440th Airlift Wing.

I introduced this amendment because of the incredible support the 440th Airlift Wing provides to our military and the necessity of its mission in main-

taining readiness. The Department of Defense repeatedly says that they need flexibility, certainty, and time to complete their missions and maintain readiness. The 440th provides all of these, yet the Pentagon is attempting to deactivate the very unit that provides these three crucial elements.

Fort Bragg is home to the airborne and special operation forces. The proposal to remove every C-130 from this base contradicts its important mission. And even our President, Mr. Chairman, noted that we will be shifting more of our focus to special operations.

I thank the chairman for his continued support to address this ongoing issue and look forward to working with the committee to address this very important issue.

Mr. McKEON. I thank the gentlelady for her passionate and well articulated arguments supporting the 440th Airlift Wing which provides airlift to our Nation's paratroopers, including the storied 82nd Airborne. The 1,200 men and women who comprise the 440th Airlift Wing do an incredible job each and every day providing the airlift necessary to do their complex and challenging missions.

This provision highlights the difficulty we face as the top line budget has decreased and sequestration remains the law of the land.

We have been forced to make choices as we consider the defense bill that were far from ideal, but attempted to balance competing interests and minimize risk to the greatest extent possible.

That being said, the budget simply doesn't provide sufficient funding to meet the requirements identified in our Nation's defense strategy. I will continue to work with Representative ELLMERS and others to preserve assets like the 440th Airlift Wing, and most critically, on the true cost of our problem, sequestration.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) to talk about her very important amendment dealing with Boko Haram, as we all know, a significant problem that needs to be addressed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank both the distinguished ranking member and the distinguished chairman for their courtesies and as well my fellow cosponsors of this amendment, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from California and Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON from Florida.

This is a crisis. A couple of weeks ago, as you well know, across America we were stating these words, to find the girls, bring the girls back, #bringthegirlsback. Now we come some weeks later and we recognize that Boko Haram has to be a priority for the world.

This amendment causes this issue to be a priority listed in the Defense Department to determine the extent of

the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria. But as you can see, this is a larger issue, and now we face the idea of where these girls might be. So, in essence, this amendment expands the opportunity for the United States to work with clean battalions and Rangers that we know are established in Nigeria but also other resources around to rescue the girls but to also deal with the emerging terrorism of Boko Haram.

This is a crucial issue. And if anyone knows many of the stories, one that I know of is where a little girl was placed between two dead bodies.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. A little girl that I met today tells her story all the way from Nigeria, where her father was killed refusing to deny his faith, the brother was killed because they thought he might become a pastor, and the little girl was placed between the two bodies.

The killing is going on, 300, 118—this amendment will focus our Nation and allow and continue the resources to collaborate with Nigeria and these other nations to bring the girls back to their families.

It is a crisis. It is a crisis for the United States as it is for this entire region because Boko Haram is a terrorist group, and they must be brought to justice. The girls must be found. My amendment establishes that priority today, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

I thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their work on this bill and their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces.

I also thank them for including in En Bloc Amendment No. 1 the Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee Amendment, which makes three important contributions to the bill:

1. First, it strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the kidnapping of the more than 200 young schoolgirls kidnapped from the Chibok School by Boko Haram;

2. Second, it expresses support for the people of Nigeria who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic Nigeria; and

3. Third, it requires that not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment, the Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress on the nature and extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

This is about religious oppression and killing innocent women, men and children.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram. Boko Haram kills because of religion and holds little girls as slaves.

The victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers. And schoolchildren.

I am confident that the international community working with the African Union will assist

the Government of Nigeria in bringing and end to Boko Haram's reign of terror and ensuring that its crimes against humanity are documented so its leaders can be held accountable.

The Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee Amendment affirms that the United States stands with the civilized world in solidarity with the people of Nigeria.

The Jackson Lee-Wilson-Lee Amendment affirms that the United States is fully committed to the fundamental principle that women everywhere have a right to be free, to live without fear, and should not be forced to risk their lives to get the education they want and deserve.

The violent modern day slavery and killing must end.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for including this amendment in En Bloc Amendment #1 and all Members to support it.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, May 8, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,

The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to commend your decision to deploy American security experts and equipment in Nigeria to help locate and rescue the more than 200 Nigerian schoolgirls kidnapped by the terrorist group, Boko Haram. We support your action and we strongly urge you to work in concert with the Government of Nigeria and the African Union to achieve this objective and to bring Abubakar Shekau and other leaders of Boko Haram to justice.

Boko Haram, a militant group designated by the State Department in November 2013 as a Foreign Terrorist Organization, has been conducting a reign of terror against innocent Nigerian women, children, and men since 2009, when it killed hundreds of persons during a raid of a police station in Maiduguri. In the last four years, Boko Haram has carried out more than 480 violent attacks against a broad array of targets: Christian and Muslim communities, government installations, schools, hospitals and medical facilities, aid workers and journalists. Since the beginning of 2013, more than 4,400 innocent persons have been killed and thousands more left homeless.

According to media reports, the leader of Boko Haram has threatened to ransom or sell the girls into the human trafficking market for about twelve dollars each (\$12.00 USD). This outrageous conduct cannot be tolerated or overlooked. Not only is it a violation of the girls' human rights, it is also contrary to United States policy supporting and promoting equal access to education and economic opportunity for women and girls.

We know that terrorist groups cannot operate effectively without reliable and steady funding to support its criminal acts. Therefore, we urge you to work with the international community to detect, disrupt, and dismantle the funding networks financing Boko Haram, which published reports indicate has received as much as \$70 million from other Islamist groups, including Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), the Al Muntada Trust Fund, and the Islamic World Society.

Additionally, we urge you to consider working with the Government of Nigeria to develop its own capacity to deploy specialized police and army units rapidly to rescue the schoolgirls and bring Boko Haram leader Abubakar Shekau to justice. Such units also can be deployed to prevent and combat sectarian violence in cities and around the country where there has been a history of

sectarian violence. The creation of an elite highly-trained rapid response unit would appear to be a sound short-term strategy that the Government of Nigeria should employ in dealing with violent groups like Boko Haram. This approach was used to successful effect by the Indonesia Government in 2004 to neutralize the Laskar Jihad terrorist organization.

Finally, we call upon you to take appropriate action to help the Government of Nigeria establish a Victim's Fund to provide humanitarian relief and economic assistance to the victims of attacks by Boko Haram so that they can rebuild their lives and communities.

"People are the great issue of the 20th century," declared, then-Senator Hubert Humphrey in 1948. The well-being of people remains the great issue of the 21st century. And there is no better measure of any society than the way its treats its women and girls. Boko Haram understands that when Nigerian girls are educated, Nigerian women can succeed; and when Nigerian women succeed, Nigeria succeeds. And that is why it is so important that the United States help Nigeria ensure that Boko Haram fails.

Thank you for your leadership and your consideration of our recommendations. We stand ready to work with you to bring about the safe rescue of the kidnapped Nigerian schoolgirls and to reunite them with their families and loved ones.

Sincerely,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

Marcia L. Fudge, Karen E. Bass, Donald Payne, Jr., John Lewis, Yvette D. Clarke, Robin Kelly, Janice Hahn, Sheila Jackson Lee, Terri A. Sewell, Corrine Brown, Frederica Wilson, Gregory W. Meeks, Barbara Lee, Marc Veasey, Members of Congress.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), my friend and colleague.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, "If America is going to approach adversaries with a dove of peace in one hand, we must have a sword in the other."

That is what President Reagan wrote when he used U.S. military strength to hasten the demise of the Soviet Union.

The nuclear triad is our country's most lethal sword. It makes the world safer by deterring our rivals and reassuring our allies.

The commander coin of Montana's Malmstrom Air Force Base expresses why nuclear deterrence works. It says:

Scaring the hell out of America's enemies since 1962.

My amendment reaffirms support for the nuclear triad, the airmen, and the sailors who work this mission because there is no greater asset for peace than an unrivaled U.S. military.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including such an important amendment from Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Congresswoman WILSON, and myself. I want to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for her relentless effort—her relentless effort—to make sure that we put the United States on record expressing very strong support for the people of Nigeria, espe-

cially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram, and also in condemning these despicable—mind you, despicable—crimes against humanity in the strongest way.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram, and we join with the international community in saying bring our girls back.

Earlier this month, Congresswomen JACKSON LEE and WILSON, along with Congressman HONDA, I, and 150 Members—bipartisan, both sides of the aisle—wrote a letter calling for the United States to work with the U.N., the African Union, and the Government of Nigeria to find these girls and bring the perpetrators to justice.

This amendment would give Congress a clear understanding of the nature and extent of the crimes committed by this terrorist organization and help us bring an end to Boko Haram's reign of terror.

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

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

□ 1845

Ms. LEE of California. Let me conclude by saying that the girls should be able to pursue their education and live free from the threats of slavery, kidnapping, and violence. This resolution, in no uncertain terms, says enough is enough.

So thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE and Congresswoman WILSON, for making sure that, once again, we come together in a bipartisan way to insist that this terrorist organization is brought to justice and insist that we do everything we can do to bring our girls home.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I encourage our colleagues to support the amendments en bloc.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR.

WESTMORELAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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 341 of subtitle E of title III of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to ensure that the C-17 aircraft stays in flight and provides our troops with the same reliability it has provided for the last 20 years.

Tonight, I join my friend, Mr. COURTNEY from Connecticut, in offering this amendment. We want to ensure that this program is sustained and will continue in the best possible way, and right now, I seek a colloquy with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, the F-117 engine has a history of successful performance through a performance-based contract, and I believe that it is important that we keep these successful tenets available as we move forward in the next phase of a sustainment contract.

While I support cost visibility in this performance-based contract, I believe it is important that we do no harm to the success of the program.

Mr. McKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern. We agree that we must ensure the successful sustainment of this critical engine.

I look forward to working with the gentleman as we move forward to conference with the Senate on this bill to ensure that we achieve both improved visibility and cost-efficiency for the government, as well as keeping a successful model for engine sustainment.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the chairman for that.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Westmoreland amendment to the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. It strikes section 341 which would negatively impact the venerable and highly effective F117 engine that powers the Air Force workhorse personnel and cargo transport, the C-17 aircraft. The existing language requires disclosure of proprietary information which would hamper contract negotiations, having the potential of posing a detrimental impact to the readiness of the fleet.

Today, F117 engines are sustained through an award-winning performance-based logistics contract that minimizes life cycle costs with fixed fees based on flight cycles. This contract type requires comprehensive understanding and investment by the service provider along with the engineering design expertise to develop and implement improvements in response to actual mission experience. It is vital that we use every practical means of providing for the defense of this country and the protection of our warfighters, including the appropriate

use of competition and any other contracting method.

In fact, the Air Force has already taken steps to ensure these outcomes are achieved on the C-17 sustainment contract. Just last year, the Air Force held an open and transparent bidding process for the F117 and there was only one bidder. Under the current structure, the F117 service provider is incentivized to reduce total maintenance cost by improving reliability, increasing time on wing, and controlling shop visit cost. All of these factors have been good for the Air Force by minimizing operational disruption and reducing maintenance crew requirements and logistics infrastructure.

Section 341 of this bill jeopardizes the efficiencies and success the F117 performance-based logistics contract has achieved. This language could be interpreted as requiring the Air Force to significantly change contract structure for maintenance instead of requesting a robust price reasonableness assessment as is already required by procurement regulations. Changes in the F117 maintenance structure could be less effective in supporting the C-17 and may result in higher sustainment costs and lower readiness. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chair, I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. SHIMKUS. 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:

Page 370, after line 23, insert the following:
SEC. 1082. NTIA RETENTION OF DNS RESPONSIBILITIES PENDING GAO REPORT.

(a) **RETENTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Until the Comptroller General of the United States submits the report required by subsection (b), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information may not relinquish or agree to any proposal relating to the relinquishment of the responsibility of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (in this section referred to as the “NTIA”) over Internet domain name system functions, including responsibility with respect to the authoritative root zone file, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions, and related root zone management functions.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the NTIA receives a proposal relating to the relinquishment of the responsibility of the NTIA over Internet domain name system functions that was developed in a process convened by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers at the request of the NTIA, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to the Internet domain name system. Such report shall include—

(1) a discussion and analysis of—

(A) the advantages and disadvantages of relinquishment of the responsibility of the NTIA over Internet domain name system functions, including responsibility with respect to the authoritative root zone file, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions, and related root zone management functions;

(B) any principles or criteria that the NTIA sets for proposals for such relinquishment;

(C) each proposal received by the NTIA for such relinquishment;

(D) the processes used by the NTIA and any other Federal agencies for evaluating such proposals; and

(E) any national security concerns raised by such relinquishment; and

(2) a definition of the term “multistakeholder model”, as used by the NTIA with respect to Internet policymaking and governance, and definitions of any other terms necessary to understand the matters covered by the report.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, for over two decades, U.S. oversight of the Internet's domain name system has kept the global Internet free and open.

Though dismissed by NTIA as merely a clerical role of assigning and matching domain names with IP addresses, U.S. stewardship of these basic functions has prevented authoritarian governments from censoring content or restricting access to Web sites beyond their borders.

That all could change, Mr. Chairman, if the administration's announced intention to relinquish our oversight role to an undefined multistakeholder community is not carefully considered.

This isn't a hypothetical concern. Russia and China have already tried to put domain name authority in the hands of the United Nations' International Telecommunication Union, the ITU; and while the administration says it won't accept a proposal that puts the Internet in the hands of another government or government-led entity, there is no guarantee that won't happen after the initial transfers takes place. One thing is for sure: once our authority is gone, it is gone for good.

Now, some of my friends across the aisle will tell you, in a few minutes, that this Chamber voted in support of a transition to a multistakeholder model in the past. I voted for that resolution because I didn't—and I still don't—have an objection to the concept of a multistakeholder Internet governance, but that structure must be insulated from government influence.

We know bad actors will certainly try to interfere with whatever overseer takes our place, so that is why I am offering this trust but verify amendment today.

My amendment will simply require the GAO to review the proposals NTIA receives to replace our oversight. What

is the harm, Mr. Chairman, in taking this slow, deliberate process and making sure that we get this right? I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlelady from Tennessee for allowing me to help write this important amendment.

The President's unilateral handoff of key Internet functions to a multistakeholder community, without the consent of Congress, lacks a clear plan for how and what that community would look like and what authority it would have.

Now, we can debate later about whether Congress would actually ever give such consent, but for now, we are offering this amendment because Americans deserve to know that due diligence has occurred and that a clear plan exists for such matters.

America has proven, throughout history, that we are the vanguards of freedom, and we have an obligation to protect the Internet. The Internet is an unsurpassed vehicle for the free exchange of ideas; but it is more than just freedom. It is also about American interests.

The Internet is the single greatest economic machine created in the last 50 years—and perhaps ever—and its full potential is yet to be realized. America's role in its success is a shining example of our American exceptionalism.

It is not in our national interest to relinquish control of such a resource, especially without a clear path that will protect Internet freedom and American interests, but against the interest of individuals in the world who can't appreciate such freedom and the blessing, really, that this technology is.

So pass this amendment, I urge my colleagues, so we can give this issue the due diligence it deserves. The self-professed "most transparent administration ever" should want nothing less when it comes to this important issue.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Shimkus amendment. The amendment is identical to H.R. 4342, the DOTCOM Act of 2014. It would arbitrarily delay the transition of the United States' role in the management of the global Internet domain name system to the multistakeholder community.

It really does represent a very drastic departure from the support Members of this body have expressed for the multistakeholder model of Internet governance. In fact, despite the House of Representatives already voting unanimously three times in the past 2 years calling on the Obama administration to commit to a global Internet free

from government control, the Shimkus amendment sends the exact opposite message by raising doubts about the strength and credibility of the multistakeholder approach.

NTIA's recent transition announcement will complete our 16-year-long effort to move management of the domain name system away from governments and into the private sector.

This objective has been the linchpin of U.S. policy, bipartisan through the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administrations, and the entire rationale for having ICANN, a private U.S.-based nonprofit organization created in 1998 to assume key responsibilities for Internet functions on behalf of the Internet's multistakeholder community.

Some of my colleagues raise the specter of Russia or China taking over the Internet as a reason for supporting this amendment. These threats against Internet openness are real, but claiming this amendment does anything to address them is false.

In fact, by creating an artificial delay in the implementation of the consensus transition plan produced by ICANN, the Shimkus amendment suggests governmental meddling in the multistakeholder process is entirely appropriate.

The reverse is true. Authoritarian regimes are already using the U.S. Government's stewardship of technical Internet functions as evidence for a need to move these functions to another governmental or intergovernmental entity like the United Nations.

This amendment further plays into the hands of these antidemocratic nations by emboldening their efforts to seize control of the Internet.

So I would say to my colleagues to support this amendment or the DOTCOM Act, they either show a lack of understanding of what our government's role actually is or a lack of confidence in the multistakeholder model and its ability to resist governmental control. Both serve to weaken our role in the global stage, not strengthen it.

The best defense we have against a governmental takeover of the domain system is to empower our allies in the multistakeholder community. Our diplomats, who have fought hard to preserve an Internet free from governmental control in global forums, tell us that having this transition is a critical continuation of our efforts to build upon the success of the multistakeholder model.

Now is the time to continue our unwavering support of that model. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the Shimkus amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say, as I try to wait for a few more colleagues, I would ask my colleague to define multistakeholder. They can't. The Internet community says it is us. The international community, the Russias and the Chinas say it is us.

So all we are asking is for a Government Accountability Office, the IG, nonpartisan, to whatever the agreement comes from NTIA, to say look at it. Do some due diligence. Make sure that this is in our national interest.

This is the most curious debate I have ever seen. Go slow. ICANN and NTIA say they want to go slow. What is the harm of having additional eyes on this process?

So the real debate is define multistakeholder. No one can do that because they don't know what that is. The Internet community says it is us, and we are going to have control, and all our net folks are going to drive this, and it is going to be okay. While our friends—or not friends—Vladimir Putin and China say: this is a way in.

I would rather make sure that, when we relinquish this, we know what the agreement actually is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

You know, we are pretty proud of the Internet. We want to keep it free and nongovernmental control. Multistakeholder basically means all of the stakeholders who have a stake in the Internet are going to be at the table having a discussion about how we are going to resolve this situation.

There is an apprehension that I don't think is well-founded that is reflected in this amendment. It is really, essentially, about delaying the process of these ongoing negotiations that have to occur in a very complicated global system which is called the Internet.

So the House has voted on this three times before. It has indicated its support through the Clinton, the Bush, and the Obama administrations. Every one of those Presidents, I think, shares the concern that every one of us in this House have about maintaining a free and open Internet. We have got to get on with the job.

Our view is that the Shimkus amendment would create confusion and delay and impede our ability to get to an end result that will make the Internet more secure, more free, and more open.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, the Shimkus amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to look at this agreement, to make sure it is in our national interest.

The Shimkus amendment would ask the Government Accountability Office to look at this agreement to ensure that it is in our national interest. That is what this amendment does.

The world has significantly changed since our vote of last year, and for anyone to say it has not is not reading the paper. You have got Russia, you have got China, you have got Iran, you have got Turkey—all meddling and trying to usurp and get involved in the World Wide Web. We should not relinquish this unless it is in our national interest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

□ 1900

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1032 and 1033 and insert the following:

SEC. 1032. GUANTANAMO BAY DETENTION FACILITY CLOSURE ACT OF 2014.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility Closure Act of 2014”.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to—

(1) construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment; and

(2) transfer, or assist in the transfer, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of any individual detained at Guantanamo;

(c) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days before transferring any individual detained at Guantanamo to the United States, its territories, or possessions, the President shall submit to Congress a report about such individual that includes—

(1) notice of the proposed transfer; and

(2) the assessment of the Secretary of Defense and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) of any risks to public safety that could arise in connection with the proposed transfer of the individual and a description of any steps taken to address such risks.

(d) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used after December 31, 2016, for the detention facility or detention operations at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(e) **PERIODIC REVIEW BOARDS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each periodic review board established pursuant to Executive Order No. 13567 or section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1564; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is completed by not

later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) **PRESIDENTIAL PLAN.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan describing each of the following:

(1) The locations to which the President seeks to transfer individuals detained at Guantanamo who have been identified for continued detention or prosecution.

(2) The individuals detained at Guantanamo whom the President seeks to transfer to overseas locations, the overseas locations to which the President seeks to transfer such individuals, and the conditions under which the President would transfer such individuals to such locations.

(3) The proposal of the President for the detention and treatment of individuals captured overseas in the future who are suspected of being terrorists.

(4) The proposal of the President regarding the disposition of the individuals detained at the detention facility at Parwan, Afghanistan, who have been identified as enduring security threats to the United States.

(5) For any location in the United States to which the President seeks to transfer such an individual or an individual detained at Guantanamo, estimates of each of the following costs:

(A) The costs of constructing infrastructure to support detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(B) The costs of facility repair, sustainment, maintenance, and operation of all infrastructure supporting detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(C) The costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the detention operations or prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies or State or local governments.

(D) Any other costs associated with supporting the detention operations or prosecution at such location.

(6) The estimated security costs associated with trying such individuals in courts established under Article III of the Constitution or in military commissions conducted in the United States, including the costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies, or State or local governments.

(7) A plan developed by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the heads of other relevant departments and agencies, identifying a disposition, other than continued detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for each individual detained at Guantanamo as of the date of the enactment of this Act, who is designated for continued detention or prosecution. Such a disposition may include transfer to the United States for trial or detention pursuant to the law of war, transfer to a foreign country, or release.

(g) **INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.**—In this section, the term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(h) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **REDUCTION.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4601 for military construction, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, for a high value detainee facility at Guantanamo Bay is hereby reduced by \$69,000,000.

(2) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4601 for military construction, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, for planning and design for the Missile Defense Agency is hereby increased by \$20,000,000.

(3) **REDUCTION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount specified in section 4601 for General Reductions, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by \$49,000,000.

(4) **REDUCTION IN AMOUNT FOR GUANTANAMO BAY.**—In the item relating to Guantanamo Bay in the table in section 2101(b), strike “\$92,800,000” and insert “\$23,800,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, this is the amendment that will enable us to eventually close the Guantanamo Bay prison. There are several compelling reasons to do this.

First of all, we have reached a point where we are now spending \$2.7 million per inmate at Guantanamo Bay. To contrast that, an inmate at a supermax Federal prison facility here in the U.S. costs roughly \$78,000 a year. This is only going to become more expensive as the temporary facility at Guantanamo Bay is forced to last longer and longer. So the cost alone is reason, I believe, to close it.

Also, we have the larger issue. President George W. Bush wanted to close Guantanamo Bay, as did Secretary Gates, as did Senator MCCAIN. Many very conservative Republicans came out in favor of closing Guantanamo back in 2008. Why? Because the military told them that it was harming our ability to effectively fight al Qaeda and affiliated forces, that the presence of Guantanamo Bay was recognized as an international eyesore that undermined U.S. credibility with our allies abroad as we tried to prosecute that fight. There is no need for Guantanamo. So argument number one is all of the problems with it.

Argument number two is that there is no need for it, because what we could do would be—154 inmates who are in Guantanamo Bay, first of all, some number of them, I think it is roughly half, have been deemed not to be a threat to the United States. We just don't have anyplace to send them. So we can do foreign transfers, which we are beginning to work on. The rest of them that are a threat can be housed in supermax facilities in the United States of America.

Now, we constantly hear the argument that we can't bring terrorists to the United States. The way that argument is stated, it is like we are bringing them here and setting them free. We are not. We are going to lock them up and hold them. In fact, there was a recent ruling of the courts that made it clear those inmates would not be freed in the United States under any set of circumstances.

In addition to that, we have the ability in the United States of America to hold dangerous people. I will submit to you that if we didn't have that ability, we would be in a whole lot of trouble regardless of the people at Guantanamo Bay.

We currently house over 300 terrorists here in the U.S., including Ramzi Yousef, The Blind Sheikh, and a number of others. We have been able to successfully hold terrorists in the United States. We also hold mass murderers and gang leaders and mobsters. We have the ability to safely hold these people in the United States of America. So there is no downside to doing this.

The upside is to finally do what President George W. Bush recognized back in 2007 and 2008 that we needed to do, to close down Guantanamo Bay because of the international perception that it goes against our values and because of the very fact that it does go against our values to have people locked away in a prison that was originally set up under the hopes that somehow we would be able to avoid habeas corpus. Well, the Supreme Court said no, Guantanamo Bay is effectively under U.S. control, so habeas corpus applies anyway, so same amount of rights, same everything. It is simply an international eyesore that we keep open for no good reason.

This bill has prohibitions on closing it. My amendment would put in place a plan to close Guantanamo Bay by the end of 2016 and enable the steps necessary to accomplish that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield myself 2 minutes at this time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The Guantanamo facility is safe and the most appropriate location for detainees to be held. Detainees at Guantanamo are held there because they were engaged in dangerous acts threatening the United States of America and its allies. Some orchestrated and celebrated the murders of thousands of innocent Americans.

As in previous conflicts, it is entirely appropriate to hold detainees until enemy forces are defeated. In this case, it is al Qaeda and their associates.

The Guantanamo facility is ideal for this purpose. It is secure. It is relatively distant from the United States. It is difficult to attack. I can promise

you that the Cubans have no interest in freeing the prisoners there, but there are people in this world that want to do that. We saw it at Abu Ghraib prison last year where many members of al Qaeda were freed. That prison was attacked, and they were freed.

So the Guantanamo facility is ideal for this purpose. It is secure and it is safe. It also provides humane conditions for the detainees. They have access to health care, recreational activities, cultural and religious materials. Also, Members of the House of Representatives routinely visit Guantanamo, and they have seen the humane conditions in which dangerous detainees are held.

Based upon these facts and the nature of the character of those held at Guantanamo, the cost already incurred in accommodating them, there is no reason to move the Guantanamo detainees to facilities in the United States.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I want to also thank the chairman, the gentleman from California, for his leadership in bringing the NDAA bill to the floor. Again, I want to salute Chairman MCKEON on the tremendous work that he has displayed here and all that he has done in support of the men and women in uniform of our country. So I do rise today, Mr. Chairman, in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Mr. Chairman, regrettably, events of the past year have demonstrated that the forces that threaten America's national security, the stability of our allies, and seek to subject millions to a tyranny that violates the most basic of human rights are on the rise.

A desperate dictator in Syria has used chemical weapons, a strong man in Venezuela is consolidating power, and Iran is inching closer to nuclear weapons and funding terrorism. North Korea continues to threaten America and our Pacific allies, and Russia recently invaded Ukraine. Now is not the time for the United States to recede from the global arena. Now is the time to lead and to project the strength that has protected America's interests for over half a century.

An America that leads is an America with military power that cannot be matched, because at all times we must be prepared to meet and confront challenges so that our homeland is pro-

tected, our allies are defended, and our enemies are defeated.

On a congressional delegation I led to Asia last month, I saw firsthand just how important it is for America to be engaged on the world stage. While in Japan, we toured the aircraft carrier the USS George Washington. While aboard the ship, we met with its crew and heard directly from its Naval commanders that the U.S. needs to have a constant carrier presence in the region.

America provides our allies with much-needed security and stability to a region that is threatened by a madman in North Korea and has seen China become more provocative and aggressive with its neighbors, particularly in the South China Sea.

The presence of our aircraft carrier is a vital part of guaranteeing that security which, in turn, guarantees America's security. One of the admirals even stated: "In the world we are going to be operating in, we simply must have the USS George Washington." That is why I am so pleased that this bill begins to fund the refuel of the USS George Washington. Failing to do so would leave our allies in the region and throughout the world feeling vulnerable and embolden our enemies.

In hundreds of other ways, today's bill will provide our military with the resources it needs to remain the greatest fighting force in the world and keep America as a leader on the world stage.

Since the time of the revolution, my home State of Virginia has been a leader in contributing to our Nation's security. In addition to the thousands of Virginians who wear the uniform and those members of the military stationed in Virginia, tens of thousands of Virginians work in industries directly tied to supporting our Armed Forces and our national defense. I am pleased that this bill recognizes their efforts.

So today, let us stand together, pass this bill in a bipartisan fashion, and show the world that we are committed to being an America that leads.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman BUCK MCKEON, for all of his hard work on this issue, along with his members of the Armed Services Committee.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this important bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we are told in opposition to this amendment that terrorists have no constitutional rights. That is like saying rapists or murderers have no constitutional rights. But accused rapists and accused murders do have rights until it is proven that they are guilty, and then their rights are taken away from them. The same must be true of accused terrorists.

Ever since Magna Carta, we have denied the government the power to imprison and punish people on mere accusation. That is tyranny. The government's labeling someone a terrorist

doesn't make him one. The government must prove the accusation in court. That was always a bedrock American value until we opened Guantanamo. Now we imprison people indefinitely without trial. This must stop.

Guantanamo should be closed, and its inmates should be tried or released. Our Federal courts work. They have repeatedly tried, convicted, and sentenced terrorists to long prison terms. Prosecuting and imprisoning terrorists on U.S. soil has proven to be safer, less expensive, and less harmful to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, end indefinite detention, and restore our national honor.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment as well.

Transferring detainees to our homeland would require expensive new construction or renovation of existing facilities in the U.S. Current facilities at Gitmo already accommodate the detainees, their guards, all associated medical, recreational, and legal needs. Estimates for constructing or renovating similar facilities in the U.S. have ranged from \$300 million to \$500 million.

Meanwhile, the dangers are also clear. Moving detainees to the U.S. would make the facility housing them a terrorist target. For example, in 2010, New York City estimated it would cost \$200 million a year to provide security when it was proposed some Gitmo detainees be moved to New York for trial.

In conclusion, there are no advantages of moving detainees to the U.S.; there are clear disadvantages.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, how much time is left in the debate on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

□ 1915

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, Guantanamo is a rallying cry for extremists around the world. Until we transfer and try these detainees, it is hurting our national security, and Gitmo is expensive. We are spending about \$2.7 million per detainee per year at Guantanamo compared to \$34,000 per inmate at a high security prison in the United States. In fact, the Pentagon is going to spend \$435 million this year in operations and personnel costs for this facility.

The reality is we have 300 individuals convicted of crimes related to international terrorism that are currently

incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons with no escapes or attacks in attempts to free them.

When the Authorization for Use of Military Force in Afghanistan expires, we have no plans. What are we going to do with these prisoners of war?

The Smith amendment should be passed.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment merely required the President to come up with a plan that Congress and the American people could look at on exactly what he would do and how he would do it to close Guantanamo, including what the costs would be, where he would move them, what the cost of security wherever he would move them would be, I might support that.

The truth of the matter is in all the time since the President has been in office, he has not come up with a specific plan that has gotten the support of the American people or this Congress. Even when Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress, they were not able to pass any legislation to close Guantanamo.

So if he can put a plan together that gets the support of the Congress, support of the American people, I think that may be a step forward. But to say we are going to close it and, oh, by the way, along the way you can tell us what you are doing and how you are doing it, that is putting the cart before the horse.

The President needs to get the support of the American people. So far he has not done that. The American people have been clear: they are uncomfortable with those detainees coming here. Therefore, it is premature to close it, and this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I have heard Members from both sides of the aisle speak out against this very notion that they do not want these types of detainees coming to their State or territory.

I will remind them that, as in previous conflicts, it is entirely appropriate and lawful to hold detainees until our enemy forces are defeated. I have not seen that. If al Qaeda is on the run, I think it is toward us, as we have seen so many actions taken by them in recent times.

I ask for your support in defeating this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes 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 pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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:

Page 294, after line 21, insert the following:
SEC. 1034. DISPOSITION OF COVERED PERSONS DETAINED IN THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Due Process and Military Detention Amendments Act".

(b) **DISPOSITION.**—Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1562; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking "The disposition" and inserting "Except as provided in subsection (g), the disposition"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(g) **DISPOSITION OF PERSONS DETAINED IN THE UNITED STATES.**—

"(1) **PERSONS DETAINED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE OR THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT.**—In the case of a covered person who is detained in the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act, disposition under the law of war shall occur immediately upon the person coming into custody of the Federal Government and shall only mean the immediate transfer of the person for trial and proceedings by a court established under Article III of the Constitution of the United States or by an appropriate State court. Such trial and proceedings shall have all the due process as provided for under the Constitution of the United States.

"(2) **PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER TO MILITARY CUSTODY.**—No person detained, captured, or arrested in the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, may be transferred to the custody of the Armed Forces for detention under the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act.

"(h) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—This section shall not be construed to authorize the detention of a person within the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, under the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act."

(c) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY CUSTODY.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 is hereby repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1029(b) of such Act is amended by striking "applies to" and all that follows through "any other person" and inserting "applies to any person".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment would eliminate indefinite detention in the United States and its territories. So basically anybody who we captured who we suspected of terrorist activity would no longer be subject to indefinite detention, as is now currently the law.

The basic reason for this is our Constitution works, and we ought to value it and we ought to let the Constitution work. We have gone through article III courts to try, convict, and incarcerate terrorists successfully for decades. Yet, because of the 2001 AUMF, we still have on the books a law that would allow the President, any President now or in the future, to indefinitely detain any person in the United States if they determine that that person is affiliated with al Qaeda or affiliated forces. If they are acting in support of those organizations, they would be subject to indefinite detention and would not be allowed to due process rights that are in our Constitution.

That is an enormous amount of power to give the Executive: to take someone and lock them up without due process. It is not necessary. This President has not used the authority. President George W. Bush did not use it after about 2002 and then only in a couple of instances. It is not necessary. It is an enormous amount of power to grant the Executive, and I believe places liberty and freedom at risk in this country.

We need to eliminate indefinite detention in the United States. This amendment would do that clearly and unequivocally, and I urge support.

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 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a great amount of respect for my colleague and friend, the ranking member, but I strongly oppose this amendment.

My friend talks a lot about how we shouldn't limit the President's options with regard to Guantanamo. I don't think that we should be limiting our options in dealing with terrorists, and I can't imagine anything more fundamental than taking away the option to question al Qaeda terrorists bent on killing American citizens in whatever is the most effective way possible, and consistent with the law, to stop future attacks.

In the fiscal year 2013 NDAA, we addressed any misconceptions about the detention authority provided by the Authorization for Use of Military Force. We included the following language in the conference report:

Nothing in the Authorization for Use of Military Force or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 shall be construed to deny the availability of the

writ of habeas corpus or to deny any constitutional rights in a court ordained or established by or under article III of the Constitution to any person inside the United States who would be entitled to the availability of such writ or to such rights in the absence of such laws.

The NDAA has changed nothing with regard to the laws of war, our values, or our traditions. Our Supreme Court has agreed that appropriate detention and interrogation of al Qaeda terrorists is entirely lawful. It is false to imply that this is not the case or to something not in line with our values.

In fact, our courts have gone well beyond the traditional attachment of rights to our enemies and has extended the constitutional right of habeas corpus to foreign detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

This amendment would be the first time we self-imposed such a sweeping change to the conduct of war and our ability to gather intelligence.

Despite what any of us may want, al Qaeda has not surrendered. Far from it. The threat is evolving, but unfortunately for all of us, it continues.

We must oppose this amendment and preserve every lawful option in our arsenal.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The language within the NDAA about preserving rights is very confusing. I think it is very clear that the President does have the power right now to indefinitely detain people. So arguing that rights are protected, they are not. Indefinite detention is the law of the land. The President has the power to do that. Habeas corpus is one right. It is not due process. This law currently allows for due process to be ignored and for the Executive to indefinitely detain people.

The other big problem with this is it goes on forever. We have at different points in our Nation's history suspended habeas corpus—during the Civil War and other times of extreme danger. But in this case, al Qaeda and terrorism have been with us for a while. They are going to be with us for a long time to come in some form or another.

So to grant the President the power to indefinitely detain people is a long, long-term issue. Again, it is not necessary. Our article III courts have arrested, tried, convicted, and incarcerated hundreds of terrorists. It works. We don't need to give the President the power to throw out portions of the Constitution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has previously been defeated in the House. Members have voted on it before, and I think it should be defeated again.

This is the underwear bomber case. A foreign terrorist flies into the U.S. in order to kill as many Americans as possible. The bomb malfunctions, the terrorist is captured, he is immediately given under the amendment American constitutional rights, including the right to remain silent.

Now, in fact, the underwear bomber was questioned for about 50 minutes before the FBI gave him his Miranda rights and he quit talking. But meanwhile, when he knows he has the right to remain silent, he quits talking, we have no idea how many more bombers there are, where they may be, or how we may be attacked again.

Actually, this amendment goes further than the Obama administration even wants to, because the administration has admitted that there are several dozen terrorists in Guantanamo that cannot be tried in article III courts and are too dangerous to release. So what happens to them under this amendment? If they can't be tried, they are released.

Especially if you put this amendment with the previous amendment, they come here to the United States, they can't be tried in article III courts because it reveals too much information, so what do you do with them? That is part of the problem. We need this flexibility for indefinite detention.

Secondly, the Supreme Court has held that this right of detention goes hand-in-hand with an authorization for the use of force. I believe probably constitutionally the President has that authority when he has the authority to use military force. So trying to take it away not only limits the options, it is impractical in this case.

It is, of course, true that everybody detained has that right of habeas corpus to contest their detention in front of an article III court, as the gentleman said, even those foreigners held in Guantanamo. But to say that everybody immediately goes into the court system I think would be compromising our security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, Guantanamo Bay would not apply in this case. None of the people being held at Guantanamo Bay were captured in the United States, so this would have nothing to do with that. That is a vexing and difficult question. This applies to people captured from this point forward in the United States. It would not apply to Guantanamo Bay inmates.

Second, I want to deal with this argument about intelligence. It is an argument that has been made repeatedly that does not make any sense. This notion that somehow under the normal judicial process, under the normal law enforcement model you cannot collect any intelligence. Well, that would be a surprise to the FBI. It would be a surprise to every law enforcement agency in the United States of America that has been giving suspects Miranda rights, investigating crimes, and gathering intelligence for decades. Just because you tell someone they have the right to remain silent doesn't mean that they will, first of all.

Second of all, even if you don't tell them, everybody is aware of the fact

that they don't have to talk. We have used Miranda successfully to gather intelligence in a variety of different ways repeatedly. You will not lose that ability if you go through article III courts using Miranda rights.

Again, I want to emphasize, the idea that when you capture a terrorist, it never occurs to them that they don't have to give up information until you give them Miranda rights makes no sense whatsoever, number one.

Number two, over and over and over again domestic law enforcement officials have been able to give Miranda rights and gather an enormous amount of intelligence. That is a red herring in this argument.

Again, we come back to what the law does. The law gives the President of the United States the power to indefinitely detain people without due process. The Republican Party is always talking about freedom from government intrusion. They are concerned about the health care law, they are concerned about all manner of different things. This is a law that gives the President the power to lock you up and take away your basic freedom without due process. It strikes me that nothing could be more fundamental to those basic freedoms from government intrusion that we always hear about from the other side of the aisle than this issue.

I urge Republicans and Democrats alike to support this amendment. Take away the President's ability to lock people up indefinitely without due process. That is a gross, gross violation and an individual right that none of us in this country should stand for any longer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, admittedly, there are some difficult issues involved in detention, particularly with this war against terrorists that we are involved in.

But you have got to look at the bigger picture, and part of what one needs to look at is how one is going to deal with these situations. We just debated an amendment where the argument was close Guantanamo. Now we have an amendment on the other hand that says everybody that is here, including the people presumably that we would bring back from Guantanamo when it was closed, automatically and immediately goes to article III courts.

It is not my argument that some of the people in Guantanamo cannot be tried in article III courts. That is what the administration tells us.

□ 1930

So how does this fit together?

It doesn't, not without releasing very dangerous people out into society or into the world.

Secondly, when it is clear that you have greater rights when you come to the United States, rather than if you attack us from some other place, the incentive is to come to the United

States because that is where you are given the greater rights. That is the perverse incentive under this amendment. It would be a mistake.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes 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 Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. HECK of Washington. 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 title X, add the following:

SEC. 1011. MILITARY COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish a Military Community Infrastructure Program under which the Secretary may provide grants to eligible entities for transportation infrastructure improvement projects in military communities.

(2) APPLICATION.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Grants awarded under the Program may be used for transportation infrastructure improvement projects, including—

- (i) the construction of roads;
- (ii) the construction of mass transit;
- (iii) the construction of, or upgrades to, pedestrian access and bicycle access; and
- (iv) upgrades to public transportation systems.

(B) LOCATION.—To be eligible for a grant under the Program, a project described in subparagraph (A) shall be—

- (i) related to improving access to a military installation, as determined by the Secretary; and
- (ii) in a location that is—
 - (I) within or abutting an urbanized area (as designated by the Bureau of the Census); and
 - (II) designated as a growth community by the Office of Economic Adjustment.

(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In awarding grants under the Program, the Secretary shall give consideration to—

- (A) the magnitude of the problem addressed by the project;
- (B) the proportion of the problem addressed by the project that is caused by military installation growth since the year 2000;
- (C) the number of service members affected by the problem addressed by the project;
- (D) the size of the community affected by the problem addressed by the project;
- (E) the ability of the relevant eligible entity to execute the project; and
- (F) the extent to which the project resolves the transportation problem addressed.

(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out using grant amounts made available under the Program may not exceed 80 percent.

(b) TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall conduct a traffic impact study for any urbanized area (as designated by the Bureau of the Census) that expects a significant increase in traffic related to a military installation within or abutting the urbanized area.

(2) CONTENTS.—A traffic impact study under paragraph (1) shall determine any transportation improvements needed because of an increase in the number of military personnel, including study of commute sheds affected by installation-related traffic.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing a traffic impact study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation planning organization with jurisdiction over the urbanized area; and

(B) the commander of the appropriate military installation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

- (A) a State or political subdivision thereof;
- (B) an owner or operator of public transportation;

(C) a local governmental authority (as such term is defined in section 5302 of title 49, United States Code);

(D) a metropolitan planning organization;

or

(E) a regional transportation planning organization.

(2) METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION.—The terms “metropolitan planning organization” and “regional transportation planning organization” have the meanings given those terms in section 134(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of the Office of Economic Adjustment.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated, to carry out this section, \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2015.

(e) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, to carry out this section during fiscal year 2015—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, is hereby increased by \$200,000,000, with the amount of the increase allocated to administrative and servicewide activities, as set forth in the table under section 4301, to carry out this section; and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, is hereby reduced by \$200,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress for the

brandnew 10th Congressional District in Washington State, I have the privilege to represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord, which is the largest joint operating base in America.

In the vicinity of Joint Base Lewis-McChord is Interstate 5, which is the most heavily traveled north-south freight corridor in our State. Nearly 80 percent of the traffic to and from JBLM relies on that interstate freeway.

Local travelers in neighboring cities have absolutely no other option except to use I-5 as an arterial, and when incidents occur, trust me, it can take hours to recover.

Around the country, military installations like JBLM are still adapting to base realignment and short-term growth caused by troops passing through before being deployed. Installation growth has had a significant effect on regional transportation, particularly when an installation is located in or near an urban area.

Even acknowledging the potential for drawdowns on military bases, those reductions would not nearly come close to alleviating the problem—not nearly.

Surrounding roads play an important role in preserving military readiness. Our Armed Forces need to instantly deploy, and we need functional roads in order to do that. If military personnel are caught in a jam and if nobody moves, efficiency goes out the window.

The domino effect of delays due to congestion, therefore, literally impairs our national security. This leaves not only military activities on base stranded, but also commerce in the congested area, and when we don't have a reliable roadway, economic activity halts. Goods don't move, and companies can't make money.

It is a cascading inaction, which affects our productivity and balance sheets, and it puts a strain on businessowners.

To be clear, the military is not to blame for this. Bases have come up with innovative approaches to ease the pain, but the problem remains severe and unavoidable without more investment. It is a Band-Aid over a wound that needs stitches.

The only existing DOD program that provides funding for public highway improvements is the Defense Access Roads Program. However, the DAR Program is limited by outdated and restrictive eligibility criteria and was designed when bases were only expected to be located in relatively undeveloped areas, which is clearly no longer the case.

DAR needs to be replaced with a separate DOD program to fund the transit services necessary to meet military needs.

I know being stuck in traffic is not something unknown to most Americans. We are all too familiar with the horrible feeling of approaching an unexpected slow crawl on the road, but when this affects our military's ability to get to base, to do the job, and to be

ready for anything, that is when we can't just sit and wait for it to get better. We can and should do more.

Mr. Chairman, I plan to withdraw my amendment, but I will soon introduce a bill that embodies its concept, entitled the "COMMUTE Act," and it will address these issues.

I hope, beyond hope, that I can look forward to working with the members and my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee on this plan to meet this very important need.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just want to quickly agree with Congressman HECK.

I used to represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord. It is the worst traffic in the State of Washington. The base more than doubled over the course of 7 to 8 years. It is a significant quality of life issue for our men and women and their families who are serving on Joint Base Lewis-McChord, and I am sure this is a situation that is repeated around many bases across the country.

So I strongly support his efforts to try and deal with this. This is something that directly impacts our troops and their families. I thank him for his effort.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. I, likewise, would be interested in working with you on this.

In southern California, I know a major highway runs right through Camp Pendleton, and there is a lot of traffic. With Congressman SMITH, I was able to visit Lewis-McChord, and I think you would find that a lot of people on both sides of the aisle would be willing to work with you on this bill, and I hope to be able to.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you, sir.

As is characteristic to both of you, thank you for your graciousness and for your positive remarks.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that there are some estimates that the Interstate 5 corridor around Joint Base Lewis-McChord—remember, I-5 extends from Canada to Tijuana—is the most congested chokepoint.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. JENKINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Ms. JENKINS. 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 title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1107. PROHIBITION ON CONVERTING THE PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS FROM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE TO PERFORMANCE BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided under subsection (b), no Federal department or agency may implement or carry out a guideline, regulation, circular, policy, or other instrument to enable a Federal department or agency to convert to performance by Federal employees any function that, before the date of the enactment of this Act, was performed by contractor employees.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition in this section shall not apply to a function that is an inherently governmental function as that term is defined in section 5 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-270; 31 U.S.C. 501 note).

(c) PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION REQUIRED.—Before any Federal department or agency may convert any function from performance by a contractor to performance by a civilian employee of the department or agency, the department or agency shall conduct a public-private competition similar to a public-private competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 that examines the cost of performance of the function by civilian employees and the cost of performance of the function by one or more contractors to demonstrate whether converting to performance by civilian employees will result in savings to the Government over the life of the contract. Upon completion of the competition, the Federal department or agency shall select the option that is determined pursuant to the competition to result in the most savings to the Government.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

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

In 2008, Congress passed legislation to suspend public-private competitions at the DOD through the OMB Circular A-76. That moratorium remains in place today. In 2009, the OMB issued a memorandum which regulated the move to insourcing at the DOD.

Today, nearly half of the Federal Government owns and operates thousands of activities that are commercial in nature. These functions are not inherent or unique to government; rather, they can be found in small and Main Street businesses across the Nation. Not only are these Federal agencies duplicating private business, but many engage in unfair government competition with the private sector.

My amendment seeks to place a moratorium on the insourcing of previously contracted activities within the DOD. Exceptions would be made, number one, if the activity were inherently governmental and, thereby, should never have been contracted out in the first place; or, number two, if the DOD would employ a reverse A-76 to itemize specific costs saved to the taxpayer, should the DOD be able to

perform the commercial activity more efficiently for the taxpayer.

According to the OMB, the act of conducting the A-76 competition alone can generate a savings of 10 to 40 percent on average. That is just the average savings generated from simply going through the process.

While the A-76 process is not perfect, it is the best opportunity we have for a cost comparison. As an accountant, I understand the importance of a cost comparison. This amendment is just the first step. Studies also show that utilizing the A-76 public-private cost comparisons can save up to \$27 billion per year. Again, this is just by implementing the cost comparison tool.

In 2011, the Department of Defense completed a report in response to section 325 of the NDAA for fiscal year 2010, which concluded with two major recommendations to Congress, the first of which is to lift the suspension on A-76 competitions. This is the recommendation from the DOD.

This amendment will provide the DOD with the flexibility to use the private sector for commercial activities and save valuable taxpayer money. I encourage a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

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

I rise this evening in strong opposition to this amendment.

Put simply, this amendment would cost taxpayers. It would not be in the best interests of our military readiness, and it is not supported by the Department of Defense. This amendment is extreme in its intention.

It overrides every other law on the books in terms of the management of the national defense workload by prohibiting the transfer of the workload from the private sector to the public sector.

For years now, Congress and the DOD have established statutes, regulations, and policies for determining the correct mix of the workforce between military contractor and civilian.

As the cochair of the Depot and Arsenal Caucus, I am deeply concerned that this amendment would put back into place a severely flawed system that would do significant damage to our organic industrial base, including to our arsenals and depots, at a time when it is critical that we maintain these facilities' capabilities to equip our troops.

I proudly represent the Rock Island Arsenal, where thousands of highly skilled people work every day to equip our troops. Our organic industrial base has, time and again, shown its critical importance to our men and women in uniform.

When our troops on the ground need improved armor on their vehicles, it

was the Rock Island Arsenal that was able to rapidly produce and field that lifesaving armor to protect our troops; and as a military parent, I am personally thankful that the workforce at Rock Island Arsenal and organic industrial base facilities across our country are there to equip our men and women in uniform.

This amendment would starve our critical organic industrial base, sending it into a death spiral, undermining key elements of our national security infrastructure, and reducing our ability to meet our national security strategy.

In addition to the impact on military operations, this amendment would also not produce the best value for the Department of Defense and for our servicemen and servicewomen. Again, it is not wanted by our Nation's military leaders.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the amendment of my colleague's from Kansas.

Our military has three workforces. We have the uniformed, we have the civilian, and we have the contractor. All three are vital to the national security of this country. The defense workforce must be managed in what makes the most long-term sense for both the mission of national security and the taxpayer.

This amendment would prohibit the insourcing of contracted services, even when it would make sense for the taxpayer and would save money. By disrupting the Department of Defense's management practice, this amendment would impair military readiness. The Department did not ask for this proposed change, and it is against this amendment.

I believe that this amendment is bad for the long-term security of the Nation, and I would ask that you oppose it.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for my friends from Kansas. We usually agree, but in this case, we don't.

I represent Tinker Air Force Base, which has 15,000 Federal civilian defense employees, along with thousands of private employees, working in contract facilities on and around the base. Usually, they work together, but sometimes, they compete for work. When

they do, that work should go to whom-ever can do the work better and cheaper.

This amendment overrides every other law in the book, in terms of managing the defense workload by prohibiting the transfer of the workload from the private to the public sector, even when the public sector can do it better and cheaper.

□ 1945

That, in my view is inefficient, it is counterproductive, and ultimately it is unfair. We should allow the work to flow to those best able to complete it, and we should rely on the services to actually make the decisions in this regard.

So I urge the rejection of the amendment.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, opponents may argue that this is a burden to place on the DOD when they are seeking to insource, but I believe that ensuring taxpayer dollars are well spent and that taxpayers are getting the best value for their money is hardly a burden.

A formal, documented process which shows the cost savings will make sure that this is fair for the small businesses who depend on these contracts to thrive.

The American Legion approves of this proposed amendment. They stated:

The practice of converting functions and services that have been performed by contractors with government employees limits the amount of contracts that can go to the private sector to stimulate and grow the veteran small business industrial base. When the government takes a couple of positions away from a small business, they are essentially crippling the small business' ability to succeed in the private sector. These practices primarily affect small businesses, as large contractors are rarely affected by insourcing policy because of their size and number of employees.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this chart—for those with keen eyesight—kind of puts this in perspective.

The blue is what we spend on the civilian workforce. The green is what has been spent over the last decade on military personnel. The yellow is on contract services. And the white is the rest of it.

The premise of this amendment is that the blue is too big.

There are times when competition, especially on acquisition, is extremely helpful. There are also times where competition on sustainment or maintenance has a habit of unintentionally hurting our readiness, at least that was the result of the GAO study in 2010.

So the committee has wisely tried to strike a balance between those two, making sure that there is competition when it makes sense, all of which is defined in title X of our code, which demands a core workload be established

by the military of what our needs are and what is most cost-effective.

Unfortunately, the first line of the amendment which says that “notwithstanding any other provision of law” simply turns all of that on its head. This takes precedence over the entire code, which I am assuming is the reason DOD communicated the Defense Department does not want this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is also supported by the TRSA, MAPPS, the Business Coalition for Fair Competition, and the American Conservative Union.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit their statements in support for the RECORD.

SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD IN SUPPORT OF
JENKINS AMENDMENT #135

Textile Rental Services Association (TRSA): In its 1996 examination of the issue, the Center for Naval Analyses likewise found benefits of competing work. The visibility and identification of alternate providers were beneficial aspects of the process identified by the Center. As a bottom line, the Center for Naval Analyses determined a 30% average savings resulted from this beneficial focus on competition, with savings persisting over time. A leaner, more efficient government is a worthy goal, and Rep. Jenkins (KS) Amendment #135 is a means to achieve this goal.

MAPPS: We have seen insourcing take place beyond ‘inherently governmental’ activities such as commercial activities like mapping and geospatial activities. The Jenkins Amendment is the fairest approach by helping defend business opportunities for the private sector, including small business.

Business Coalition for Fair Competition (BCFC): The Jenkins Amendment is the ‘yellow pages test’ personified. This amendment 1) prevents the outright conversion of ‘commercial activities’ from private sector firms into DOD performance; 2) requires an official cost accounting be performed and documented to identify whether DOD performance is more cost effective than the private sector contractor; and 3) helps protect private sector firms, including small business, from losing contracts taken away unfairly by the Federal government.

American Conservative Union (ACU): The Jenkins Amendment is essential to stopping the government goliath from gobbling up jobs that belong in the private sector. Rather than wringing our hands over slow growth and the lack of good paying jobs, we should start by protecting existing private sector jobs from further ‘insourcing’ by this Administration. This amendment will help do that.

Ms. JENKINS. In closing, my amendment seeks to strike a balance. If the service is inherently governmental, it should be contracted out. If it is a commercial activity, the Federal Government owes it to the American taxpayer to get the best value, the most efficiency, and the best service available.

We owe this to our warfighters to ensure they are receiving the best possible services as they protect us. This cannot be assured without the use of a fair competitive processes. With a debt of more than \$17 trillion, calls for reductions that will erode the end strength of our military and a stagnant private-sector job market, we must find ways to reduce spending and find

efficiencies at DOD while boosting job creation in our communities.

This amendment is an opportunity to vote for small business, break up Federal monopolies, ensure more efficient services, empower the warfighter, and maintain funding for DOD.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chair, I submit the following statements in support of Jenkins Amendment #15 to H.R. 4435.

National Veteran Small Business Coalition (NVSBC): “The National Veteran Small Business Coalition (NVSBC) has seen the negative effect of Insourcing on veteran and service disabled veteran small businesses over the last few years. Veterans who have fought for this government should not have to compete for business opportunities with the same government who ordered them in harm’s way.

Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI): A leaner, more efficient government is a worthy goal. Competitive sourcing provides important, demonstrable benefits for our business workforce, our economy, and our government’s efficiency. The Competitive Enterprise Institute supports Rep. Lynn Jenkins’ insourcing-and-outsourcing-related amendment to achieve that goal.

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

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. 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 gentlewoman from Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

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:

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. — LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW START TREATY.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used for implementation of the New START Treaty until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory;

(2) the Russian Federation is respecting the sovereignty of all Ukrainian territory;

(3) the Russian Federation is no longer taking actions that are inconsistent with the INF Treaty;

(4) the Russian Federation is in compliance with the CFE Treaty and has lifted its suspension of Russian observance of its treaty obligations; and

(5) there have been no inconsistencies by the Russian Federation with New START Treaty requirements.

(b) 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) CFE TREATY.—The term “CFE Treaty” means the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed at Paris November 19, 1990, and entered into force July 17, 1992.

(3) INF TREATY.—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.

(4) NEW START TREATY.—The term “New START Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011.

(c) 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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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, my amendment is very simple. The United States should not be spending money to disarm ourselves—to dramatically cut our strategic nuclear deterrent under the New START Treaty—if the other party to the treaty is not trustworthy.

At the moment, the Russian Federation is clearly not trustworthy.

Let me remind us all of Russia’s current record on observing treaties and agreements.

In 1994, Russia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and the United States signed the Budapest Memorandum. This agreement included a commitment to “respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine.” But this agreement did not keep Putin from invading Ukrainian territory.

Strike one.

In January, The New York Times revealed that the Russian Federation was cheating on another treaty—the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, or INF Treaty. According to the story, our State Department has been raising the INF cheating issue with the Russians for about a year now, with no response.

Strike two.

In 2007, President Putin announced that he was suspending Russian participation in the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, or CFE. This came after years of Russian violations of the CFE Treaty.

Strike three.

Is the Russian government trustworthy?

The answer is clearly no.

The question for us tonight under my amendment is whether it makes sense for us to spend money on reducing our nuclear deterrent when the other party to the New START Treaty is not trustworthy. If you trust Vladimir Putin and the Russian government, vote against this amendment. But if you, like me, don't want to put our national security in the hands of a serial treaty violator, please vote for this amendment.

We should not be spending money implementing the New START Treaty, which reduces our nuclear forces, unless and until Russia makes it clear that they are a responsible actor and will abide by the agreements they make.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, on the trust issue, you wouldn't have to negotiate with people that you trusted.

Unfortunately, regrettably, we have to negotiate with people all the time who are not entirely trustworthy. That is why Ronald Reagan always said, "Trust but verify," which I think was wrong. Let's verify. Trust is a very difficult thing.

Obviously, Russia has proven itself untrustworthy, but they have consistently reduced their nuclear weapons arsenal as a result of treaties that were first negotiated by Ronald Reagan, and many others.

They have also worked cooperatively with us to contain nuclear material, which has been enormously important. They would be a huge terrorist threat if they were to ever get their hands on nuclear material. Outside of the United States, the former Soviet Union—and now Russia—is the number one place where you have that nuclear material.

So having some measure of cooperation with them to contain and reduce that material is enormously important. That is the goal of the START Treaty.

It is not a matter of whether or not you trust Putin or Russia. I don't trust many people, just in general, and I certainly don't trust them. The question is: is the START Treaty, an effort to reduce the number of nuclear weapons that Russia has and to contain and control the fissile material that they have, is that in our best interest?

It is. And we should negotiate that.

Certainly, what Putin is doing in the Ukraine is reprehensible and violates all manner of treaties. I support the President and the efforts of others to condemn and sanction them as a result.

But to walk away from an effort to contain nuclear weapons I don't believe

is in the best interest of the U.S. It is not a matter of whether you trust Russia; it is a matter of what it is in our best interest. I believe it is in our best interest to try to contain the nuclear fissile material available out there in the world. START is one way to do that. Walking away from this just because we don't trust Putin—and we don't—is not sound policy.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to my colleague by saying there is a flaw in the New START Treaty, in my opinion, in that it originally called for reductions in U.S. nuclear forces and allowed Russia to increase its nuclear forces.

So that right there I think is a problem. But when you have serial violations by the Russian Federation invading Ukraine, in violation of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, the INF Treaty, and the CFE Treaty, they are not a reliable partner in these treaties.

And so to reduce our forces, how can that be in our interest when the other party to the treaty is not someone who is performing on these other treaties? There could be questions on whether they are even fully complying with the New START Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I will enter into the RECORD an article from The New York Times dated January 29 of this year detailing some of their violations of the INF Treaty.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 2014]

U.S. SAYS RUSSIA TESTED MISSILE, DESPITE TREATY

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON.—The United States informed its NATO allies this month that Russia had tested a new ground-launched cruise missile, raising concerns about Moscow's compliance with a landmark arms control accord.

American officials believe Russia began conducting flight tests of the missile as early as 2008. Such tests are prohibited by the treaty banning medium-range missiles that was signed in 1987 by President Ronald Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader at the time, and that has long been viewed as one of the bedrock accords that brought an end to the Cold War.

Beginning in May, Rose Gottemoeller, the State Department's senior arms control official, has repeatedly raised the missile tests with Russian officials, who have responded that they investigated the matter and consider the case to be closed. But Obama administration officials are not yet ready to formally declare the tests of the missile, which has not been deployed, to be a violation of the 1987 treaty.

With President Obama pledging to seek deeper cuts in nuclear arms, the State Department has been trying to find a way to resolve the compliance issue, preserve the treaty and keep the door open to future arms control accords.

"The United States never hesitates to raise treaty compliance concerns with Russia, and this issue is no exception," Jen Psaki, the State Department spokeswoman, said. "There's an ongoing review process, and we wouldn't want to speculate or pre-judge the outcome."

Other officials, who asked not to be identified because they were discussing internal deliberations, said there was no question the

missile tests ran counter to the treaty and the administration had already shown considerable patience with the Russians. And some members of Congress, who have been briefed on the tests on a classified basis for well over a year, have been pressing the White House for a firmer response.

A public dispute over the tests could prove to be a major new irritant in the already difficult relationship between the United States and Russia. In recent months, that relationship has been strained by differences over how to end the fighting in Syria; the temporary asylum granted to Edward J. Snowden, the former National Security Agency contractor; and, most recently, the turmoil in Ukraine.

The treaty banning the testing, production and possession of medium-range missiles has long been regarded as a major step toward curbing the American and Russian arms race. "The importance of this treaty transcends numbers," Mr. Reagan said during the treaty signing, adding that it underscored the value of "greater openness in military programs and forces."

But after President Vladimir V. Putin rose to power and the Russian military began to re-evaluate its strategy, the Kremlin developed second thoughts about the accord. During the administration of President George W. Bush, Sergei B. Ivanov, the Russian defense minister, proposed that the two sides drop the treaty.

Though the Cold War was over, he argued that Russia still faced threats from nations on its periphery, including China and potentially Pakistan. But the Bush administration was reluctant to terminate a treaty that NATO nations regarded as a cornerstone of arms control and whose abrogation would have enabled the Russians to increase missile forces directed at the United States' allies in Asia.

Since Mr. Obama has been in office, the Russians have insisted they want to keep the agreement. But in the view of American analysts, Russia has also mounted a determined effort to strengthen its nuclear abilities to compensate for the weakness of its conventional, nonnuclear forces.

At the same time, in his State of the Union address last year, Mr. Obama vowed to "seek further reductions in our nuclear arsenals," a goal American officials at one point hoped might form part of Mr. Obama's legacy.

But administration officials and experts outside government say Congress is highly unlikely to approve an agreement mandating more cuts unless the question of Russian compliance with the medium-range treaty is resolved.

"If the Russian government has made a considered decision to field a prohibited system," Franklin C. Miller, a former defense official at the White House and the Pentagon, said, "then it is the strongest indication to date that they are not interested in pursuing any arms control, at least through the remainder of President Obama's term."

It took years for American intelligence to gather information on Russia's new missile system, but by the end of 2011, officials say it was clear that there was a compliance concern.

There have been repeated rumors over the last year that Russia may have violated some of the provisions of the 1987 treaty. But the nature of that violation has not previously been disclosed, and some news reports have focused on the wrong system: a new two-stage missile called the RS-26. The Russians have flight-tested it at medium range, according to intelligence assessments, and the prevailing view among Western officials is that it is intended to help fill the gap in Russia's medium-range missile capabilities that resulted from the 1987 treaty. The

treaty defines medium-range missiles as ground-launched ballistic or cruise missiles capable of flying 300 to 3,400 miles.

But because Russia has conducted a small number of tests of the RS-26 at intercontinental range, it technically qualifies as a long-range system and will be counted under the treaty known as New Start, which was negotiated by the Obama administration. So it is generally considered by Western officials to be a circumvention, but not a violation, of the 1987 treaty.

One member of Congress who was said to have raised concerns that the suspected arms control violation might endanger future arms control efforts was John Kerry. As a senator and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he received a classified briefing on the matter in November 2012 that dealt with compliance concerns, according to a report in *The Daily Beast*.

As secretary of state, Mr. Kerry has not raised concerns over the cruise missile tests with his Russian counterpart, Sergey V. Lavrov, but he has emphasized the importance of complying with arms accords, a State Department official said.

Republican lawmakers, however, have urged the administration to be more aggressive.

"Briefings provided by your administration have agreed with our assessment that Russian actions are serious and troubling, but have failed to offer any assurance of any concrete action to address these Russian actions," Representative Howard McKeon, Republican of California and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and Representative Mike Rogers, the Michigan Republican who leads the Intelligence Committee, said in an April letter to Mr. Obama.

And Senator Jim Risch, Republican of Idaho, and 16 other Republican senators recently proposed legislation that would require the White House to report to Congress on what intelligence the United States has shared with NATO allies on suspected violations of the 1987 treaty.

Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have also cited the issue in holding up Ms. Gottemoeller's confirmation as under secretary of state for arms control and international security.

It was against this backdrop that the so-called deputies committee, an interagency panel led by Antony Blinken, Mr. Obama's deputy national security adviser, decided that Ms. Gottemoeller should inform NATO's 28 members about the compliance issue.

On Jan. 17, Ms. Gottemoeller discussed the missile tests in a closed-door meeting of NATO's Arms Control, Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Committee that she led in Brussels.

The Obama administration, she said, had not given up on diplomacy. There are precedents for working out disputes over arms control complaints, and Ms. Gottemoeller said American officials would continue to engage the Russians to try to resolve the controversy.

But even with the best of intentions, establishing what the Russians are doing may not be easy. The elaborate network of verification provisions created under the medium-range missile treaty is no longer in effect, since all the missiles that were believed to be covered by the agreement were long thought to have been destroyed by May 1991.

Mr. LAMBORN. At this point I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my colleague.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, again, I am pleased to join my friend from Colorado on this particular issue.

When you have a partner, which is Russia, who is already engaged in a

cyberattack against Estonia, they have invaded and declared independent the two northern provinces of Georgia, and they also have done everything we know about in the Ukraine right now, and, in addition, have violated the existing INF Treaty—and we can talk about that classified material because it was quoted on the front page of *The New York Times*; they have violated that—it is in the best interest of the United States to wait until we have a more profitable, reliable partner before launching into another endeavor.

With that, I actually support this amendment. I think it is well-timed, well-placed.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

First of all, just for everybody's information, you cannot actually reveal classified information, even if it has showed up in the newspaper, because then you are confirming it. So you are not supposed to do that.

Second of all, if you don't like the START Treaty, that is one thing. We can have that debate. We had that debate in the Senate and a bipartisan group of senators confirmed the treaty and then passed it. That is a separate debate. If you are trying to still reopen that, that is something that the Senate has already determined.

Again, it is not a matter of Russia being trustworthy. I don't think of them as a partner. I think of them as a reality that we have to deal with.

In the one area where they have been fairly consistent, again, starting with the treaty negotiated under Ronald Reagan, is they have reduced their nuclear forces and worked with us to contain their fissile material after the breakup of the Soviet Union. This has reduced the amount of nuclear weapons in the world, which is a positive step.

So, again, yes, what they are doing in the Ukraine, we ought to oppose that. But when it comes to trying to contain nuclear material for the protection of both of our countries and the world, that is not something that I think we should walk away from.

I am sure there are other opportunities, other ways we can punish Russia for their misdeeds that would make a great deal more sense. This hurts us, it does not help us.

Again, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I can't see how it would be in our interest to keep complying with a treaty when the other party to that treaty is not in compliance with so many other things it is supposed to be doing.

This amendment merely calls for a halt in the spending until such time as they come into compliance with all of these other treaties.

We are talking about reducing our nuclear forces. That is a guarantee against the main and only existential threat against the United States: a devastating nuclear attack, God forbid. But why in the world would we want to give up further nuclear forces when the party that is supposed to be working with us on this is not reliable?

□ 2000

I do not understand that. I would ask adoption of this amendment.

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

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

Again, I want to emphasize, the START Treaty, if you don't like the START Treaty, that is a separate debate. That is not the purpose of where we are at here in the House.

With regards to violating treaties, on this START Treaty, the Russians are in compliance with it. There has been no evidence brought forward that they are not. This is the treaty that we are talking about.

If they have violated other treaties, we can talk about that and deal with that.

I will also point out that they are not alone. The U.S. abrogated the anti-ballistic missile treaty that we had signed with the Soviet Union because we thought it was in our own interest, so there are different reasons for doing those things.

Again, let me just emphasize the point. If we have an agreement with Russia that enables us to better control nuclear weapons, I think that is a good thing.

Don't trust them. Don't think of them as a partner. Whatever evil things you want to say about Russia, that is fine, but let's not do things that are contrary to our own best interest.

There are other ways to punish Russia for the treaties that they have violated, for the horrible things that they are doing in Ukraine.

Walking away from the START Treaty undermines our interests. That is why, again, a bipartisan group of United States Senators voted for and put into the law the START Treaty because it is in the United States' best interest.

So, as much as I am opposed to what Russia is doing in many areas and agree with the gentleman on that, this amendment is the wrong way to go about dealing with those changes, and I urge opposition.

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. LAMBORN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. . SUNSET OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

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

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, when Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force just days after 9/11, it provided the President with the broad authority to strike against those who “planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored” them.

That authorization no longer properly encompasses the scope of military action that we are taking in the ongoing fight against terrorism. While the AUMF was originally directed at a fairly narrow range of actors, it has been used to sanction targeted strikes against groups and militants with little relation to the individuals who actually planned, authorized, and perpetrated the attacks on 9/11.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution invests Congress with the power to declare war. It is our most awesome responsibility, and it is central to the success of our military efforts overseas. We owe it to the men and women we send into combat to properly define and authorize their mission.

This amendment would not immediately repeal the 2001 AUMF. Instead, it would sunset one year from the date of enactment, providing time for Congress and the administration to consider what authorities are needed to protect the Nation.

I think a more narrow authorization, constrained in focus and duration, may very well be necessary, but let’s be clear. Even in the absence of an AUMF, the administration would retain the necessary authority to respond to threats from al Qaeda.

At a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning, Stephen Preston, General Counsel for the Department of Defense, testified:

The AUMF is not the only authority the President has to use force to keep us safe. The President has authority, under the Con-

stitution, to use military force as needed to defend the Nation against armed attacks and imminent threat of armed attack.

Over the course of the last year, there has been a growing recognition of the outdated nature of the current AUMF. In Syria, for example, one of the most violent groups on the ground is the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, ISIL, which grew out of al Qaeda in Iraq.

Though originally part of the al Qaeda brand, ISIL has since been excommunicated from al Qaeda, and recent months have seen intense fighting between ISIL and the Nusra Front, al Qaeda’s preferred jihadi group.

That raises the question of whether action against ISIL would be covered by the current AUMF, and if it is not, do we really want to be in a situation where Ayman al-Zawahiri is able to choose which groups are subject to the authorization for the use of force by the United States and which are not? That is not something I think we want to delegate to our enemies.

Last year, during consideration of the defense appropriations bill, I offered a similar amendment that gained the bipartisan support of 185 Members of the House, indicating strong support on both sides of the aisle, for bringing our actions into conformity with the law.

Since then, the legally precarious nature of our military actions under the AUMF has only become more pronounced. This amendment will force Congress and the administration to do something about it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Chair, as the gentleman indicates, he offered this amendment last year, and it failed, and I believe it should fail again.

As the gentleman knows, I believe very strongly that the AUMF should be updated. In fact, this House has voted twice to update it, but then the Senate failed to take any action whatsoever, and I don’t think there is any reason to believe that there is any more likely prospect of the Senate acting now than before.

So what this amendment would do, it would be to repeal the AUMF against terrorists, without anything, anything at all to replace it and, frankly, without any prospect of having anything to replace it, at least in this Congress, so we would be left with no authority to take action against terrorists bent on killing Americans.

I can’t help but note, Madam Chair, that they just opened the 9/11 museum in New York in the last few days. Have we forgotten so quickly about what this AUMF is all about?

One other factor, the President has made some comments about engaging

Congress on this issue, but he has exercised absolutely no leadership whatsoever in doing so. What does the President propose, if he proposes an update to the AUMF?

We have no idea. Unfortunately, that lack of leadership is all too common for this administration.

Meanwhile, what is happening in the world? Well, terrorism is growing, and it is getting more dangerous. I note there was a New York Times story just 3 days ago, where the new director of the FBI says that, before he was sworn in and got access to the latest information, he underestimated the terrorist threat.

“I didn’t have anywhere near the appreciation I got after I came into this job just how virulent those affiliates had become,” Mr. Comey said. “There are many more than I appreciated, and they are stronger than I appreciated.”

Yet the Obama administration, Madam Chairman, wants us to believe that terrorism is done; we have got them on the run. Everybody’s going to live happily ever after. That sort of wishful thinking is not only unrealistic, it is dangerous.

As a matter of fact, Richard Haass, the president of the Council on Foreign Relations, has written within the last month that:

American foreign policy is in troubling disarray.

David Brooks wrote in *The New York Times*:

All around, the fabric of peace and order is fraying.

I would suggest that a substantial part of that disarray and fraying is the sort of wishful thinking that we can wish terrorism and other problems away and go along and the world is not going to bother us.

In other words, short-term political messaging is taking precedence over longer-term strategic interests; so repealing the current authority that helps the military protect us against terrorism, without something to take its place, is exactly that kind of wishful thinking.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, let me thank Congressman SCHIFF for offering this amendment.

As this body knows, I have been offering an amendment to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force for many, many years. Congressman SCHIFF, this is such an important—a very important amendment, which is critical to stopping this endless war.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee refused to allow my bipartisan amendment, taken from my bill, the War Authorization Review and Determination Act, to even be considered.

For those who were not here on that sorrowful day, just 3 days after 9/11, let me just read from that short sentence—one sentence, mind you—that

passed the House with just 1 hour of debate, with 420 ayes and one no.

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.

I voted against this resolution. Of course, it was the most difficult vote of my career, but I knew then what I know now. It was too broad, and it is open-ended.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has allowed a mere—what is it—10 minutes now to debate this serious and dangerous authorization.

Supporting this amendment would be an important step to ensuring that the President does not have a blank check to conduct endless war.

Congress must exercise its constitutional authority.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I want to respond to a couple of the points that have been made in opposition, the first, that if the sunset goes into effect and nothing is enacted, subsequently, there will be no authority to take action against our enemies.

That ignores the President's authority under article II, or it is a very, very constrained view of the President's authority under article II as Commander in Chief, one not shared by this President, one certainly not shared by President Bush and, indeed, one not shared by any President, I think, in U.S. history.

This is not an effort to legislate away the threats that we face. That cannot be done, but it is an effort to compel Congress and the administration to bring our use of force into conformity with the laws passed by Congress and to restore our responsibility as the body with the power to declare war and to define the scope of any conflict.

Without a sunset, I am convinced that, a year from now, we will be exactly where we are today, continuing to rely on an increasingly legally unreliable AUMF, and I have confidence that, spurred on by the necessity of acting—and we are not requiring that we act tomorrow, we give a deadline of a year from an enactment—that should not be too much to ask of this Congress. Congress will step up to its responsibility.

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

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

Madam Chair, the gentleman argues that, oh, we don't really need these authorities, that there are other authorities.

Well, either they are important, or they are not. Either article I, section 1 makes a difference in what the President can do to defend the country, or it is all superfluous, and I don't know why we continue to have these debates and declare war.

Obviously, there are different views about how far a President's power under article II goes, but most people believe article I, section 8 means something and that for the Congress to authorize the use of military force means something.

I would say, parenthetically, the last thing we need is to get all balled up in court arguing about this after we have repealed the AUMF, but have nothing to take its place.

Secondly, the gentleman argues that: well, we are not going to do anything unless we make a deadline.

I hate to remind us all, but we have had deadlines before that we have not exactly met. Unfortunately, repealing something this serious without something to take its place is a dangerous game, I think, to play.

The evolution of al Qaeda is a very serious issue, Madam Chair. We should be having a conversation about how to update the Authorization for Use of Military Force, but we still have to protect the country while we are having that discussion.

Unfortunately, this puts the cart before the horse, deciding to repeal before we know what will be used to replace it.

This amendment is not about Afghanistan, Yemen, Mali, Somalia, or anywhere else. This amendment is about us. This is about protecting Americans, and when the President and the military have the authority that the Constitution allows us to give them to protect the country, we should not abandon that lightly.

The world is still dangerous. The terrorists are still coming for us. We need to keep this in place unless and until there is a more updated AUMF to replace it.

Madam Chairman, I oppose the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part A of House Report 113-460.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam 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 D of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1636. ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REVIEW OF COST ESTIMATES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Section 1041(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1931) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “ANNUAL” before “CBO”; and

(2) by inserting “and annually thereafter,” after “this Act.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, we all agree that transparency and nonpartisan oversight strengthens our democracy and promotes greater efficiency and effectiveness in government, especially in monitoring government spending. This amendment provides every Member with an opportunity to promote this efficiency and effectiveness through increased transparency. The amendment would simply require the Congressional Budget Office to update, each year, their report on the projected costs of the United States' nuclear forces over the 10-year budget window.

This report initially was required in the last reauthorization as a one-time look at U.S. spending on our nuclear forces. It was released last December and has since proven to be incredibly valuable for Members, staff, and civil society organizations. I am sure it was referenced by many people on the committee as this bill before us was crafted.

The CBO's report provided an unbiased and more realistic forecast of spending. It found that the administration's own estimates for the costs of our nuclear weapons over the next decade were understated by nearly \$150 billion. With tight budgets, we can't afford to rely on partial or inaccurate information, let alone such a significant disparity.

If the United States is likely committing—at some level—to refurbishing the nuclear triad, we all deserve to know the long-term costs to make the strategic, effective decisions and to appreciate any trade-offs that might be required.

Despite everyone's best intentions, these projects have a history of egregious cost overruns. No one is better suited to help Congress monitor these projected costs as they change and fluctuate than the Congressional Budget Office. The amendment provides Congress with the information that we need to make the difficult decisions.

We are scheduled to spend between one-half and two-thirds of a trillion dollars over the next 10 years for our nuclear forces and related programs. This spending, adjusted for inflation, is higher than we spent at the height of the cold war.

But we can and should debate the merits of that spending. There should be no objection from anyone about

knowing how much the projects will cost. It will be valuable if you want to increase the programs. It will be valuable if you want to decrease them. It will be valuable if you just want to fund the existing program.

This amendment focuses on increased transparency and oversight. I urge my colleagues to adopt it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to his amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, the Blumenauer amendment is a continuation of the gentleman's efforts to suggest that this Nation cannot afford its nuclear deterrence requirements, which are actually the Obama administration's requirements based on the President's personal promises.

The gentleman, notwithstanding the views of the Obama administration, the military leadership, and the senior civilian leadership, wants to unilaterally cut our nuclear forces. He has earlier offered a proposal to try to put Members of this body at odds with the National Guard in an attempt to cut nuclear weapons funding. He has offered the REIN-IN Act to gut the U.S. nuclear deterrent, which is relied upon by 31 American allies, despite the expanding nuclear weapons programs of Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and others.

It is as if the gentleman missed Vladimir Putin's massive and unplanned nuclear weapons exercise just over a week ago and his invasion of Ukraine and his violation of the INF Treaty and his questionable implementation of the New START Treaty.

Perhaps the gentleman should have heard Secretary Hagel's testimony before the Armed Services Committee this March when he said: "Most everybody agrees that our ability to possess nuclear weapons and the capability that has brought us has probably done as much to deter aggression—nuclear deterrence and the start of World War III as any one thing."

Or Chairman Dempsey's testimony when he was asked if, despite the disarmament echo chamber in this town, the debate about the U.S. nuclear posture and our strategic triad is over, he said: "For the record, I can speak for myself and the Joint Chiefs, and you are correct."

But here we are again today and again this year with a new effort to disarm this country's deterrent. It looks harmless: Let's ask for a CBO report.

Has the gentleman asked the CBO if it can do this annual report? I did. They don't have the resources to do such a report.

Is the gentleman aware of the current annual reports we receive? We have the Obama administration submit an annual report detailing these costs. It is called the section 1043 report. We get it every year. We then have the

GAO audit that report each and every year.

These are hundreds and thousands of man-hours to produce and at great expense each and every year. Yet let's add a third report, the gentleman says. Why? Because maybe this report will tell us something different than the other two reports?

What have they all shown us? They have all shown us that, by any reasonable and informed estimate, we are spending less than 5 percent of the defense budget on our nuclear forces—less than 5 percent. It is a historical low.

We will spend approximately \$6 trillion on defense spending over the next 10 years. We will spend over \$30 trillion, including the whole Federal Government. How much on our nuclear forces? According to these reports, approximately \$300 billion.

I am happy to debate the gentleman on the merits of our nuclear forces. What I am not prepared to accept is wasteful, unnecessary annual reports just so the nuclear disarmament crowd can throw another argument against the wall in hopes that maybe something will finally stick that supports its lonely position that we should be unilaterally reducing U.S. nuclear forces without regard to this Nation's security interests or those of our allies. I urge the defeat of this amendment and the return to common sense.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I am listening to my good friend from Alabama, and I don't know if he has actually read my amendment.

I, too, am happy to have a debate on the level of our nuclear spending. That is not what this amendment says. The amendment says that we ought to have a report every year from the CBO that shows what the accurate projections are going to be for the next 10 years.

The gentleman didn't dispute what I said, that the report that the committee requested last year showed that it is underestimated by \$150 billion.

Why don't you want the American people to know good information every year? I am mystified by this.

If you want to increase nuclear spending, you should know the facts. If you want to decrease nuclear spending, you deserve to have the facts. If you just want to fund what we have got, you need to have the facts.

The CBO showed that the Obama administration's plan for maintaining and upgrading the nuclear arsenal is likely to cost some 66 percent more over the next decade than senior Pentagon officials have predicted. Virtually every major project under the National Nuclear Security Administration's oversight is behind schedule and over budget.

I am sorry if the facts are inconvenient for the gentleman, but he should know that if he supports the nuclear program, there will be a day of reckoning. There is no excuse not to have

the best information available. This would simply make sure that we are requesting it from the CBO.

And when we are talking about sums on this order of magnitude, to pretend that the CBO can't do this analysis is silly. Of course they can, and there is no reason they shouldn't do it. And if we approve this amendment, it is more likely that we will have it.

I respectfully request that this amendment be approved, whether you want to cut nuclear weapons, reduce nuclear weapons, or just fund what we have got. I look forward to the day that we have a robust debate on the floor of the House about what course we should take, but in the meantime, there is no excuse not to have good information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 2, 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. 14, 25, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 68, 81, 97, 105, 122, 140, 143, 144, 146, 148, and 161 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 1082. IMPROVEMENT OF FINANCIAL LITERACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—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 each military department (including the Marine Corps) is hereby increased by \$2,500,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(A) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000; and

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in division C for weapons activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for the B61 life extension program and the W76 life extension program are each hereby reduced by \$2,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Page 520, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 1643. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR SPECIFIED FUZES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into contracts for the life-of-type procurement of covered parts of the intercontinental ballistic missile fuze.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 101 and available for Missile Procurement, Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4101, \$4,500,000 shall be available for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under subsection (a).

(c) COVERED PARTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered parts” means commercial off-the-shelf items as defined in section 104 of title 41, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. LINDA T. SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 28 . . . LAND CONVEYANCE, FORMER AIR FORCE NORWALK DEFENSE FUEL SUPPLY POINT, NORWALK, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the City of Norwalk, California (in this section referred to as the “City”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 15 acres at the former Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point for public purposes.

(b) APPLICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall affect the applicability of Federal, State, or local environmental laws and regulations, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), to the Department of the Air Force.

(c) PAYMENT OF COST OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require the City to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation related to the conveyance, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the City in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—

(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance or, if the period of availability for obligations for that appropriation has expired, to the appropriations or fund that is currently available to the Secretary for the same purpose. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(B) Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) are subject to appropriations.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property

to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Add at the end of subtitle E of title I of division A the following:

SEC. 142. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE OCONUS BASING OF THE F-35A.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense has begun its process of permanently stationing the F-35 at installations in the Continental United States (in this section referred to as “CONUS”) and forward-basing Outside the Continental United States (in this section referred to as “OCONUS”).

(2) The Secretary of the Air Force is assessing operating bases for the F-35A to support Pacific Air Forces, which includes two United States candidate bases in Alaska and three foreign OCONUS candidate bases.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force, in the strategic basing process for the F-35A, should place emphasis on the benefits derived from sites that—

(1) are capable of hosting fighter-based bilateral and multilateral training opportunities with international partners;

(2) have sufficient airspace and range capabilities and capacity to meet the training requirements;

(3) have existing facilities to support personnel, operations, and logistics associated with the flying mission;

(4) have limited encroachment that would adversely impact training or operations; and

(5) minimize the overall construction and operational costs.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 47, after line 22, insert the following:
SEC. 302. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS.

(a) FUNDING.—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, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Civil Military Programs, is hereby increased by \$55,000,000.

(b) 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 is hereby reduced by \$55,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

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

SEC. 3 . . . AGREEMENTS WITH LOCAL CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS TO SUPPORT CONDUCTING A MILITARY AIR SHOW OR OPEN HOUSE.

(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—Chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2616. Military air show or open house: agreements with local civic organization; authority to charge nominal admission fee

“(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may enter into a contract or agreement with a non-Federal civic organization to conduct or support an air show or

open house to feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of that Secretary.

“(b) NOMINAL FEES AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may charge, or authorize a civic organization with which the Secretary has entered into a contract or agreement under subsection (a) to charge, the public a nominal admission fee (to be determined by the Secretary) to attend a military air show or open house.

“(c) TREATMENT OF FEES.—Amounts collected as admission fees under subsection (b) for an air show or open house may be retained to cover costs associated with the air show or open house, including costs associated with parking for the air show or open house or the provision of temporary shuttle-bus service for air show or open house visitors. If costs are incurred and covered in advance of the collection of the fees, amounts collected shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account. Any amounts so credited under this subsection shall be subject to the Appropriations process of the United States Congress.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2616. Military air show or open house: agreements with local civic organization; authority to charge nominal admission fee.”

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 72, after line 21, insert the following:
SEC. 354. GIFTS MADE FOR THE BENEFIT OF MILITARY MUSICAL UNITS.

Section 974(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “The Secretary concerned may” and inserting “The Secretary concerned shall”.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 5 . . . DEFERRED RETIREMENT OF CHAPLAINS.

Section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) DEFERRED RETIREMENT OF CHAPLAINS.—(1) The Secretary of the military department concerned may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), defer the retirement under subsection (a) of an officer who is appointed or designated as a chaplain if the Secretary determines that such deferral is in the best interest of the military department concerned.

“(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), a deferment under this subsection may not extend beyond the first day of the month following the month in which the officer becomes 68 years of age.

“(3) The Secretary of the military department concerned may extend a deferment under this subsection beyond the day referred to in paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that extension of the deferment is necessary for the needs of the military department concerned. Such an extension shall be made on a case-by-case basis and shall be for such period as the Secretary considers appropriate.”

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle A of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 514. COMPLIANCE WITH EFFICIENCIES DIRECTIVE.

By not later than December 31, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the number of flag officers and generals are reduced to comply with the Department of Defense efficiencies directive dated March 14, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

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

SEC. 5. ELECTRONIC TRACKING OF CERTAIN RESERVE DUTY.

The Secretary of Defense shall establish an electronic means by which members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces can track their operational active-duty service performed after January 28, 2008, under section 12301(a), 12301(d), 12301(g), 12302, or 12304 of title 10, United States Code. The tour calculator shall specify early retirement credit authorized for each qualifying tour of active duty, as well as cumulative early reserve retirement credit authorized to date under section 12731(f) of such title.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 5. NATIONAL GUARD CYBER PROTECTION TEAMS.

(a) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress made by the Army National Guard to establish 10 Cyber Protection Teams composed of members of the National Guard to perform duties relating to analysis and protection in support of programs to prepare for and respond to emergencies involving an attack or natural disaster impacting a computer, electronic, or cyber network.

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

(1) A timeframe of when stationing of the Cyber Protection Teams will be finalized.

(2) A timeframe of activation of the Cyber Protection Teams and whether the teams will be activated at the same time or staggered over time.

(3) A description of what manning and basing requirements have been established.

(4) The number and location of nominations received for a Cyber Protection Team and the activation date estimate provided in each nomination.

(5) An assessment of the range of stated cost projections included in the nominations.

(6) An assessment of any identified patterns regarding ease or difficulty of staffing individuals with required credentials within particular regions.

(7) Any additional information deemed relevant by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 5. REVISION TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY ON RETENTION OF EVIDENCE IN A SEXUAL ASSAULT CASE TO ALLOW RETURN OF PERSONAL PROPERTY UPON COMPLETION OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS.

Section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1435; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **RETURN OF PERSONAL PROPERTY UPON COMPLETION OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (c)(4)(A), personal property retained as evidence in connection with an incident of sexual assault involving a member of the Armed Forces may be returned to the rightful owner of such property after the conclusion of all legal, adverse action, and administrative proceedings related to such incident.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

Page 195, after line 7, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) mental health and substance use disorders, traumatic brain injury, and suicide are being experienced at alarming levels among members of the Armed Forces;

(2) members of the Armed Forces should have adequate access to the support and care they need;

(3) public-private mental health partnerships can provide the Department of Defense with an enhanced and unique capability to treat members of the Armed Forces;

(4) the Department of Defense should fully implement the pilot program authorized under section 706 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 10101 note; Public Law 112-239) for purposes of enhancing the efforts of the Department of Defense in research, treatment, education, and outreach on mental health and substance use disorders and traumatic brain injury in members of the National Guard and Reserves.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 827. DEBARMENT REQUIRED OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF FRAUDULENT USE OF “MADE IN AMERICA” LABELS.

(a) **DEBARMENT REQUIRED.**—Subsection (a) of section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Secretary shall” and all that follows through the period and inserting “the person shall be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense unless the Secretary waives the debarment under subsection (b).”.

(b) **WAIVER AUTHORITY AND NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—Section 2410f of such title is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

“(b) **WAIVER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.**—The Secretary may waive a debarment required by subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that the exercise of such a waiver would be in the national security interests of the United States.

“(c) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees annually, not later than March 1 of each year, of any exercise of the waiver authority under subsection (b).”.

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—Section 2410f of such title is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “DEBARMENT REQUIRED.—” after “(a)” ; and

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated by subsection (b), by inserting “DEFINITION.—” before “In this section”.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1065. BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS OF THE CREATION OF AN ACTIVE DUTY ASSOCIATION FOR THE 68TH AIR REFUELING WING.

(a) **BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall conduct a business case analysis of the creation of a 4-PAA (Personnel-Only) KC-135R active association with the 168th Air Refueling Wing. Such analysis shall include consideration of—

(1) any efficiencies or cost savings achieved assuming the 168th Air Refueling Wing meets 100 percent of current air refueling requirements after the active association is in place;

(2) improvements to the mission requirements of the 168th Air Refueling Wing and Air Mobility Command; and

(3) effects on the operations of Air Mobility Command.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the business case analysis conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. . REPORT ON CERTAIN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY AND CRITICAL NATIONAL SECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification of each instance in which the Secretary or the Director determine through analysis or reporting that an information technology or telecommunications component from a company suspected of being influenced by a foreign country, or a suspected affiliate of such a company, is competing for or has been awarded a contract to include the technology of such company or such affiliate into a covered network.

(b) **TIME OF NOTIFICATION.**—Each notification required under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary or the Director makes a determination described in such subsection.

(c) **ELEMENTS OF NOTIFICATION.**—Each notification submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the instance described in subsection (a), including an identification of the company of interest and the covered network affected;

(2) an analysis of the potential risks and the actions that can be taken to mitigate such risks; and

(3) a description of any follow up or other response actions to be taken.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

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

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) **COVERED NETWORK.**—The term “covered network” includes—

(A) information technology or telecommunications networks of the Department of Defense or the intelligence community; and

(B) information technology or telecommunications networks of network operators supporting systems in proximity to Department of Defense or intelligence community facilities.

(3) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning

given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. . PLAN TO REDUCE RUSSIAN FEDERATION NUCLEAR FORCE DEPENDENCIES ON UKRAINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Russian Federation relies on the Ukrainian defense industry for certain elements of its land-based nuclear ballistic missile force, the Russian Strategic Rocket Force.

(2) Press reports indicate that Ukraine's Yuzhnoye Design Bureau played a prominent role during the Soviet era in producing heavy silo-based Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

(3) These land-based missiles include the RS-20 ICBM, known by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Designator, SATAN.

(4) This missile has been reported to be deployed with as many as 10 independently targetable nuclear reentry vehicles.

(5) In a press conference on May 13, 2014, Russian Federation Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin stated that his country would discontinue the sale of Russia-made rocket engines to the United States if they will be used for military purposes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should promptly enter into discussions with the Government of Ukraine to ensure a halt to the activities of the Yuzhnoye Design Bureau and any other Ukrainian industry that supports the military or military industrial base of the Russian Federation while Russia is violating its commitments under the Budapest Memorandum, illegally occupying Ukrainian territory and supporting groups that are inciting violence and fomenting secessionist movements in Ukraine.

(c) PLAN.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan on how the United States Government intends to work with the Government of Ukraine to accomplish the goals expressed in subsection (b) and any recommendations it has for how the United States and its allies could benefit from the capability of the Yuzhnoye Design Bureau.

AMENDMENT NO. 140 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. . SPACE PROTECTION STRATEGY.

Section 911(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Fiscal years 2026 through 2030.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Page 516, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 1636. IMPROVEMENT TO BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT ON DELIVERY PLATFORMS FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THE NUCLEAR COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.

Section 492(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, and the ability to meet operational availability requirements for,” after “military effectiveness of”.

AMENDMENT NO. 144 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

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

SEC. 1636. REPORTS AND BRIEFINGS OF STRATEGIC ADVISORY GROUP.

Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress, under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, a budget for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees each report and briefing provided by the Strategic Advisory Group established pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), including any subgroup thereof and any successor advisory group, to the Commander during the one-year period preceding the date of such submission. The Commander may include with each such submission any additional views the Commander determines appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL OF NEW YORK

Page 508, after line 9, add the following new section:

SEC. 1622. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ROLE OF NATIONAL GUARD IN DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES AGAINST CYBER ATTACKS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) members of the National Guard may possess knowledge of critical infrastructure in the States in which the members serve that may be of value for purposes of defending such infrastructure against cyber threats;

(2) traditional members of the National Guard and National Guard technicians may have experience in both the private and public sector that could benefit the readiness of the Department of Defense's cyber force and the development of cyber capabilities;

(3) the long-standing relationship the National Guard has with local and civil authorities may be beneficial for purposes of providing for a coordinated response to a cyber attack and defending against cyber threats;

(4) the States are already working to establish cyber partnerships with the National Guard; and

(5) the National Guard has a role in the defense of the United States against cyber threats and consideration should be given to how the National Guard might be integrated into a comprehensive national approach for cyber defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

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

SEC. 1643. PLAN TO COUNTER CERTAIN GROUND-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILES AND CRUISE MISSILES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 5, 2014, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that “[w]e are concerned about Russian activity that appears to be inconsistent with the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. We've raised the issue with Russia. They provided an answer that was not satisfactory to us, and we will, we told them that the issue is not closed, and we will continue to raise this.” Congress shares this concern regarding Russian behavior that is “inconsistent with” or in violation or circumvention of the INF Treaty.

(2) The Commander of the U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, stated on April 2, 2014, that “a weapon capability that violates the INF, that is introduced into the greater European land mass is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with. . . I would not judge how the alliance will choose to react, but I would say

they will have to consider what to do about it. . . It can't go unanswered.”.

(3) The Director of the Missile Defense Agency stated on March 25, 2014, that Aegis Ashore missile defense sites, including those to be deployed in the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Romania, could be reconfigured to deal with the threat of intermediate-range ground launched cruise missiles with modest changes to “the software, [and] with a minor hardware addition.”.

(4) The “Report on Conventional Prompt Global Strike Options if Exempt from the Restrictions of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics” provided to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in September 2013 by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated, “[i]n the absence of the INF Treaty, four types of weapons systems could assist in closing the existing JROC-validated capability gap: (1) Modifications to existing short range or tactical weapon systems to extend range; (2) Forward-based, ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs); (3) Forward-based, ground-launched intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs); and (4) Forward-based, ground-launched intermediate-range missiles with trajectory shaping vehicles (TSVs).”.

(5) The report further stated that, “[b]ecause of INF restrictions, examination of prohibited concepts has not been performed by industry or the Services. Trade studies regarding capability, affordability, and development timelines would have to be completed prior to providing an accurate estimate of cost, technology risk, and timeline advantages that could be achieved with respect to these concepts. Extensive knowledge could be leveraged from past and current land- and sea-based systems to assist in potential development and deployment of these currently prohibited concepts.”.

(6) President Obama stated in Prague in April 2009 that “Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something.”.

(7) The Nuclear Posture Review of 2010 stated, “it is not enough to detect non-compliance; violators must know that they will face consequences when they are caught.”.

(8) The July 2010 Verifiability Assessment released by the Department of State on the New START Treaty, and as quoted in a hearing of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, stated: “[t]he costs and risks of Russian cheating or breakout, on the other hand, would likely be very significant” and that the Russian Federation would be unlikely to cheat because of the “financial and international political costs of such an action.”.

(b) PLAN FOR TESTING OF AEGIS ASHORE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall develop a plan to test, by not later than December 31, 2015, the capability of the Aegis Ashore system, including pursuant to any appropriate modifications to the hardware or software of such system, to counter intermediate-range ground launched cruise missiles.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan under paragraph (1), including, if determined appropriate by the Director, whether the Director determines that such plan should be implemented.

(c) PLAN TO DEVELOP CERTAIN GROUND-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILES AND CRUISE MISSILES.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Russian Federation is not in complete and verifiable compliance

with its obligations under the INF Treaty, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) develop a plan for the research and development of intermediate range ballistic and cruise missiles, including through trade studies regarding capability, affordability, and development timelines, for which there are validated military requirements; and

(2) by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the congressional defense committees the plan developed under paragraph (1), including, if determined appropriate by the Secretary, whether the Secretary determines that such plan should be implemented.

(d) INF TREATY DEFINED.—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.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 729. EVALUATION OF WOUNDED WARRIOR CARE AND TRANSITION PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that gaining new ideas and an objective perspective are critical to addressing issues regarding the treatment of wounded warriors.

(b) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a private organization to evaluate the wounded warrior care and transition program of the Department of Defense. Such evaluation shall identify deficiencies in the treatment of wounded warriors and offer recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and Congress to improve such treatment. The Secretary may not award a contract to a private organization to carry out such evaluation unless the private organization received less than 20 percent of the annual revenue of the organization during the previous five years from contracts with the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(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, is hereby increased by \$20,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(A) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000; and

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in division C for weapons activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for the B61 life extension program and the W76 life extension program are each hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Chair, I rise to commend the Armed Services Committee for their hard work. There is a lot going on, and they deserve a lot of credit.

I just wanted to take the opportunity to highlight an aircraft that is a vital component of our national security, and particularly to our Navy. That is the E-2D Hawkeye, which is the Navy's carrier-based airborne early warning and battle management command and control system. It provides theater air and missile defense, synthesizing information from multiple onboard and off-board sensors, making complex tactical decisions, and disseminating actionable information to Joint Forces.

Our ability to take an aircraft carrier and move that anywhere in the world and then project power from there is critical to our national security, and the E-2D serves as the eyes of the fleet, protecting our assets and our forces. I just want to say that I think it is vitally important that our fleet is equipped with these.

There is no better person that I know of in this body to speak to the importance of the E-2D than my colleague from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE, who is also a lieutenant commander in the Navy Reserve and is a former E-2 pilot himself. So I will yield to my friend from Oklahoma to discuss the importance of this aircraft.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Well, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, who is championing a cause that is near and dear to my heart, a platform that I have spent many hours in. I flew combat off of an aircraft carrier in the Persian Gulf and the north Arabian Sea. In the E-2 Hawkeye, I flew combat in Afghanistan, flew combat in Iraq.

□ 2030

I can tell you that the missions that we did, airborne battle space command and control, and control of the assets that provide close air support to our troops on the ground, was critically important to the mission in both theaters. I can tell you that we did air intercept control in order to have dominance of the skies. We provided airborne early warning.

It is not without reason that the E-2 Hawkeye is the first aircraft that comes off of the aircraft carrier when we launch a mission, and it is the last aircraft to come back. We are the first ones to the fight, and we are the last ones home.

It is also not without reason that when the E-2 gets airborne, when the rest of the air wing is on the deck and the ship is steaming across the ocean, the Hawkeye is always working because we are that airborne early warning asset that can provide threat recognition to the carrier battle group.

The Hawkeye is a critical node in America's force structure, and I would

say that I was also involved in generating the requirements for the next generation Hawkeye, the E-2D. And Congress has recognized the value of the E-2D by providing the Navy with multiyear procurement authority. Multiyear procurement drives down costs by enabling block buys, improving supplier surety, and stabilizing production lines. As my friend from Florida knows, the Navy requested four E-2Ds for the fiscal year 15 budget request, which is one less anticipated.

I would just like to thank the chairman of the committee for being able to work with us on ensuring that we can get another E-2D Hawkeye.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to express support for strong Buy American provisions within the Department of Defense procurement policy. I would like to thank Chairman McKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, and Ranking Member SWALWELL for engaging in this colloquy to discuss our shared goal to promote increased procurement of domestically manufactured solar devices for use by the Department of Defense.

The Buy American Act is especially important when it comes to supporting nascent American industries, and strong Buy American policies can assist development of domestic manufacturing capability with regard to renewable energy. Currently, the Department of Defense is required to comply with Buy American Act provisions for procurement of energy produced from solar panels if those panels are located on government property and the electricity produced by the panels is reserved exclusively for use by the Department.

Recently, we have witnessed the development of large-scale solar installations that are not located on government property, though the electricity produced is still exclusively used by the Department of Defense. I support a minor language change that would require DOD's procurement process to comply with the Buy American Act for electricity that is exclusively used by the Department of Defense or is generated from solar devices located on government property.

This small change is worthy of support. The Congressional Budget Office has scored this proposal as costing \$2 million over a 10-year budget window, and my amendment was not made in order because of this score. I understand CBO rules, but I strongly submit that this investment in domestic manufacturing not only strengthens our energy independence, but also strengthens our industrial base. I hope the chairman and ranking member will work with me to advance this important issue.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her work in this

area, and I appreciate her efforts to advance U.S. manufacturing and our industrial base, and I thank her, again, for her hard work on this issue. I look forward to working with you as we move forward on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would like to address two amendments that I offered that are included in the en bloc amendment, one that deals with expanding financial resources and tools for servicemembers and one that funds an independent study to improve wounded warrior care.

For too long, unscrupulous lenders have targeted servicemembers on military bases with financial products that could have long-term negative impacts on their family's financial security. Inadequate financial understanding or literacy training on some of these financial products can lead to financial difficulty for servicemembers. Many servicemembers often require security clearances to perform their duties, and financial difficulties and the loss of a clearance can have an enormous impact on military combat readiness.

This first amendment that I offer would allocate \$10 million to expand financial literacy resources for incoming and transitioning servicemembers to ensure that they are not unfairly targeted by predatory lenders.

The other amendment that is included is an important one to fund an independent study to improve wounded warrior care. While the DOD is still confronting significant challenges and issues regarding its care and transition of wounded warriors, and while improvements have been made, it is obvious that wounded warriors are still failing to receive the care that they need and that they deserve. Caring for these individuals who have served honorably should—and I know always will be—one of our most solemn duties.

For this reason, a review, a comprehensive review, an independent and comprehensive review and study of this type should be awarded to an entity that is free of any current obligation; 20 percent of its revenues in the last several years should not have come from contracts from the DOD or the VA, ensuring independence. It is really important that we take a close look at how we are providing services to these servicemembers, and this independent study would do so.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R.

4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

It facilitates the transfer of a portion of the U.S. Air Force Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, also known as the Norwalk Tank Farm, to the city of Norwalk. If enacted, it would allow 15 acres of the 51-acre area to be designated for public purposes and transferred to city hands. City officials have worked tirelessly for over a decade, and this amendment is a reflection of the compromise reached by the U.S. Air Force and the city of Norwalk.

My amendment is of significant importance for my district. Once this land is transferred, this currently blighted property will mean real opportunity for the city of Norwalk and the surrounding communities. This property is currently located next to an elementary school and a child care learning center. Once the land has been completely cleaned and remediated and the park is built, children will have somewhere safe to go after school and on weekends.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, the ability of our national labs to meet their mission relies on the strength of their foundational capabilities. I submitted an amendment that would give the Directors of our national laboratories the authority to accept grant funding from nonprofits and foundations for scientific research that supports the core missions of these labs.

After discussion with the committee staff, rather than offering this amendment tonight, I look forward to working with Chairman ROGERS of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee and Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH of the Armed Services Committee to find an acceptable solution on this issue.

I also want to thank Mr. MCKEON for his service and his time. It has really been an honor to get to know him, and I continue to look forward to working with him for many years to come.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico. I agree with the importance of the national labs. I look forward to working with you to find ways to strengthen their capabilities and meet their important missions. I expect we will be able to find a way to ensure nonprofits have access to our national laboratories without using defense funding to subsidize such work.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I appreciate all the staff's time on this.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chairman, my amendment prohibits construction of any projects in Afghanistan over \$500,000—unless the U.S. Government can conduct proper audits, inspection, and oversight.

Up to \$79 billion has been authorized for new projects in this bill, most of which are outside the area in which our personnel can travel and operate safely and therefore will most likely go uninspected and unaudited. To date, \$60 billion of the \$100 billion of these so-called nation-building projects are completely unaccounted for.

The blue area here in this first chart shows where our military and civilian personnel were allowed to travel and operate safely in the year 2009. The blue area in the second chart shows how dramatically the safe areas have been reduced.

Moreover, since traditional banking services do not exist in these non-blue, non-safe areas, contracts are financed with truckloads of cash. It is the perfect recipe for fraud, graft, and abuse. It is time to stop it. Our Nation's taxpayers and our soldiers deserve better.

Madam Chairman, Members of the House, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to fix the Department of Defense (DoD) policy with respect to military bands.

I want to thank my friend, Congressman PATRICK MEEHAN, for cosponsoring this important amendment. I also want to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their support.

For decades, military musical units have accepted assistance from community organizations to travel and perform at public events such as ceremonies and parades at no cost to taxpayers.

Last April, the DoD decided to no longer accept such support, forcing military bands to cancel numerous public performances across the country.

We learned that this new policy was issued because gifts from community organizations were not credited to the appropriate account.

To combat this problem, last year Congressman MEEHAN and I sponsored an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (NDAA) in order to credit these contributions to the appropriate accounts, and thus, allow military bands to perform at community events. Our amendment was adopted. A version was included as Section 351 of NDAA, as enacted into Public Law 133-66.

Despite the intent of the amendment, it has come to our attention that, although the Secretary of Defense is allowed to accept outside donations, his office likely will continue the status quo and prevent military musical units from receiving assistance from outside organizations.

It is hard to believe that during a time of tight budgets DoD would reject assistance from community organizations to facilitate band performances.

It would be in the financial interest of DoD to continue to allow military bands, such as the Marine bands, to travel with the assistance of community organizations.

Additionally, public performances by military bands bring a sense of patriotism and community to our cities and towns.

It also increases goodwill and helps to enliven community events, increasing attendance and economic activity.

The intent behind the Section 351 of Public Law 133–66 is clear—to allow bands, like the Marine Band, to perform at community events when the expenses are fully covered by a private organization.

In early May, Congressman MEEHAN and I sent a letter to DoD expressing our frustration with it continuing the current policy. We have not yet received a response from DoD on this issue.

Since DoD apparently is choosing not to abide by the intent of our original amendment, we offered this new amendment to require DoD to accept gifts for military bands. Our amendment removes the discretion of DoD.

This simple amendment will once again allow military musical units to travel and perform at community events at no cost to taxpayers.

I urge all Members to support the amendment.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 26 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 27 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part A of House Report 113–460.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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 D of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 3143. BUDGET INCREASE FOR DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 3102 for defense environmental cleanup, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, is hereby increased by \$20,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts authorized to be appropriated

in this title for weapons activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign is hereby reduced by \$20,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, our nuclear weapons production programs played a pivotal role in our Nation's defense for decades. It helped end World War II, and it helped end the cold war. But these programs created a large amount of radioactive nuclear waste, and the Federal Government has a legal responsibility to clean up this waste.

This amendment restores a portion of the proposed reduction for the Department of Energy's environmental management program, which is tasked with cleaning up the nuclear defense waste at sites across our country.

Hanford's Richland Operations Office in my district is one of the defense nuclear waste sites, and it is facing a cut of over \$100 million, putting cleanup progress and legally enforceable cleanup commitments at risk.

Even at a time of tight budget constraints, the Federal Government must meet existing legal obligations to clean up its defense nuclear waste. Existing legal obligations of the Federal Government, like cleanup of its nuclear waste sites, must be met before funding optional activities, regardless of how valuable those other activities may be.

By adding back \$20 million for the defense environmental management program—a small portion of the overall cut—this amendment helps to ensure that cleanup can move forward safely, efficiently, and in a timely manner.

□ 2045

It would help ensure that the Richland Operations Office can complete the successful and nearly complete River Corridor Closure Project and meet cleanup commitments.

I might add that the river I am talking about that this River Corridor Closure Project abuts is the Columbia River, which is a main waterway through central Washington, so I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition on behalf of the ranking member.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the Hastings amendment, and while I understand and appreciate the gentleman from Washington's interest in environ-

mental cleanup, I am afraid that it does so at the expense of research.

Inertial confinement fusion is critical to our national security. It keeps our nuclear weapons safe and ready at a time of growing threats across the globe.

This amendment does not just target research at the National Ignition Facility—which is in my congressional district, which includes Livermore, California—it also tries to cut the whole budget for inertial confinement fusion.

It ropes in the Z facility at Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico and the OMEGA laser at the University of Rochester in New York.

Budgets right now are tight, and I know all Members would welcome the chance to add more money to priorities they believe in, but it is a mistake to try to fund such priorities by short-changing critical science that helps us in our national security mission, as well as meet our future energy needs.

This science keeps us safe. It will also eventually revolutionize how we think about and produce energy, and we can't let ourselves fall behind or cede leadership to other nations who are making large investments in inertial confinement fusion, including France, Russia, and China.

I ask all Members to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I simply want to say, Madam Chair, that the environmental management program is a program that is the result of our war efforts going back to the Second World War. As I mentioned in my opening statement, we won the Second World War because of this activity and won the cold war largely because of this activity, but developing nuclear weapons creates a tremendous amount of waste, and that is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

I mentioned Hanford, and I mentioned one of the projects at Hanford, and I want to remind my colleagues of how much nuclear waste is stored underground at Hanford.

Fifty-six million gallons of radioactive/hazardous waste is stored underground on the upper plateau at Hanford. If you were to quantify how much 56 million gallons would be, it would fill up over 20 House chambers.

This amendment does not address particularly that program, but I just want to remind my colleagues that cleaning up this waste is a massive, massive task, and it must be done, simply because what the programs did initially by ending the war, so I urge

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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 130, 133, 139, and 141 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 5. ENHANCEMENT OF PARTICIPATION OF MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND BOARDS FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.**—Section 1552 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):

“(g) Any medical advisory opinion issued to a board established under subsection (a)(1) with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces who was diagnosed while serving in the armed forces as experiencing a mental health disorder shall include the opinion of a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist if the request for correction of records concerned relates to a mental health disorder.”

(b) **BOARDS FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL.**—

(1) **REVIEW FOR CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS WITH PTSD OR TBI.**—Subsection (d)(1) of section 1553 of such title is amended by striking “physician, clinical psychologist, or psychiatrist” the second place it appears and inserting “clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with training on mental health issues connected with post traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury (as applicable)”.

(2) **REVIEW FOR CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DIAGNOSES.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) In the case of a former member of the armed forces (other than a former member covered by subsection (d)) who was diagnosed while serving in the armed forces as experiencing a mental health disorder, a board established under this section to review the former member’s discharge or dismissal shall include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with special training on mental health disorders.”

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 108, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 528. PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 520d. Preliminary mental health assessments

“(a) **PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.**—Before any individual enlists in an armed force or is commissioned as an officer in an armed force, the Secretary concerned shall provide the individual with a mental health assessment. The Secretary shall use such results as a baseline for any subsequent mental health examinations, including such examinations provided under sections 1074f and 1074m of this title.

“(b) **USE OF ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary may not consider the results of a mental health assessment conducted under subsection (a) in determining the assignment or promotion of a member of the Armed Forces.

“(c) **APPLICATION OF PRIVACY LAWS.**—With respect to applicable laws and regulations relating to the privacy of information, the Secretary shall treat a mental health assessment conducted under subsection (a) in the same manner as the medical records of a member of the armed forces.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 520c the following new item:

“520d. Preliminary mental health assessments.”

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health shall submit to Congress and the Secretary of Defense a report on preliminary mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces.

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Recommendations with respect to establishing a preliminary mental health assessment of members of the Armed Forces to bring mental health screenings to parity with physical screenings of members.

(B) Recommendations with respect to the composition of the mental health assessment, best practices, and how to track assessment changes relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions.

(3) **COORDINATION.**—The National Institute of Mental Health shall carry out paragraph (1) in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the surgeons general of the military departments, and other relevant experts.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF PHONE SERVICE FOR PROMPT REPORTING OF HAZING INVOLVING A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code) shall develop and implement a phone service through which an individual can anonymously call to report incidents of hazing in that branch of the Armed Forces.

(b) **HAZING DESCRIBED.**—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard operates) shall use the definition of hazing contained in the August 28, 1997, Secretary of Defense Policy Memorandum, which defined hazing as any conduct whereby a member of the Armed Forces, regardless of branch or rank, without proper authority causes another member to suffer, or be exposed to, any activity which is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Soliciting or coercing another person to per-

petrate any such activity is also considered hazing. Hazing need not involve physical contact among or between members of the Armed Forces. Hazing can be verbal or psychological in nature. Actual or implied consent to acts of hazing does not eliminate the culpability of the perpetrator.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 548. ROLE OF MILITARY SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS IN ADDRESSING UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF SPOUSES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CLOSING THE WAGE GAP BETWEEN MILITARY SPOUSES AND THEIR CIVILIAN COUNTERPARTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Members of the Armed Forces and their families make enormous sacrifices in defense of the United States.

(2) Military spouses face a unique lifestyle marked by frequent moves, increased family responsibility during deployments, and limited career opportunities in certain geographic locations.

(3) These circumstances present significant challenges to military spouses who desire to build a portable career commensurate with their skills, including education and experience.

(4) According to a recent Department of Defense survey, the unemployment rate for civilians married to a military member is 25 percent, but the unemployment rate is 33 percent for spouses of junior enlisted members. The same survey revealed that 85 percent of military spouses want or need to work.

(5) A recent Military Officers Association of American (MOAA)/Institute for Veterans and Military Families’ (IVMF) Military Spouse Employment Report revealed that an overwhelming ninety percent of female military spouses are underemployed.

(6) The Department of Defense has demonstrated its commitment to helping military spouses obtain employment by creating the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP), the Military Spouse Career Center, and the Military Spouse Career Advancement Accounts (MyCAA). More than 61,000 military spouses have been hired as part of the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP) since the MSEP launch in June 2011.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should continue to work to reduce the unemployment and underemployment of spouses of members of the Armed Forces (in this section referred to as “military spouses”) and support closing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts;

(2) in this process, the Secretary should prioritize efforts that assist military spouses in pursuing portable careers that match their skill set, including education and experience; and

(3) in evaluating the effectiveness of military spouse employment programs, the Secretary should collect information that provides a comprehensive assessment of the program, including whether program goals are being achieved.

(c) **DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO EFFORTS TO ADDRESS UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF MILITARY SPOUSES.**—

(1) **DATA COLLECTION REQUIRED.**—In addition to monitoring the number of military spouses who obtain employment through military spouse employment programs, the Secretary of Defense shall collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of military spouse

employment programs in addressing the underemployment of military spouses and in closing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts. Information collected shall include whether positions obtained by military spouses through military spouse employment programs match their education and experience.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report evaluating the progress of military spouse employment programs in reducing military spouse unemployment, reducing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts, and addressing the underemployment of military spouses.

(d) MILITARY SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “military spouse employment programs” means the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP).

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 127, line 10, insert after the period the following: “In establishing the eligibility requirements to be used by the program manager for the selection of the civilian employment staffing agencies, the Secretary of Defense shall also take into account civilian employment staffing agencies that are willing to work and consult with State and county Veterans Affairs offices and State National Guard offices, when appropriate.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. COOK OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 553. DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PILOT PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members in the National Guard and Reserves.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The pilot program shall be offered to, and administered by, the adjutants general appointed under section 314 of title 32, United States Code.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition on the provision of funds under this section to a State to support the operation of the pilot program in the State, the State must agree to contribute an amount, derived from non-Federal sources, equal to at least 30 percent of the funds provided by the Secretary of Defense under this section.

(d) DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM MODEL.—The pilot program should follow a job placement program model that focuses on working one-on-one with a member of a reserve component to cost-effectively provide job placement services, including services such as identifying unemployed and under employed members, job matching services, resume editing, interview preparation, and post-employment follow up. Development of the pilot program should be informed by State direct employment programs for members of the reserve components, such as the programs conducted in California and South Carolina.

(e) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop outcome measurements to evaluate the success of the pilot program.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the results of the pilot program. The Secretary shall prepare the report in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(2) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—A report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description and assessment of the effectiveness and achievements of the pilot program, including the number of members of the reserve components hired and the cost-per-placement of participating members.

(B) An assessment of the impact of the pilot program and increased reserve component employment levels on the readiness of members of the reserve components.

(C) A comparison of the pilot program to other programs conducted by the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs to provide unemployment and underemployment support to members of the reserve components.

(D) Any other matters considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(g) LIMITATION ON TOTAL FISCAL-YEAR OBLIGATIONS.—The total amount obligated by the Secretary of Defense to carry out the pilot program for any fiscal year may not exceed \$20,000,000.

(h) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority to carry out the pilot program expires September 30, 2018.

(2) EXTENSION.—Upon the expiration of the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may extend the pilot program for not more than two additional fiscal years.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 553. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY ATHLETIC PROGRAMS.

Section 9362 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (e), (f), and (g) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(e) ACCEPTANCE OF SUPPORT.—

“(1) SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM THE CORPORATION.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Secretary of the Air Force may accept from the corporation funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(2) FUNDS RECEIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may charge fees for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy. The Secretary may accept and retain fees for services and other benefits provided incidental to the operation of its athletic programs, including fees from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, fees from athletic conferences, game guarantees from other educational institutions, fees for ticketing or licensing, and other consideration provided incidental to the execution of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that contributions accepted under this subsection do not reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Air Force, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner, or compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Air Force, or any individual involved in such a program.

“(f) LEASES AND LICENSES.—

“(1) SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM THE CORPORATION.—In accordance with section 2667 of this title, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into leases or licenses with the corporation for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. Consideration provided under such a lease or license may be provided in the form of funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(2) SUPPORT TO THE CORPORATION.—The Secretary may provide support services to the corporation without charge while the corporation conducts its support activities at the Academy. In this section, the term ‘support services’ includes the providing of utilities, office furnishings and equipment, communications services, records staging and archiving, audio and video support, and security systems in conjunction with the leasing or licensing of property. Any such support services may only be provided without any liability of the United States to the corporation.

“(g) CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with the corporation for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. Notwithstanding section 2304(k) of this title, the Secretary may enter such contracts or cooperative agreements on a sole source basis pursuant to section 2304(c)(5) of this title. Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, a cooperative agreement under this section may be used to acquire property, services, or travel for the direct benefit or use of the Academy athletic programs.

“(h) TRADEMARKS AND SERVICE MARKS.—

“(1) LICENSING, MARKETING, AND SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENTS.—Consistent with section 2260 (other than subsection (d)) of this title, an agreement under subsection (g) may authorize the corporation to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—No such licensing, marketing, or sponsorship agreement may be entered into if it would reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Air Force, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner, or if the Secretary determines that the use of the trademark or service mark would compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Air Force, or any individual involved in such a program.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Add at the end of subtitle F of title V the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 553. REPORT ON TUITION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the requirement of the Army, effective January 1, 2014, that members of the Army may become eligible for the Army’s tuition assistance program only after serving a period of 1 year after completing certain training courses, such as advance individual training, officer candidate school, and the basic officer leader course.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the Secretary’s—

(1) evaluation of the potential savings in costs resulting from requiring all service members to wait a period of 1 year after training described in subsection (a) before becoming eligible for the Army’s tuition assistance program;

(2) evaluation of the impact that the 1-year waiting period described in subsection (a) will have on recruitment for the National Guard; and

(3) explanation of the extent to which the qualities of the National Guard, including the role of college students and college-bound students in the National Guard, were considered before reaching the decision to

require all service members to wait a period of 1 year before becoming eligible for the Army's tuition assistance program.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 132, lines 18 and 19, strike "4-year" and insert "5-year".

Page 133, lines 9 and 10, strike "4-year" and insert "5-year".

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. GERLACH OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 5. RECOGNITION OF WERETH MASSACRE OF 11 AFRICAN-AMERICAN SOLDIERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY DURING THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE.

Congress officially recognizes the dedicated service and ultimate sacrifice on behalf of the United States of the 11 African-American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion of the United States Army who were massacred in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge on December 17, 1944.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 574. REPORT ON ARMY REVIEW, FINDINGS, AND ACTIONS PERTAINING TO MEDAL OF HONOR NOMINATION OF CAPTAIN WILLIAM L. ALBRACHT.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) conduct a review of the initial review, findings, and actions undertaken by the Army in connection with the Medal of Honor nomination of Captain William L. Albracht; and

(2) submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the review required by this section, including an accounting of all evidence submitted with regard to the nomination.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MS. CHU OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 5. COMPTROLLER GENERAL AND MILITARY DEPARTMENT REPORTS ON HAZING IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the designated congressional committees a report on the policies to prevent hazing, and systems initiated to track incidents of hazing, in each of the Armed Forces, including reserve components, officer candidate schools, military service academies, military academy preparatory schools, and basic training and professional schools for enlisted members.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An evaluation of the definition of hazing by the Armed Forces.

(B) A description of the criteria used, and the methods implemented, in the systems to track incidents of hazing in the Armed Forces.

(C) An assessment of the following:

(i) The scope of hazing in each Armed Force.

(ii) The policies in place and the training on hazing provided to members throughout the course of their careers for each Armed Force.

(iii) The available outlets through which victims or witnesses of hazing can report hazing both within and outside their chain of command, and whether or not anonymous reporting is permitted.

(iv) The actions taken to mitigate hazing incidents in each Armed Force.

(v) The effectiveness of the training and policies in place regarding hazing.

(vi) The number of alleged and substantiated incidents of hazing over the last five years for each Armed Force, the nature of these cases and actions taken to address such matters through non-judicial and judicial action.

(D) An evaluation of the additional actions, if any, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security propose to take to further address the incidence of hazing in the Armed Forces.

(E) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for improving hazing prevention programs, policies, and other actions taken to address hazing within the Armed Forces.

(3) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "designated congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(b) MILITARY DEPARTMENT REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Secretary of a military department, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of each Armed Force under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing an update to the hazing reports required by section 534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1726).

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report on an Armed Force required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A discussion of the policies of the Armed Force for preventing and responding to incidents of hazing, including discussion of any changes or newly implemented policies since the submission of the reports required by section 534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

(B) A description of the methods implemented to track and report, including report anonymously, incidents of hazing in the Armed Force.

(C) An assessment by the Secretary submitting such report of the following:

(i) The scope of the problem of hazing in the Armed Force.

(ii) The effectiveness of training on recognizing, reporting and preventing hazing provided members of the Armed Force.

(iii) The actions taken to prevent and respond to hazing incidents in the Armed Force since the submission of the reports under such section.

(D) A description of the additional actions, if any, the Secretary submitting such report and the Chief of Staff of the Armed Force propose to take to further address the incidence of hazing in the Armed Force.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

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

SEC. 5. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH STUDY OF RISK AND RESILIENCY OF UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESERVATION OF THE FORCE AND FAMILIES PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Director of the National Institute of Mental Health shall conduct a study of the risk and resiliency of the United States Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of the United States Special Operations Command's Preservation of the Force and Families Program on reducing risk and increasing resiliency.

(b) ELEMENTS OF THE STUDY.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall specifically include an assessment of each of the following:—

(1) The mental, behavioral, and psychological health of the United States Special Operations Force, the United States Special Operations Command's Preservation of the Force and Families Program's focus on physical development to address the mental, behavioral, and psychological health of the United States Special Operations Force, including measurements of effectiveness on reducing suicide and other mental, behavioral and psychological risks, and increasing resiliency of the United States Special Operations Forces.

(2) The United States Special Operations Command's Human Performance Program, including measurements of effectiveness on reducing risk and increasing resiliency of United States Special Operations Forces.

(3) Such other matters as the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health considers appropriate.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle J of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 594. ACCESS OF CONGRESSIONAL CASEWORKERS TO INFORMATION ABOUT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CASEWORK BROKERED TO OTHER OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT.

If Department of Veterans Affairs casework is brokered out to another office of the Department from its original submission site, a caseworker in a congressional office may contact the brokered office to receive an update on the constituent's case, and that office of the Department is required to update the congressional staffer regardless of their thoughts on jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle J of title V (page 162, after line 18) add the following:

SEC. . PILOT PROGRAM ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO STATE VETERANS AGENCIES TO FACILITATE THE TRANSITION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM MILITARY SERVICE TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—Commencing not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing the information described in subsection (b) on members of the Armed Forces who are separating from the Armed Forces to State veterans agencies as a means of facilitating the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life.

(b) COVERED INFORMATION.—The information described in this subsection with respect to a member is as follows:

- (1) Department of Defense Form DD 214.
- (2) A personal email address.
- (3) A personal telephone number.
- (4) A mailing address.

(c) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The participation of a member in the pilot program shall be at the election of the member.

(d) FORM OF PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Information shall be provided to State veterans agencies under the pilot program in digitized electronic form.

(e) USE OF INFORMATION.—Information provided to State veterans agencies under the pilot program may be shared by such agencies with appropriate county veterans service offices in such manner and for such purposes as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of the pilot program.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 15 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program. The report shall include a description of the pilot program and such recommendations, including recommendations for continuing or expanding the pilot program, as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Page 162, after line 18, insert the following:
SEC. 594. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE RECOVERY OF THE REMAINS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES KILLED IN THURSTON ISLAND, ANTARCTICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Commencing August 26, 1946, though late February 1947 the United States Navy Antarctic Developments Program Task Force 68, codenamed “Operation Highjump” initiated and undertook the largest ever-to-date exploration of the Antarctic continent.

(2) The primary mission of the Task Force 68 organized by Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd Jr. USN, (Ret) and led by Rear Admiral Richard H. Cruzen, USN, was to do the following:

(A) Establish the Antarctic research base Little America IV.

(B) In the defense of the United States of America from possible hostile aggression from abroad - to train personnel test equipment, develop techniques for establishing, maintaining and utilizing air bases on ice, with applicability comparable to interior Greenland, where conditions are similar to those of the Antarctic.

(C) Map and photograph a full two-thirds of the Antarctic Continent during the classified, hazardous duty/volunteer-only operation involving 4700 sailors, 23 aircraft and 13 ships including the first submarine the U.S.S. *Sennet*, and the aircraft carrier the U.S.S. *Philippine Sea*, brought to the edge of the ice pack to launch (6) Navy ski-equipped, rocket-assisted R4Ds.

(D) Consolidate and extend United States sovereignty over the largest practicable area of the Antarctic continent.

(E) Determine the feasibility of establishing, maintaining and utilizing bases in the Antarctic and investigating possible base sites.

(3) While on a hazardous duty/all volunteer mission vital to the interests of National Security and while over the eastern Antarctica coastline known as the Phantom Coast, the PBM-5 Martin Mariner “Flying Boat” “George 1” entered a whiteout over Thurston Island. As the pilot attempted to climb, the aircraft grazed the glacier’s ridgeline and exploded within 5 seconds instantly killing En-

sign Maxwell Lopez, Navigator and Wendell “Bud” Hendersin, Aviation Machinists Mate 1st Class while Frederick Williams, Aviation Radioman 1st Class died several hours later. Six other crewmen survived including the Captain of the “George 1’s” seaplane tender U.S.S. *Pine Island*.

(4) The bodies of the dead were protected from the desecration of Antarctic scavenging birds (Skuas) by the surviving crew wrapping the bodies and temporarily burying the men under the starboard wing engine nacelle.

(5) Rescue requirements of the “George-1” survivors forced the abandonment of their crewmates’ bodies.

(6) Conditions prior to the departure of Task Force 68 precluded a return to the area to the recover the bodies.

(7) For nearly 60 years Navy promised the families that they would recover the men: “If the safety, logistical, and operational prerequisites allow a mission in the future, every effort will be made to bring our sailors home.”

(8) The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command twice offered to recover the bodies of this crew for Navy.

(9) A 2004 NASA ground penetrating radar overflight commissioned by Navy relocated the crash site three miles from its crash position.

(10) The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command offered to underwrite the cost of an aerial ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey of the crash site area by NASA.

(11) The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command studied the recovery with the recognized recovery authorities and national scientists and determined that the recovery is only “medium risk”.

(12) National Science Foundation and scientists from the University of Texas, Austin, regularly visit the island.

(13) The crash site is classified as a “perishable site”, meaning a glacier that will calve into the Bellingshausen Sea.

(14) The National Science Foundation maintains a presence in area - of the Pine Island Glacier.

(15) The National Science Foundation Director of Polar Operations will assist and provide assets for the recovery upon the request of Congress.

(16) The United States Coast Guard is presently pursuing the recovery of 3 WWII air crewmen from similar circumstances in Greenland.

(17) On Memorial Day, May 25, 2009, President Barak Obama declared: “. . . the support of our veterans is a sacred trust. . . we need to serve them as they have served us. . . that means bringing home all our POWs and MIAs. . .”

(18) The policies and laws of the United States of America require that our armed service personnel be repatriated.

(19) The fullest possible accounting of United States fallen military personnel means repatriating living American POWs and MIAs, accounting for, identifying, and recovering the remains of military personnel who were killed in the line of duty, or providing convincing evidence as to why such a repatriation, accounting, identification, or recovery is not possible.

(20) It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to return to the United States for proper burial and respect all members of the Armed Forces killed in the line of duty who lie in lost graves.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings under subsection (a), Congress—

(1) reaffirms its support for the recovery and return to the United States, the remains and bodies of all members of the Armed Forces killed in the line of duty, and for the efforts by the Joint POW-MIA Accounting Command to recover the remains of mem-

bers of the Armed Forces from all wars, conflicts and missions;

(2) recognizes the courage and sacrifice of all members of the Armed Forces who participated in Operation Highjump and all missions vital to the national security of the United States of America;

(3) acknowledges the dedicated research and efforts by the US Geological Survey, the National Science Foundation, the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command, the Fallen American Veterans Foundation and all persons and organizations to identify, locate, and advocate for, from their temporary Antarctic grave, the recovery of the well-preserved frozen bodies of Ensign Maxwell Lopez, Naval Aviator, Frederick Williams, Aviation Machinist’s Mate 1ST Class, Wendell Hendersin, Aviation Radioman 1ST Class of the “George 1” explosion and crash; and

(4) encourages the Department of Defense to review the facts, research and to pursue new efforts to undertake all feasible efforts to recover, identify, and return the well-preserved frozen bodies of the “George 1” crew from Antarctica’s Thurston Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 162, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 594. NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE JOINT OUTPATIENT CLINIC, MARINA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed at the intersection of the proposed Ninth Street and the proposed First Avenue in Marina, California, shall be known and designated as the “Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic”.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. . . 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 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty, or to make any change to existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by Congress in furtherance of, pursuant to, or otherwise to implement the Arms Trade Treaty, unless the Arms Trade Treaty has received the advice and consent of the Senate and has been the subject of implementing legislation, as required, by the Congress.

(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 and regulations up to United States standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle F of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. . . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NAVAL CAPABILITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Mistral class amphibious assault warships, each of which has the capacity to carry 16 helicopters, up to 700 soldiers, four landing craft, 60 armored vehicles, and 13

tanks, would significantly increase the the naval capabilities of the Russian navy;

(2) Mistral class warships would allow the Russian navy to expand its naval presence in the region, thereby augmenting its capabilities against Ukraine, Georgia, and Baltic member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(3) France should not proceed with its sale of two Mistral class warships to the Russian Federation; and

(4) the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense should use diplomatic means to urge their counterparts in the Government of France not to proceed with its sale of two Mistral class warships to the Russian Federation.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle C of title XV, insert the following:

SEC. 1523. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund until all funds appropriated for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund before the date of the enactment of this Act are obligated or expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title 16, insert the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . REPORT ON GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report on the status of governance and democratization in the Russian Federation.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the extent of political and economic corruption among the senior leadership of the Russian Federation; and

(2) an analysis of the assets of the senior leadership of the Russian Federation, with a particular focus on the illegal attainment and movement of those assets, including the use of family or friends to hide assets.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director of National Intelligence shall make publicly available on the Internet the unclassified portion of the report required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman.

I rise in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 4435, the FY15 NDAA, to

renew a 1-year ban on the Obama administration from using any Department of Defense funds to implement the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

This language is identical to the version of my amendment that was enacted into law FY14 NDAA and reflects the consistent will of the American people and the unified position of Congress in opposition to this misguided and dangerous treaty.

Renewal of this ban is timely and necessary. In January, the Obama administration, unexpectedly and without consultation, issued a new arms export control policy, which has not been changed since 1995.

The administration's new policy clearly seeks to implement the ATT and is based on the most dangerous part of the treaty, the international human rights law/international humanitarian law standard, that can be readily politicized by bad actors to stop the U.S. from providing arms to our friends and allies, including Israel.

The Obama administration has been so brazen about this that, in a speech to CSIS on April 23, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Countryman openly stated:

We're already implementing the treaty.

Amazingly, in that same speech, Mr. Countryman stated:

We don't have to change any laws to implement the treaty.

That is not up to him or the administration to decide. It is up to the Senate to provide its advice and consent on the treaty, and the House and Senate to pass the necessary implementing legislation.

This President's assertion is deeply disrespectful to the Senate and the House and to the Constitution he is sworn to uphold. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of the Second Amendment, our Nation's sovereignty, and vote in support of this amendment to renew the annual ban on funding the ATT.

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

Mr. MCKEON. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 4435 to express the sense of Congress against France's impending sale of Mistral class helicopter amphibious assault warships to Russia and urging the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense to seek to stop this sale.

Zoos often have signs posted that say don't feed the bears because it is just common sense. Similarly, I would like to say now, especially, don't feed the Russian bear; but with the sale of these advanced warships, France isn't just feeding the Russian bear, it is serving up fine dining on a silver plate.

A Mistral is no mere civilian hull, as France's Defense Minister claims. Just one Mistral class warship has the capacity to carry 16 helicopters, up to 700 soldiers, four landing craft, 60 armored

vehicles, and 13 tanks and has the advanced communications capabilities that make it capable of operating as a command and control vessel.

France wants to send Russia two of them—Vladivostok and Sevastopol—which just happens to be the name of the naval base in Crimea, which Russia has just annexed from Ukraine.

These warships would allow the Russian navy to expand its naval presence in the region, augmenting its capabilities against Ukraine, Georgia, and Baltic members of NATO, but don't take my word for it. Admiral Vysotsky, former head of Russia's navy, boasted that Russia would have won its war against Georgia in 2008 in just 40 minutes, instead of 26 hours, if it just had these ships back then.

It makes no sense for France to provide these warships to Russia when it is occupying Georgia and amassing troops on Ukraine's border. France's support of Russia's navy is unbecoming of a close NATO ally, and it has got to stop.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this commonsense amendment for the sake of our allies and our friends in Europe.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I rise in support of the en bloc amendment, which includes the amendment I offered with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), to call attention to an important issue facing the Army National Guard.

Soldiers join the National Guard to serve their country. Often, they choose the National Guard because they want to balance service with civilian careers or postsecondary education. The Army's tuition assistance program is a valuable benefit for soldiers who want to pursue opportunities for professional growth or attend college while off duty.

In January of 2014, the Army changed its tuition assistance program, and now, all soldiers must wait one full year after initial training before becoming eligible for tuition assistance. This change affects all soldiers, but it may disproportionately harm those in the National Guard.

Nonprior service soldiers in the National Guard, some of whom attend college full time, will have to wait at least a year, and perhaps much longer, depending on the availability of training courses before they get help paying for their education.

The Bonamici-Walden amendment asks the Secretary of the Army to evaluate how this one-size-fits-all change to tuition assistance could affect citizens-soldiers enrolled in education programs.

I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, and their staffs for their willingness to accept this important amendment to help protect education benefits and ensure a strong citizen-soldier force.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, first of all, I want to thank Chairman McKEON for his service on this committee and in this body as a colleague; and quite frankly, on behalf of my wife Penny and I, as military parents, thank you for your service to those who serve.

I want to thank you, also, for allowing me to discuss my amendment and have it as part of this en bloc. My amendment will institute a preliminary mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits. A recent Army study found:

Nearly one in five Army soldiers enters the service with a mental disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who have tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting.

In March, Representative TIM RYAN of Ohio, and I introduced the bipartisan H.R. 4305, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Service Members Act of 2014, which is the exact language of this amendment.

This small but subsequent change to current law will bring mental health to parity with physical health during entrance screenings. A preliminary evaluation will also have the purpose of serving as a baseline to identify changes in behavioral health, including traumatic brain injury and/or posttraumatic stress injury throughout an individual's military career.

Protecting individual privacy was taken into the utmost consideration when putting this amendment together. While the MEPS Act is not a cure-all, it will be a significant step in further understanding a well-documented gap in behavioral health information that exists among our service branches; and of equal importance, it will assist with the mental wellness of our servicemembers and veterans.

Since introduction, the MEPS Act has garnered over 35 bipartisan cosponsors and the support of over 40 major military, veteran, and health advocacy groups.

I thank all those who supported this legislation and worked with me and my staff to put this together. I ask for your support as we pass this important piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I want to thank Rules Committee Chairman PETE SESSIONS for making this amendment in order, and I want to thank Chairman McKEON for his service and for allowing this amendment to be part of the en bloc package.

My amendment adds the voice of the House to those of many Americans, including Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who would like to see the names of the 74 sailors lost aboard the USS *Frank E. Evans* added to the Vietnam Memorial.

The USS *Frank Evans*, a destroyer, was launched near the end of World War II and was recommissioned for the

Korea and Vietnam conflicts. After participating in combat off the coast of Vietnam, the *Evans* was deployed for the Operation Sea Spirit training exercise in the South China Sea.

On the morning of June 3, 1969, the *Evans* was training with an Australian navy carrier when the two ships collided.

□ 2100

The *Melbourne* ripped the American destroyer in two. The bow sank in just 3 minutes, leaving only a stern section afloat. Seventy-four sailors perished.

Although they were in the South China Sea, these sailors' names have been excluded from the Vietnam Memorial because the *Evans* was outside the designated combat zone which determines inclusion on the wall.

Although these men did not die in direct combat, they were instrumental in advancing military objectives in Vietnam and participated in the conflict just days before the collision.

I thank the chairman for allowing this amendment which would encourage the addition of their names to the wall.

My amendment adds the voice of this House to those of many Americans, including Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who would like to see the names of the 74 sailors lost aboard the USS *Frank E. Evans* added to the Vietnam Memorial.

The USS *Frank E. Evans*, a destroyer, was launched near the end of World War II and was recommissioned for the Korea and Vietnam conflicts. After participating in combat off the coast of Vietnam, the *Evans* was deployed for the "Operation Sea Spirit" training exercises in the South China Sea.

On the morning of June 3, 1969, the *Evans* was training with the Australian Navy carrier HMAS *Melbourne*, when the two ships collided. The *Melbourne* ripped the American destroyer in two. The bow sank in just three minutes, leaving only the stern section afloat. Seventy-four sailors perished.

Although they were in the South China Sea, these sailors' names have been excluded from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial because the *Evans* was outside the designated combat zone which determines inclusion on the Wall. Although these men did not die in direct combat, they were instrumental in advancing American military objectives in Vietnam and had participated in the conflict just days before the collision. This happenstance should not obscure their valor, patriotism, and ultimate sacrifice for their country, especially as other exceptions to the stated policy have been made, including by Ronald Reagan, who waived the combat zone criteria to add 68 names of U.S. Marines who were killed when a "rest and recreation" flight to Hong Kong crashed.

It has been nearly 45 years to the day since that June night in 1969, and the passage of time has made duller and less distinct, boundaries and criteria that may have seemed reasonable and clear back then. The 74 sailors from the *Evans* belong with the other 58,000 Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam—on the Wall—where Americans from every corner of this great nation can give our silent thanks for their having given the "last full measure of devotion."

Mr. McKEON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my friend and colleague.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman for including this amendment en bloc.

As our men and women transition out of the Armed Forces, they are confronted with a number of challenges as they reintegrate into civilian life. My amendment offers a simple change to current DOD policy that I believe will greatly benefit our servicemembers as they return home.

Based on bipartisan legislation I have introduced, the Servicemembers Transition Improvement Act, this amendment would require a pilot program at DOD to transmit a comprehensive copy of a servicemember's information to State veterans agencies.

Veterans service agencies are a powerful resource, helping veterans through job assistance programs and navigating the benefits they have earned. This legislation will enable veterans service offices to assist separating servicemembers who reside in their communities and confirms that caring for our men and women in uniform does not end when they leave military service.

Also, Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment with Mr. COHEN of Tennessee to prohibit new funds for the Afghanistan infrastructure fund and ensure American tax dollars are invested wisely.

We have already spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has appropriated over \$1.2 billion alone to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund since it was created in 2011.

In their most recent report, SIGAR reported that only \$229 million of the \$1.2 billion Congress has appropriated has actually been disbursed for projects. More importantly, SIGAR has repeatedly found that the projects which are underway are behind schedule and years away from completion.

Without any assurance that these projects are needed or can be completed, let's focus these funds on growing our economy, investing in American infrastructure, and paying off our debt.

I want to thank Chairman McKEON for accepting this amendment in the en bloc and would encourage my colleagues to vote in support of it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH).

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc package, including my amendment which will strengthen our military families.

Madam Chair, last Mother's Day I traveled to Afghanistan with a bipartisan group of Members of Congress. We heard firsthand about the difficult mental and physical challenges our brave servicemen and -women must overcome. One such challenge was their maternity leave policy, which is not in line with the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Currently, the Department of Defense permits Active Duty mothers to take 6 weeks of maternity leave. This is 6 weeks less than mandated by the Family and Medical Leave Act.

My amendment, which is based on my widely supported bipartisan bill, the Military Opportunities for Mothers, or MOM, Act, would give servicemembers the option of extending leave to the same amount that is guaranteed to their civilian sisters. It has received widespread support because my colleagues have heard from female servicemembers and veterans on how bad this policy of just 6 weeks is for the retention of talented women, morale, and mental health.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and give our military mothers a chance at a healthier, stronger future for their families and our country. Extending maternity leave for these women is the least we can do for those who sacrifice so much for our country.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your service to our Nation as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. As a veteran, I deeply appreciate all you have done and will do until the end of your term.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this en bloc amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act because it contains an amendment I offered which provides servicemembers diagnosed with a mental health condition who have been discharged access to a physician with special mental health training to provide an additional level of expert review on appeal.

According to the Congressional Research Service, from 2001 to 2011, well over 900,000 servicemembers were diagnosed with at least one mental health condition. While the majority of those diagnosed were able to continue serving, many were ultimately discharged from the military either directly for their mental health issues or for conduct linked to those diagnoses.

Current law insufficiently equips servicemembers diagnosed with a mental health disorder during appeal of a discharge. My amendment corrects this injustice and ensures fairness for those suffering from mental health issues as a result of their service to our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding. I want to thank the chairman for his efforts on this evening's work.

I rise today in support of my amendment to improve mental health and suicide prevention for our Nation's veterans.

Every day our country loses 22 of our Nation's heroes to suicide. This heart-breaking statistic remains a devastating reality that should shake every Member in this House. Truly providing our heroes with the respect and care they have earned means treating not only physical, but invisible wounds as well.

With damning reports about the VA failing our veterans and our country, my amendment would insist on more accountability by requiring an independent third-party evaluation of existing suicide prevention efforts to improve coordination and integration between the DOD and the VA.

Outcomes of servicemember and veteran suicide prevention programs are too important to be left to government agencies, particularly ones embroiled in scandal.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. Our Nation must not continue to fail those who served us so bravely.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH).

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment which is included in the next en bloc amendment, which will strengthen small business participation in government contracts.

In my district and across the country, small businesses are the backbone of our economy. They innovate, know how to operate on a tight budget, and create good-paying jobs. My small businesses in Elgin, Illinois, should be able to win government contracts from the Department of Defense because I know they will do more with taxpayer dollars and provide superior products and services for our military.

This amendment would raise the small business prime contracting goal from 23 percent to 25 percent and establish a subcontracting goal of 40 percent. It would allow small businesses to reap \$10 billion annually in new work. These steps will ensure small businesses are able to compete, remain a powerful employment source, and save taxpayers money.

Small businesses are a vital part of Illinois' Eighth Congressional District. That is why last year I came to the House floor to speak on behalf of small business amendments that I offered in the past. This time I am happy to partner with my colleague, the chairman of the Small Business Committee, to fight for this critical pillar of our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the en bloc package that is before us tonight, which includes my amendment that will finally recognize the valiant service of merchant mariners who operated domestically during World War II.

Ensuring that individuals who sacrifice so much in service to our country receive the recognition they deserve is one of the most important jobs we have as Members of Congress.

I am grateful for the bipartisan support my amendment has received from colleagues like my good friends JANICE HAHN from California and WALTER JONES from North Carolina. With support for my amendment coast to coast, I am proud to stand here today one step closer to correcting an injustice that has remained for over 70 years. Madam Chair, after 70 long years, these mariners deserve to receive recognition for their service to our country.

I thank the chairman, I thank the ranking member for including this amendment in the en bloc package this evening, and I ask my colleagues to support final passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 41, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 110, 112, 125, 138, 156, 157, and 160 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. DUCKWORTH OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 5. AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN CONNECTION WITH THE BIRTH OF A CHILD.

Section 701(j) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting after “(j)” the following new paragraph (1):

“(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a member of the armed forces who gives birth to a child shall receive 42 days of convalescent leave to be used in connection with the birth of the child. At the discretion of the member, the member shall be allowed up to 42 additional days in a leave of absence status in connection with the birth of the child upon the expiration of the convalescent leave, except that—

“(A) a member who uses this additional leave is not entitled to basic pay for any day

on which such additional leave is used, but shall be considered to be on active duty for all other purposes; and

“(B) the commanding officer of the member may recall the member to duty from such leave of absence status when necessary to maintain unit readiness.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. BILIRAKIS
OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 6. TRANSPORTATION ON MILITARY AIRCRAFT ON A SPACE-AVAILABLE BASIS FOR DISABLED VETERANS WITH A SERVICE-CONNECTED, PERMANENT DISABILITY RATED AS TOTAL.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) SPECIAL PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide, at no additional cost to the Department of Defense and with no aircraft modification, transportation on scheduled and unscheduled military flights within the continental United States and on scheduled overseas flights operated by the Air Mobility Command on a space-available basis for any veteran with a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total.

“(2) Notwithstanding subsection (d)(1), in establishing space-available transportation priorities under the travel program, the Secretary shall provide transportation under paragraph (1) on the same basis as such transportation is provided to members of the armed forces entitled to retired or retainer pay.

“(3) The requirement to provide transportation on Department of Defense aircraft on a space-available basis on the priority basis described in paragraph (2) to veterans covered by this subsection applies whether or not the travel program is established under this section.

“(4) In this subsection, the terms ‘veteran’ and ‘service-connected’ have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of title 38.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (f) of section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. ROSS OF
FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 634. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE COMMISSARY STORES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to close any commissary store.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF
NEW YORK

Page 175, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 642. AVAILABILITY FOR PURCHASE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEMORIAL HEADSTONES AND MARKERS FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO PERFORMED CERTAIN TRAINING.

Section 2306 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i)(1) The Secretary shall make available for purchase a memorial headstone or marker for the marked or unmarked grave of an

individual described in paragraph (2) or for the purpose of commemorating such an individual whose remains are unavailable.

“(2) An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who—

“(A) as a member of a National Guard or Reserve component performed inactive duty training or active duty for training for at least six years but did not serve on active duty; and

“(B) is not otherwise ineligible for a memorial headstone or marker on account of the nature of the individual’s separation from the Armed Forces or other cause.

“(3) A headstone or marker for the grave of an individual may be purchased under this subsection by—

“(A) the individual;

“(B) the surviving spouse, child, sibling, or parent of the individual; or

“(C) an individual other than the next of kin, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(4) In establishing the prices of the headstones and markers made available for purchase under this section, the Secretary shall ensure the prices are sufficient to cover the costs associated with the production and delivery of such headstones and markers.

“(5) No person may receive any benefit under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs solely by reason of this subsection.

“(6) This subsection does not authorize any new burial benefit for any person or create any new authority for any individual to be buried in a national cemetery.

“(7) The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Defense in establishing procedures to determine whether an individual is an individual described in paragraph (2).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS OF
CALIFORNIA

Page 177, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 703. AVAILABILITY OF BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT, SUPPLIES, AND COUNSELING UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1079(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) Breastfeeding support, supplies (including breast pumps and associated equipment), and counseling shall be provided as appropriate during pregnancy and the postpartum period.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MRS. ELLMERS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 184, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 715. PROVISION OF WRITTEN NOTICE OF CHANGE TO TRICARE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1097c the following new section:

“§ 1097d. TRICARE program: notice of change to benefits

“(a) PROVISION OF NOTICE.—(1) If the Secretary makes a significant change to any benefits provided by the TRICARE program to covered beneficiaries, the Secretary shall provide individuals described in paragraph (2) with written notice explaining such changes.

“(2) The individuals described by this paragraph are covered beneficiaries and providers participating in the TRICARE program who may be affected by a significant change covered by a notification under paragraph (1).

“(3) The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) through electronic means.

“(b) TIMING OF NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) by the earlier of the following dates:

“(1) The date that the Secretary determines would afford individuals described in

paragraph (2) of such subsection adequate time to understand the change covered by the notification.

“(2) The date that is 90 days before the date on which the change covered by the notification becomes effective.

“(3) The effective date of a significant change that is required by law.

“(c) SIGNIFICANT CHANGE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘significant change’ means a system-wide change—

“(1) in policy regarding services provided under the TRICARE program (not including the addition of new services or benefits); or

“(2) in payment rates of more than 20 percent.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1097c the following new item:

“1097d. TRICARE program: notice of change to benefits.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF
FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. . IMPROVEMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE.

(a) EVALUATIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than once each year, the Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code) shall contract with a third party unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense to conduct an evaluation of the mental health care and suicide prevention programs carried out under the laws administered by such Secretary.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) use metrics that are common among and useful for practitioners in the field of mental health care and suicide prevention;

(B) identify the most effective mental health care and suicide prevention programs conducted by the Secretary concerned;

(C) propose best practices for caring for individuals who suffer from mental health disorders or are at risk of suicide; and

(D) make recommendations to improve the coordination and integration of mental health and suicide prevention services between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to improve the delivery and effectiveness of such services.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL
OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. 7. PRIMARY BLAST INJURY RESEARCH.

The peer-reviewed Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program shall conduct a study on blast injury mechanics covering a wide range of primary blast injury conditions, including traumatic brain injury, in order to accelerate solution development in this critical area.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA
SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 729. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO TREAT INFERTILITY OF MILITARY FAMILIES.

(a) REPORT.—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 what steps the Secretary is taking to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members have access to reproductive counseling and a full spectrum of treatments for infertility, including in vitro fertilization.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of treatment options available at military medical treatment facilities throughout the military health system.

(2) An identification of factors that might disrupt treatment, including availability of options, lack of timely access to treatment, change in duty station, or overseas deployments.

(3) The number of members of the Armed Forces who have used specific treatment options, including in vitro fertilization.

(4) The number of dependents of members who have used specific treatment options, including in vitro fertilization.

(5) An identification of non-Department of Defense treatment options for infertility that could benefit members and the dependents of members.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 197, after line 16, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 805. MAXIMIZING COMPETITION IN DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACTS.

(a) PUBLIC DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.—Section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and the contract is in an amount of \$1,000,000 or greater” after “appropriate for use”;

(2) by striking the second sentence of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “The maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the agency approves the contracting officer’s justification with respect to the solicitation that a number greater than 5 is in the Federal Government’s interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection procedures.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require the head of each agency to appoint an individual who shall provide to the Director an annual compilation of each instance the agency awarded a contract pursuant to this section in which—

“(A) more than 5 offerors were selected to submit competitive proposals pursuant to subsection (c)(4); or

“(B) the contract was awarded without using the two-phase selection procedures described in subsection (c).

“(2) PUBLICATION.—The Director shall prepare an annual report containing the information provided by each executive agency under subparagraph (A). The report shall be accessible to the public through electronic means, and the Director shall publish a notice of availability in the Federal Register.

“(3) FISCAL YEARS COVERED; DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report prepared under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year during which this subsection is enacted, and each of the next 4 fiscal years, not later than 60 days after the end of each such fiscal year.”.

(b) DEFENSE DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.—Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and the contract is in an amount of \$1,000,000 or greater” after “appropriate for use”;

(2) by striking the second sentence of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “The maximum number specified in the solicita-

tion shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the agency approves the contracting officer’s justification with respect to an individual solicitation that a number greater than 5 is in the Federal Government’s interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection procedures.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) REPORT.—(1) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require the head of each agency to appoint an individual who shall provide to the Director an annual compilation of each instance the agency awarded a contract pursuant to this section in which—

“(A) more than 5 offerors were selected to submit competitive proposals pursuant to subsection (c)(4); or

“(B) the contract was awarded without using the two-phase selection procedures described in subsection (c).

“(2) The Director shall prepare an annual report containing the information provided by each executive agency under subparagraph (A). The report shall be accessible to the public through electronic means, and the Director shall publish a notice of availability in the Federal Register.

“(3) The Director shall submit to Congress the report prepared under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year during which this subsection is enacted, and each of the next 4 fiscal years, not later than 60 days after the end of each such fiscal year.”.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than the end of fiscal year 2021, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report analyzing the extent to which Federal agencies are in compliance with the reporting requirements in section 2305a(f) of title 10, United States Code, and section 3309(g) of title 41, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII (page 197, after line 16), insert the following new section:

SEC. 805. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR USE OF SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

Section 4202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (division D of Public Law 104-106; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended by striking subsection (e).

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 214, line 9, insert after “terms.” the following:

“(C) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative’ shall mean a contract award pursuant to the process established by the Interagency Strategic Sourcing Leadership Council that was created by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to Memorandum M-13-02 issued on December 5, 2012.

“(8) STUDY OF STRATEGIC SOURCING.—

“(A) STUDY.—Not later than the last day of fiscal year 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study on the affect of contracts awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative on the small business industrial base.

“(B) SCOPE.—For each North American Classification System Code assigned to a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative, the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the following:

“(i) The number of small business concerns participating as prime contractors in that

North American Industrial Classification System code in the federal procurement marketplace prior to the award of a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

“(ii) The number of small business concerns participating as prime contractors in that North American Industrial Classification System code in the federal procurement marketplace after the award of a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

“(iii) The number of small business concerns anticipated to be participating as prime contractors in that North American Industrial Classification System code in the federal procurement marketplace at the time that the a contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative expires.

“(iv) The affect of any changes between subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) on the health of the small business industrial base, and the sustainability of any savings achieved by contract awarded as part of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after initiating the study required by subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on the results from such study and, if warranted, any recommendations on how to mitigate any negative affects ont eh small business industrial base or the sustainability of savings.”.

Page 218, insert after line 20 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 817. PUBLICATION OF REQUIRED JUSTIFICATION THAT CONSOLIDATION OF CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

Section 44(c)(2)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(c)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “This justification shall be published prior to the issuance of a solicitation.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

Page 218, strike lines 17 through 20 and insert the following (and conform the table the contents accordingly):

SEC. 816. IMPROVING FEDERAL SURETY BONDS.

(a) SURETY BOND REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter 93 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 9310. INDIVIDUAL SURETIES.

“If another applicable law or regulation permits the acceptance of a bond from a surety that is not subject to sections 9305 and 9306 and is based on a pledge of assets by the surety, the assets pledged by such surety shall—

“(1) consist of eligible obligations described under section 9303(a); and

“(2) be submitted to the official of the Government required to approve or accept the bond, who shall deposit the assets with a depository described under section 9303(b).”;

and

(2) in the table of contents for such chapter, by adding at the end the following:

“9310. Individual sureties”.

(b) SBA SURETY BOND GUARANTEE.—Section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(c)(1)) is amended by striking “70” and inserting “90”.

(c) GAO STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the following:

(A) All instances during the 10-year period prior to the date of enactment of the Act in

which a surety bond proposed or issued by a surety in connection with a Federal project was—

(i) rejected by a Federal contracting officer; or

(ii) accepted by a Federal contracting officer, but was later found to have been backed by insufficient collateral or to be otherwise deficient or with respect to which the surety did not perform.

(B) The consequences to the Federal Government, subcontractors, and suppliers of the instances described under paragraph (1).

(C) The percentages of all Federal contracts that were awarded to new startup businesses (including new startup businesses that are small disadvantaged businesses or disadvantaged business enterprises), small disadvantaged businesses, and disadvantaged business enterprises as prime contractors in the 2-year period prior to and the 2-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, and an assessment of the impact of this Act and the amendments made by this Act upon such percentages.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(A) DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.—The term “disadvantaged business enterprise” has the meaning given that term under section 26.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) NEW STARTUP BUSINESS.—The term “new startup business” means a business that was formed in the 2-year period ending on the date on which the business bids on a Federal contract that requires giving a surety bond.

(C) SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS.—The term “small disadvantaged business” has the meaning given that term under section 124.1002(b) of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 1082. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERFORMANCE OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 7734 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “and on the performance of any regional office that fails to meet its administrative goals”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “and”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) in the case of any regional office that, for the year covered by the report, did not meet the administrative goal of no claim pending for more than 125 days and an accuracy rating of 98 percent—

“(A) a signed statement prepared by the individual serving as director of the regional office as of the date of the submittal of the report containing—

“(i) an explanation for why the regional office did not meet the goal;

“(ii) a description of the additional resources needed to enable the regional office to reach the goal; and

“(iii) a description of any additional actions planned for the subsequent year that

are proposed to enable the regional office to meet the goal; and

“(B) a statement prepared by the Under Secretary for Benefits explaining how the failure of the regional office to meet the goal affected the performance evaluation of the director of the regional office; and”.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1107. EXTENSION OF PART-TIME REEMPLOYMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) CSRS.—Section 8344(1)(7) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by strike “5 years” and inserting “10 years”.

(b) FERS.—Section 8468(i)(7) of such title is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “10 years”.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle D of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. . SALE OF F-16 AIRCRAFT TO TAIWAN.

The President shall carry out the sale of no fewer than 66 F-16C/D multirole fighter aircraft to Taiwan.

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 484, after line 12, 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 loses 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 mu-

nitions 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.

(ii) 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 facilities, 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. 156 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI OF PUERTO RICO

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

SEC. 28. USE OF FORMER BOMBARDMENT AREA ON ISLAND OF CULEBRA, PUERTO RICO.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the statutory prohibition restricting environmental cleanup of the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico, is a unique anomaly for the Department of Defense and its formerly used defense sites.

(b) MODIFICATION OF RESTRICTION ON FEDERAL DECONTAMINATION AUTHORITY.—Section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93-166; 87 Stat. 668) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The first sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the portions of the former bombardment area that were identified as having regular public access in the Department of Defense study entitled 'Study Relating to the Presence of Unexploded Ordnance in a Portion of the Former Naval Bombardment Area of Culebra Island, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico' and dated April 20, 2012, which was prepared in accordance with section 2815 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4464)."

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new division:

DIVISION E—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the "Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act".

SEC. 5002. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this division is as follows:

DIVISION E—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM

Sec. 5001. Short title.

Sec. 5002. Table of contents.

Sec. 5003. Definitions.

TITLE LI—MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITHIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Sec. 5101. Increased authority of agency Chief Information Officers over information technology.

Sec. 5102. Lead coordination role of Chief Information Officers Council.

Sec. 5103. Reports by Government Accountability Office.

TITLE LII—DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION

Sec. 5201. Purpose.

Sec. 5202. Definitions.

Sec. 5203. Federal data center optimization initiative.

Sec. 5204. Performance requirements related to data center consolidation.

Sec. 5205. Cost savings related to data center optimization.

Sec. 5206. Reporting requirements to Congress and the Federal Chief Information Officer.

TITLE LIII—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATION AND WASTE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION

Sec. 5301. Inventory of information technology software assets.

Sec. 5302. Website consolidation and transparency.

Sec. 5303. Transition to the cloud.

Sec. 5304. Elimination of unnecessary duplication of contracts by requiring business case analysis.

TITLE LIV—STRENGTHENING IT ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

Sec. 5411. Expansion of training and use of information technology acquisition cadres.

Sec. 5412. Plan on strengthening program and project management performance.

Sec. 5413. Personnel awards for excellence in the acquisition of information systems and information technology.

TITLE LV—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

Sec. 5501. Maximizing the benefit of the Federal strategic sourcing initiative.

Sec. 5502. Governmentwide software purchasing program.

Sec. 5503. Promoting transparency of blanket purchase agreements.

Sec. 5504. Additional source selection technique in solicitations.

Sec. 5505. Enhanced transparency in information technology investments.

Sec. 5506. Enhanced communication between government and industry.

Sec. 5507. Clarification of current law with respect to technology neutrality in acquisition of software.

Sec. 5508. No additional funds authorized.

SEC. 5003. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term "Chief Acquisition Officers Council" means the Chief Acquisition Officers Council established by section 1311(a) of title 41, United States Code.

(2) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term "Chief Information Officer" means a Chief Information Officer (as designated under section 3506(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code) of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term "Chief Information Officers Council"

or "CIO Council" means the Chief Information Officers Council established by section 3603(a) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term "Federal agency" means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(6) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term "Federal Chief Information Officer" means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code.

(7) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OR IT.—The term "information technology" or "IT" has the meaning provided in section 11101(6) of title 40, United States Code.

(8) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "relevant congressional committees" means each of the following:

(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE LI—MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITHIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 5101. INCREASED AUTHORITY OF AGENCY CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS OVER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF CIOS OF CERTAIN AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (a) as subsection (e) and moving such subsection to the end of the section; and

(B) by inserting before subsection (b) the following new subsection (a):

"(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OR DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be within each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) of title 31 an agency Chief Information Officer. Each agency Chief Information Officer shall—

"(A)(i) be appointed by the President; or

"(ii) be designated by the President, in consultation with the head of the agency; and

"(B) be appointed or designated, as applicable, from among individuals who possess demonstrated ability in general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, information technology management practices in large governmental or business entities.

"(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—An agency Chief Information Officer appointed or designated under this section shall report directly to the head of the agency and carry out, on a full-time basis, responsibilities as set forth in this section and in section 3506(a) of title 44 for Chief Information Officers designated under paragraph (2) of such section."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3506(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the head of each agency" and inserting "The head of each agency, other than an agency with a Presidentially appointed or designated Chief Information Officer as provided in section 11315(a)(1) of title 40,"; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(b) AUTHORITY RELATING TO BUDGET AND PERSONNEL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN CIOS.—

“(1) BUDGET-RELATED AUTHORITY.—

“(A) **PLANNING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31 and in section 102 of title 5 shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology or programs that include significant information technology components.

“(B) **ALLOCATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts appropriated for any agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31 and in section 102 of title 5 for any fiscal year that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

“(2) **PERSONNEL-RELATED AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31 shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority necessary to approve the hiring of personnel who will have information technology responsibilities within the agency and to require that such personnel have the obligation to report to the Chief Information Officer in a manner considered sufficient by the Chief Information Officer.”.

(C) SINGLE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER IN EACH AGENCY.—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Section 3506(a)(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “(3)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Each agency shall have only one individual with the title and designation of ‘Chief Information Officer’. Any bureau, office, or subordinate organization within the agency may designate one individual with the title ‘Deputy Chief Information Officer’, ‘Associate Chief Information Officer’, or ‘Assistant Chief Information Officer’.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 3506(a)(3)(B) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect as of October 1, 2014. Any individual serving in a position affected by such section before such date may continue in that position if the requirements of such section are fulfilled with respect to that individual.

SEC. 5102. LEAD COORDINATION ROLE OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.

(a) **LEAD COORDINATION ROLE.**—Subsection (d) of section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **LEAD INTERAGENCY FORUM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Council is designated the lead interagency forum for improving agency coordination of practices related to the design, development, modernization, use, operation, sharing, performance, and review of Federal Government information resources investment. As the lead interagency forum, the Council shall develop cross-agency portfolio management practices to allow and encourage the development of cross-agency shared services and shared platforms. The Council shall also issue guidelines and practices for infrastructure and common information technology applications, including expansion of the Federal Enterprise Architecture process if appropriate. The guidelines and practices may address broader transparency, common inputs, common outputs, and outcomes achieved. The guidelines and practices shall be used as a basis for comparing performance

across diverse missions and operations in various agencies.

“(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 1 in each of the 6 years following the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Council shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report (to be known as the ‘CIO Council Report’) summarizing the Council’s activities in the preceding fiscal year and containing such recommendations for further congressional action to fulfill its mission as the Council considers appropriate.

“(3) **RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—For purposes of the report required by paragraph (2), the relevant congressional committees are each of the following:

“(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

“(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.”.

(b) REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATOR OF E-GOVERNMENT AS FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—

(1) **REFERENCES.**—Section 3602(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Administrator may also be referred to as the Federal Chief Information Officer.”.

(2) **DEFINITION.**—Section 3601(1) of such title is amended by inserting “or Federal Chief Information Officer” before “means”.

SEC. 5103. REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO EXAMINE EFFECTIVENESS.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the effectiveness of the Chief Information Officers Council in meeting its responsibilities under section 3603(d) of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 5102, with particular focus on whether agencies are actively participating in the Council and heeding the Council’s advice and guidance.

(b) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General from the examination required by subsection (a).

TITLE LII—DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION**SEC. 5201. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this title is to optimize Federal data center usage and efficiency.

SEC. 5202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.**—The term “Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative” or the “Initiative” means the initiative developed and implemented by the Director, through the Federal Chief Information Officer, as required under section 5203.

(2) **COVERED AGENCY.**—The term “covered agency” means any agency included in the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

(3) **DATA CENTER.**—The term “data center” means a closet, room, floor, or building for the storage, management, and dissemination of data and information, as defined by the Federal Chief Information Officer under guidance issued pursuant to this section.

(4) **FEDERAL DATA CENTER.**—The term “Federal data center” means any data center of a covered agency used or operated by a covered agency, by a contractor of a covered agency, or by another organization on behalf of a covered agency.

(5) **SERVER UTILIZATION.**—The term “server utilization” refers to the activity level of a server relative to its maximum activity level, expressed as a percentage.

(6) **POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.**—The term “power usage effectiveness” means the

ratio obtained by dividing the total amount of electricity and other power consumed in running a data center by the power consumed by the information and communications technology in the data center.

SEC. 5203. FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR INITIATIVE.**—The Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and implement an initiative, to be known as the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, to optimize the usage and efficiency of Federal data centers by meeting the requirements of this division and taking additional measures, as appropriate.

(b) **REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.**—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and submit to Congress a plan for implementation of the Initiative required by subsection (a) by each covered agency. In developing the plan, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall take into account the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General review required by section 5205(e).

(c) **MATTERS COVERED.**—The plan shall include—

(1) descriptions of how covered agencies will use reductions in floor space, energy use, infrastructure, equipment, applications, personnel, increases in multiorganizational use, server virtualization, cloud computing, and other appropriate methods to meet the requirements of the initiative; and

(2) appropriate consideration of shifting Federally owned data center workload to commercially owned data centers.

SEC. 5204. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION.

(a) **SERVER UTILIZATION.**—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum server utilization possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

(1) The closing of existing data centers that lack adequate server utilization, as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer. If the agency fails to close such data centers, the agency shall provide a detailed explanation as to why this data center should remain in use as part of the submitted plan. The Federal Chief Information Officer shall include an assessment of the agency explanation in the annual report to Congress.

(2) The consolidation of services within existing data centers to increase server utilization rates.

(3) Any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize server utilization.

(b) **POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.**—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum energy efficiency possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

(1) The use of the measurement of power usage effectiveness to calculate data center energy efficiency.

(2) The use of power meters in facilities dedicated to data center operations to frequently measure power consumption over time.

(3) The establishment of power usage effectiveness goals for each data center.

(4) The adoption of best practices for managing—

(A) temperature and airflow in facilities dedicated to data center operations; and

(B) power supply efficiency.

(5) The implementation of any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize data center energy efficiency.

SEC. 5205. COST SAVINGS RELATED TO DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track costs resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those costs annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net costs from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net costs each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

- (A) Energy costs.
- (B) Personnel costs.
- (C) Real estate costs.
- (D) Capital expense costs.

(E) Maintenance and support costs such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense costs.

(F) Other appropriate costs, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK SAVINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track realized and projected savings resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those savings annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net savings from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net savings each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

- (A) Energy savings.
- (B) Personnel savings.
- (C) Real estate savings.
- (D) Capital expense savings.

(E) Maintenance and support savings such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense savings.

(F) Other appropriate savings, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Federal Chief Information Officer shall make publicly available a summary of realized and projected savings for each covered agency. The Federal Chief Information Officer shall identify any covered agency that failed to provide the annual report required under paragraph (1).

(c) REQUIREMENT TO USE COST-EFFECTIVE MEASURES.—Covered agencies shall use the most cost-effective measures to implement the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, such as using estimation to measure or track costs and savings using a methodology approved by the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(d) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine methods for calculating savings from the Initiative and using them for the purposes identified in subsection (d), including establishment and use of a special revolving fund that supports data centers and server optimization, and shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer and Congress a report on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations.

SEC. 5206. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

(a) AGENCY REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CIO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each covered agency each year

shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report on the implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, including savings resulting from such implementation. The report shall include an update of the agency's plan for implementing the Initiative.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall comply with paragraph (1) each year by submitting to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report with relevant information collected under section 2867 of Public Law 112-81 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note) or a copy of the report required under section 2867(d) of such law.

(b) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Each year, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report that assesses agency progress in carrying out the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative and updates the plan under section 5203. The report may be included as part of the annual report required under section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

TITLE LIII—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATION AND WASTE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION

SEC. 5301. INVENTORY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SOFTWARE ASSETS.

(a) PLAN.—The Director shall develop a plan for conducting a Governmentwide inventory of information technology software assets.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall cover the following:

(1) The manner in which Federal agencies can achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and cost savings in the procurement of information technology software assets, through measures such as reducing the procurement of new software licenses until such time as agency needs exceed the number of existing and unused licenses.

(2) The capability to conduct ongoing Governmentwide inventories of all existing software licenses on an application-by-application basis, including duplicative, unused, overused, and underused licenses, and to assess the need of agencies for software licenses.

(3) A Governmentwide spending analysis to provide knowledge about how much is being spent for software products or services to support decisions for strategic sourcing under the Federal strategic sourcing program managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The inventory of information technology software assets shall be available to Chief Information Officers and such other Federal officials as the Chief Information Officers may, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, designate.

(d) DEADLINE AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete and submit to Congress the plan required by subsection (a).

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete implementation of the plan required by subsection (a).

(f) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan required by subsection (a) and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

SEC. 5302. WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION AND TRANSPARENCY.

(a) WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION.—The Director shall—

(1) in consultation with Federal agencies, and after reviewing the directory of public

Federal Government websites of each agency (as required to be established and updated under section 207(f)(3) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note)), assess all the publicly available websites of Federal agencies to determine whether there are duplicative or overlapping websites; and

(2) require Federal agencies to eliminate or consolidate those websites that are duplicative or overlapping.

(b) WEBSITE TRANSPARENCY.—The Director shall issue guidance to Federal agencies to ensure that the data on publicly available websites of the agencies are open and accessible to the public.

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—In preparing the guidance required by subsection (b), the Director shall—

(1) develop guidelines, standards, and best practices for interoperability and transparency;

(2) identify interfaces that provide for shared, open solutions on the publicly available websites of the agencies; and

(3) ensure that Federal agency Internet home pages, web-based forms, and web-based applications are accessible to individuals with disabilities in conformance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

(d) DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.—The guidance required by subsection (b) shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5303. TRANSITION TO THE CLOUD.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that transition to cloud computing offers significant potential benefits for the implementation of Federal information technology projects in terms of flexibility, cost, and operational benefits.

(b) GOVERNMENTWIDE APPLICATION.—In assessing cloud computing opportunities, the Chief Information Officers Council shall define policies and guidelines for the adoption of Governmentwide programs providing for a standardized approach to security assessment and operational authorization for cloud products and services.

(c) ADDITIONAL BUDGET AUTHORITIES FOR TRANSITION.—In transitioning to the cloud, a Chief Information Officer of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, may establish such cloud service Working Capital Funds, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency, as may be necessary to transition to cloud-based solutions. Any establishment of a new Working Capital Fund under this subsection shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and relevant Congressional committees.

SEC. 5304. ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF CONTRACTS BY REQUIRING BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to leverage the Government's buying power and achieve administrative efficiencies and cost savings by eliminating unnecessary duplication of contracts.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR BUSINESS CASE APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§3312. Requirement for business case approval for new Governmentwide contracts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An executive agency may not issue a solicitation for a covered Governmentwide contract unless the agency performs a business case analysis for the contract and obtains an approval of the business case analysis from the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

“(b) REVIEW OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any covered Governmentwide contract, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall review the business case analysis submitted for the contract and provide an approval or disapproval within 60 days after the date of submission. Any business case analysis not disapproved within such 60-day period is deemed to be approved.

“(2) BASIS FOR APPROVAL OF BUSINESS CASE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall approve or disapprove a business case analysis based on the adequacy of the analysis submitted. The Administrator shall give primary consideration to whether an agency has demonstrated a compelling need that cannot be satisfied by existing Governmentwide contract in a timely and cost-effective manner.

“(c) CONTENT OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance specifying the content for a business case analysis submitted pursuant to this section. At a minimum, the business case analysis shall include details on the administrative resources needed for such contract, including an analysis of all direct and indirect costs to the Federal Government of awarding and administering such contract and the impact such contract will have on the ability of the Federal Government to leverage its purchasing power.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED GOVERNMENTWIDE CONTRACT.—The term ‘covered Governmentwide contract’ means any contract, blanket purchase agreement, or other contractual instrument for acquisition of information technology or other goods or services that allows for an indefinite number of orders to be placed under the contract, agreement, or instrument, and that is established by one executive agency for use by multiple executive agencies to obtain goods or services. The term does not include—

“(A) a multiple award schedule contract awarded by the General Services Administration;

“(B) a Governmentwide acquisition contract for information technology awarded pursuant to sections 11302(e) and 11314(a)(2) of title 40;

“(C) orders under Governmentwide contracts in existence before the effective date of this section; or

“(D) any contract in an amount less than \$10,000,000, determined on an average annual basis.

“(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning provided that term by section 105 of title 5.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 3311 the following new item:

“3312. Requirement for business case approval for new Governmentwide contracts.”

(c) REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the next 6 years following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the implementation of section 3312 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), including a summary of the submissions, reviews, approvals, and disapprovals of business case analyses pursuant to such section.

(d) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance for implementing section 3312 of such title.

(e) REVISION OF FAR.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation

shall be amended to implement section 3312 of such title.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 3312 of such title is effective on and after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE LIV—STRENGTHENING IT ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

SEC. 5411. EXPANSION OF TRAINING AND USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure timely progress by Federal agencies toward developing, strengthening, and deploying personnel with highly specialized skills in information technology acquisition, including program and project managers, to be known as information technology acquisition cadres.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1704 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) STRATEGIC PLAN ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.—

“(1) FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a 5-year strategic plan (to be known as the ‘IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan’) to develop, strengthen, and solidify information technology acquisition cadres. The plan shall include a timeline for implementation of the plan and identification of individuals responsible for specific elements of the plan during the 5-year period covered by the plan.

“(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall address, at a minimum, the following matters:

“(A) Current information technology acquisition staffing challenges in Federal agencies, by previous year’s information technology acquisition value, and by the Federal Government as a whole.

“(B) The variety and complexity of information technology acquisitions conducted by each Federal agency covered by the plan, and the specialized information technology acquisition workforce needed to effectively carry out such acquisitions.

“(C) The development of a sustainable funding model to support efforts to hire, retain, and train an information technology acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill to effectively carry out the acquisition programs of the Federal agencies covered by the plan, including an examination of inter-agency funding methods and a discussion of how the model of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund could be applied to civilian agencies.

“(D) Any strategic human capital planning necessary to hire, retain, and train an information acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill at each Federal agency covered by the plan.

“(E) Governmentwide training standards and certification requirements necessary to enhance the mobility and career opportunities of the Federal information technology acquisition cadre within the Federal agencies covered by the plan.

“(F) New and innovative approaches to workforce development and training, including cross-functional training, rotational development, and assignments both within and outside the Government.

“(G) Appropriate consideration and alignment with the needs and priorities of the acquisition intern programs.

“(H) Assessment of the current workforce competency and usage trends in evaluation technique to obtain best value, including proper handling of tradeoffs between price and nonprice factors.

“(I) Assessment of the current workforce competency in designing and aligning per-

formance goals, life cycle costs, and contract incentives.

“(J) Assessment of the current workforce competency in avoiding brand-name preference and using industry-neutral functional specifications to leverage open industry standards and competition.

“(K) Use of integrated program teams, including fully dedicated program managers, for each complex information technology investment.

“(L) Proper assignment of recognition or accountability to the members of an integrated program team for both individual functional goals and overall program success or failure.

“(M) The development of a technology fellows program that includes provisions for recruiting, for rotation of assignments, and for partnering directly with universities with well-recognized information technology programs.

“(N) The capability to properly manage other transaction authority (where such authority is granted), including ensuring that the use of the authority is warranted due to unique technical challenges, rapid adoption of innovative or emerging commercial or noncommercial technologies, or other circumstances that cannot readily be satisfied using a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement in accordance with applicable law and the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(O) The use of student internship and scholarship programs as a talent pool for permanent hires and the use and impact of special hiring authorities and flexibilities to recruit diverse candidates.

“(P) The assessment of hiring manager satisfaction with the hiring process and hiring outcomes, including satisfaction with the quality of applicants interviewed and hires made.

“(Q) The assessment of applicant satisfaction with the hiring process, including the clarity of the hiring announcement, the user-friendliness of the application process, communication from the hiring manager or agency regarding application status, and timeliness of the hiring decision.

“(R) The assessment of new hire satisfaction with the onboarding process, including the orientation process, and investment in training and development for employees during their first year of employment.

“(S) Any other matters the Director considers appropriate.

“(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the 5 years following the year of submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees an annual report outlining the progress made pursuant to the plan.

“(4) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF THE PLAN AND ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(A) Not later than 1 year after the submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

“(B) Not later than 6 months after the submission of the first, third, and fifth annual report required under paragraph (3), the Comptroller General shall independently assess the findings of the annual report and brief the relevant congressional committees on the Comptroller General’s findings and recommendations to ensure the objectives of the plan are accomplished.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘Federal agency’ means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

“(B) The term ‘relevant congressional committees’ means each of the following:

“(i) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on

Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

“(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.”.

SEC. 5412. PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.

(a) **PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.**—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a plan for improving management of IT programs and projects.

(b) **MATTERS COVERED.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Creation of a specialized career path for program management.

(2) The development of a competency model for program management consistent with the IT project manager model.

(3) A career advancement model that requires appropriate expertise and experience for advancement.

(4) A career advancement model that is more competitive with the private sector and that recognizes both Government and private sector experience.

(c) **COMBINATION WITH OTHER CADRES PLAN.**—The Director may combine the plan required by subsection (a) with the IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan required under section 1704(j) of title 41, United States Code, as added by section 5411.

SEC. 5413. PERSONNEL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE ACQUISITION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall develop policy and guidance for agencies to develop a program to recognize excellent performance by Federal Government employees and teams of such employees in the acquisition of information systems and information technology for the agency.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The program referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable—

(1) obtain objective outcome measures; and

(2) include procedures for—

(A) the nomination of Federal Government employees and teams of such employees for eligibility for recognition under the program; and

(B) the evaluation of nominations for recognition under the program by 1 or more agency panels of individuals from Government, academia, and the private sector who have such expertise, and are appointed in such a manner, as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall establish for purposes of the program.

(c) **AWARD OF CASH BONUSES AND OTHER INCENTIVES.**—In carrying out the program referred to in subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish policies and guidance for agencies to reward any Federal Government employee or teams of such employees recognized pursuant to the program—

(1) with a cash bonus, to the extent that the performance of such individual or team warrants the award of such bonus and is authorized by any provision of law;

(2) through promotions and other non-monetary awards;

(3) by publicizing—

(A) acquisition accomplishments by individual employees; and

(B) the tangible end benefits that resulted from such accomplishments, as appropriate; and

(4) through other awards, incentives, or bonuses that the head of the agency considers appropriate.

TITLE LV—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

SEC. 5501. MAXIMIZING THE BENEFIT OF THE FEDERAL STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall prescribe regulations providing that when the Federal Government makes a purchase of services and supplies offered under the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative (managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy) but such Initiative is not used, the contract file for the purchase shall include a brief analysis of the comparative value, including price and nonprice factors, between the services and supplies offered under such Initiative and services and supplies offered under the source or sources used for the purchase.

SEC. 5502. GOVERNMENTWIDE SOFTWARE PURCHASING PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of General Services, in collaboration with the Department of Defense, shall identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative to enhance Governmentwide acquisition, shared use, and dissemination of software, as well as compliance with end user license agreements.

(b) **EXAMINATION OF METHODS.**—In developing the initiative under subsection (a), the Administrator shall examine the use of realistic and effective demand aggregation models supported by actual agency commitment to use the models, and supplier relationship management practices, to more effectively govern the Government's acquisition of information technology.

(c) **GOVERNMENTWIDE USER LICENSE AGREEMENT.**—The Administrator, in developing the initiative under subsection (a), shall allow for the purchase of a license agreement that is available for use by all executive agencies as one user to the maximum extent practicable and as appropriate.

SEC. 5503. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **PRICE INFORMATION TO BE TREATED AS PUBLIC INFORMATION.**—The final negotiated price offered by an awardee of a blanket purchase agreement shall be treated as public information.

(b) **PUBLICATION OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT INFORMATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall make available to the public a list of all blanket purchase agreements entered into by Federal agencies under its Federal Supply Schedules contracts and the prices associated with those blanket purchase agreements. The list and price information shall be updated at least once every 6 months.

SEC. 5504. ADDITIONAL SOURCE SELECTION TECHNIQUE IN SOLICITATIONS.

Section 3306(d) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period and inserting “; or” at the end of paragraph (2); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) stating in the solicitation that the award will be made using a fixed price technical competition, under which all offerors compete solely on nonprice factors and the fixed award price is pre-announced in the solicitation.”.

SEC. 5505. ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

(a) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT IT INVESTMENTS.**—Section 11302(c) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall make available to the public the cost, schedule, and performance data for all of the IT investments listed in subparagraph (B), notwithstanding whether the investments are for new IT acquisitions or for operations and maintenance of existing IT.

“(B) **INVESTMENTS LISTED.**—The investments listed in this subparagraph are the following:

“(i) At least 80 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments Governmentwide.

“(ii) At least 60 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments in each Federal agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

“(iii) Every major information technology investment (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) in each Federal agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

“(C) **QUARTERLY REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION.**—For each investment listed in subparagraph (B), the agency Chief Information Officer and the program manager of the investment within the agency shall certify, at least once every quarter, that the information is current, accurate, and reflects the risks associated with each listed investment. The Director shall conduct quarterly reviews and publicly identify agencies with an incomplete certification or with significant data quality issues.

“(D) **CONTINUOUS AVAILABILITY.**—The information required under subparagraph (A), in its most updated form, shall be publicly available at all times.

“(E) **WAIVER OR LIMITATION AUTHORITY.**—The applicability of subparagraph (A) may be waived or the extent of the information may be limited—

“(i) by the Director, with respect to IT investments Governmentwide; and

“(ii) by the Chief Information Officer of a Federal agency, with respect to IT investments in that agency;

if the Director or the Chief Information Officer, as the case may be, determines that such a waiver or limitation is in the national security interests of the United States.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 11302(c) of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following: “The report shall include an analysis of agency trends reflected in the performance risk information required in paragraph (2).”.

SEC. 5506. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe a regulation making clear that agency acquisition personnel are permitted and encouraged to engage in responsible and constructive exchanges with industry, so long as those exchanges are consistent with existing law and regulation and do not promote an unfair competitive advantage to particular firms.

SEC. 5507. CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW WITH RESPECT TO TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY IN ACQUISITION OF SOFTWARE.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to establish guidance and processes to

clarify that software acquisitions by the Federal Government are to be made using merit-based requirements development and evaluation processes that promote procurement choices—

(1) based on performance and value, including the long-term value proposition to the Federal Government;

(2) free of preconceived preferences based on how technology is developed, licensed, or distributed; and

(3) generally including the consideration of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software technologies.

(b) **TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the Federal Government's long-standing policy of following technology-neutral principles and practices when selecting and acquiring information technology that best fits the needs of the Federal Government.

(c) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, shall issue guidance concerning the technology-neutral procurement and use of software within the Federal Government.

(d) **MATTERS COVERED.**—In issuing guidance under subsection (c), the Director shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Guidance to clarify that the preference for commercial items in section 3307 of title 41, United States Code, includes proprietary, open source, and mixed source software that meets the definition of the term “commercial item” in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, including all such software that is used for non-Government purposes and is licensed to the public.

(2) Guidance regarding the conduct of market research to ensure the inclusion of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software options.

(3) Guidance to define Governmentwide standards for security, redistribution, indemnity, and copyright in the acquisition, use, release, and collaborative development of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software.

(4) Guidance for the adoption of available commercial practices to acquire proprietary, open source, and mixed source software for widespread Government use, including issues such as security and redistribution rights.

(5) Guidance to establish standard service level agreements for maintenance and support for proprietary, open source, and mixed source software products widely adopted by the Government, as well as the development of Governmentwide agreements that contain standard and widely applicable contract provisions for ongoing maintenance and development of software.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of the guidance required by subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing—

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the guidance;

(2) an identification of barriers to widespread use by the Federal Government of specific software technologies; and

(3) such legislative recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to further the purposes of this section.

SEC. 5508. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this division and the amendments made by this division. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Page 459, line 15, strike “None” and insert “(a) PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—None”.

Page 459, after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(b) **RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**—

(1) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that missile defense systems of the Russian Federation should not be integrated into the missile defense systems of the United States or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization if such integration undermines the security of the United States or NATO.

(2) **PROHIBITION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense or for United States contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization may be obligated or expended to integrate missile defense systems of the Russian Federation into missile defense systems of the United States if such integration undermines the security of the United States or NATO.

(3) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (2) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the Russian Federation—

(A) has withdrawn military forces and assets from Ukraine's Crimean peninsula, other than at those operating in accordance with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Conditions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Territory of Ukraine; and

(B) has ceased aggressive actions, particularly along Ukraine's eastern border, that have led to a destabilization of the Ukrainian government and the safety of its residents.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I agree with the chairman we should adopt the en bloc amendments.

I did want to take a moment here—we don't have any speakers on this—to make a couple comments about some Rules Committee decisions that I have not had a chance to speak about before.

Overall, I applaud the product that we have created here in a bipartisan way. I thank the chairman for doing that.

I do think it is a fortunate the Rules Committee ruled out of order a number of amendments. Two of them were mine. One was to offer a BRAC amendment to give Members of Congress a chance to vote on it. The other was to offer up the administration's proposal to lay up 14 Navy vessels as an effort to save money.

There are several problems with the fact that these amendments were ruled out of order, and the biggest one is one of the arguments that I have made of concern about this bill from the very

beginning, because even though I support the product and there are a lot of very good things in this bill, I think the weakness of it and the thing that we are going have to confront when we go to conference is the fact that it delays every single difficult decision.

During the debate and during general debate yesterday, a couple of people commented that they liked the bill for a variety of different reasons and said that it made some tough choices. I asked a couple of times to name one. I don't believe we did make a tough choice. When you look at the issues that we face in terms of the budget, we ducked every single one of them. We have both sequestrations for another 8 years. Even if sequestration doesn't come, we also have substantial cuts coming to the defense budget as a result of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 and a series of CRs and a series of cuts to the defense budget that we did not anticipate.

□ 2115

We are going to have substantially less money over the course of the next 10 years for defense than we thought we were going to have.

That is true even if sequestration goes away. If sequestration happens, we really face a challenge. So the question is how are we going to restructure our defense plans to deal with the fact that we are going to have substantially less money than we had going forward. The answer in this bill is we are not going to deal with it this year, and we are going to hope things get better and maybe deal with it next year.

The administration confronted this problem in a number of areas. I will walk through them. Number one, in the very controversial and difficult area of personnel costs, they found savings in health care by expanding what servicemembers would have to pay for their health care, they reduced somewhat the subsidy to our commissaries, they reduced the housing subsidy, and they also reduced the pay raise down to 1 percent and got rid of it for senior officers.

Except for the last part of that, we ducked all of those. That is \$2 billion over 5 years that the administration was able to save. Nothing was offered, nothing was done on our part to deal with that.

In the Guard and Reserve, the Army has put together a plan to restructure their helicopters in a way that is way too complicated to explain, but that saves \$12 billion over the course of 5 years. We put into our bill an amendment saying they can't do that at all in 2015. Also added in one of the en bloc amendments was an amendment now that says we are going to study it for a longer period of time even beyond that—that is another \$12 billion—and we don't make it up anywhere because that is over 5 years, so we can get away with that in 2015.

I mentioned the Navy issue: 14 ships that the Navy has said they will lay up

in order to save money. That is roughly \$3.5 billion that they will save. Again, we got rid of that in order to pay for it in the short-term. We didn't come up with more money or cut something else. We raided the ship modernization accounts to fund that in the short term, which again does not deal or address the problem. DOD also proposed getting rid of the A-10 and getting rid of the U-2. We stopped them from doing both of those things.

We have at every turn blocked just about every single proposal the administration has made to save money over the long-term. In each one of those isolated incidents, there are strong arguments that tend to be mostly parochial. In other words, if it is in your district or in your neighborhood then you rise up in furious anger against it, but there may be arguments as to why that isn't the best choice. But there was no alternative proposed. We simply got creative in our accounting to get through 2015. These are mostly 5-year savings, so we can sort of stagger our way through 2015 and create a massive bow wave down the road that we are not at all prepared to deal with.

I am sorry I left out the big one: BRAC. It is estimated we are wasting \$6 billion a year on facilities that we don't need. Absolutely the only argument that exists against doing another BRAC round, given how much we have drawn down our force structure and the fact that the military estimates that they are 25 percent over capacity in terms of their facilities, is that Members don't want to run the risk of having a base be closed in their district. I get that. There are a ton of bases in the State of Washington. But we have to confront these issues because the money is not going to magically appear.

So the amendments that were disallowed, I was hoping to have the opportunity on those two amendments to have the broader debate about making the choices now. I don't think we should simply rubberstamp what the White House has done. If we don't like those cuts, let's come up with another one. This is the conversation I had with my adjutant general in the State of Washington, who was concerned about the cuts to the Army Guard and the Air Force Guard. He was talking about everything he didn't like about it. I said: Look, present me an alternative, give us an alternative that says here is how we are going to save \$12 billion instead, and I am happy to look at it. But just to say: We don't like the cuts, I get that. Nobody—well, there are some. Most people don't like the cuts, but they are there. We passed the Budget Control Act, we shut down the government, we passed the budget agreement last year that set the levels for FY14 and FY15, and we still have on the books 8 more years of sequestration.

If Congress doesn't want the administration to wind up making all these choices, then we have got to step up

and make the decisions now rationally about where we are going to be in terms of the budget.

The final point I will make on that is that what happens when we don't make those decisions is that readiness gets cut. In this bill, readiness is cut by \$1.2 billion from the President's request. Plus, there is another \$633 billion that we take out of OCO to fund the A-10. That is probably readiness as well, because they use the OCO account to backfill some of the cuts in readiness. So that is \$1.8 billion out of the readiness account that was already depleted because of the shutdowns, because of the CRs.

Well, what is readiness? We had an interesting discussion about this in committee. Readiness is not the size of the force. Readiness is the capability of the force. Are the troops trained and equipped to perform the missions that we have asked them to do?

The chairman has quite eloquently on a number of occasions pointed to past wars: the Korean war and World War II, where we had to ramp up in a hurry and we sent troops over who were not ready to fight, and many of them were killed and injured because they were not ready to fight.

If we raid readiness accounts to protect personnel, to stop BRAC, to stop the Pentagon from cutting the U-2 or the A-10, or from shutting down a Guard unit, if we do that they've got to raid readiness, because that is the easiest thing to do. You spend less on fuel, you don't repair some equipment that is out there, you fly less, you drive less, you train less. What we wind up with is the hollow force that nobody wants.

So as we go into conference and as we go forward, it is an obligation of this Congress to say: What is our plan? Right now our plan is hope. I didn't serve in the military, but I heard very early on in my time on the Armed Services Committee one of the sayings in the military is "hope is not a strategy." We are hoping that the money will appear, we are hoping that somehow we magically won't have to make those decisions.

I think we are past that point. The decisions are going to get made. They are either going to get made poorly if we ignore them, or preferably they will get made well so that we do our best to put together a force that no matter the size is at least capable and ready to perform the missions that we might ask of them.

So ruling those amendments out of order I think was most unfortunate—that we weren't able to have that debate. But rest assured, as the chairman has pointed out, this is his last term, so I would say there is no ducking this, but I guess you can retire. You won't be here. But the country will have to deal with those decisions one way or the other, and we thus far have not made them.

So I would urge us to start looking at this and saying if we are not going to

do a BRAC, then what are we going to do. If we are not going to shrink the Guard this way, then what are we going to do.

Let's get some concrete proposals on the table that are something other than, don't cut anything in my backyard, and closing our eyes and hoping that the problem will go away.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON for including this amendment that I cosponsor with Congressman ROSKAM.

Israel and the United States face common threats in the Middle East, from the ongoing civil war in Syria, continued rocket fire from terrorist organizations in the Gaza Strip, and the looming threat of a nuclear-armed Iran.

In particular, Iran's brazen quest for nuclear weapons poses an existential threat to our ally Israel. A nuclear Iran would trigger an arms race in the Middle East, further destabilizing a region plagued by persistent volatility and, in the process, threatening U.S. national security and international stability.

Military action against Iran is an absolute last resort, only after we exhaust all peaceful options. However, it would be irresponsible not to prepare for a worst-case scenario.

This amendment would require the administration to certify that Israel maintains an independent capability to remove existential threats to its own security. Specifically, this report would ensure the smooth transfer to Israel of aerial refueling tankers, advanced bunker-buster munitions, and other capabilities and platforms critical to Israel's self-defense.

This is an important amendment for the security of both the U.S. as well as our ally Israel.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to enable DOD to remove unexploded ordnance from certain areas on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico, which was used as a military training range for decades.

Under the FUDS program, the Army Corps of Engineers is decontaminating limited areas of Culebra. However, DOD asserts that a 1974 law prohibits the use of Federal funds to decontaminate land that constituted the bombardment zone. Approximately 400 acres of this land were conveyed to the government of Puerto Rico in 1982 for use as a public park. DOD contends that the 1974 law has not been superseded by Federal cleanup authorities enacted in 1986.

As a result of this rigid interpretation, Culebra is the only former defense site of several thousand across the United States that

DOD claims it is barred by statute from decontaminating. The resulting state of affairs poses a direct threat to public safety, since this land encompasses popular beaches, campgrounds and a trail. In a congressionally-required study, DOD reported that there have been many incidents where members of the public encountered unexploded munitions that could have caused serious harm.

My amendment would authorize the Corps of Engineers to decontaminate those areas within the 400-acre parcel where the risk to public safety is the greatest. It will ensure that the 1974 Act ceases to serve as an obstacle to implementation of current Federal policy, which provides that the federal government is responsible for cleaning lands that were contaminated as a result of its actions. The amendment ensures that Culebra will be treated the same—no better and no worse—than other formerly used defense sites.

The U.S. citizens living in Culebra sacrificed so that our military could receive the training it required. Congress, in turn, should now take this small step to enable DOD to remove unexploded munitions from the island.

I thank the Committee leadership and, in particular, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, for working with me on this issue.

Mr. CONNELLY. Madam Chair, I want to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee and their staff for working with me on a number of amendments to this bill.

In particular, I am proud to have worked with the Chairman of the Oversight Committee, Mr. ISSA, to co-author the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, or FITARA.

In the 21st century, effective governance is inextricably linked with how well government leverages technology to serve its citizens.

Yet current laws governing Federal IT procurement are antiquated and cumbersome.

Our bipartisan amendment would comprehensively streamline and strengthen the process.

It enhances CIO authorities to ensure agency heads have talented leaders to recruit and retain talented IT staff and to oversee critical IT investments.

It accelerates data center optimization and strengthens the accountability and transparency of Federal IT programs.

If enacted, 80 percent of the approximately \$80 billion spent annually on Federal IT investment would be posted online for public review, compared to the 50 percent or less today.

Again, I thank the Chair and Ranking Member for their support.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, this amendment is a modified version of language that was incorporated in the House-passed NDAA authorization bill last year, and that was adopted again by the House earlier this year as a standalone bill, H.R. 1232, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act.

The amendment reforms—Government-wide—the process by which federal information technology is acquired and deployed.

It takes a streamlined and precise approach to solving a huge problem in Federal IT—the broken system by which the government procures and deploys critical IT infrastructure.

President Barack Obama, on Nov. 14, 2013, stated “One of the things [the federal government] does not do well is information tech-

nology procurement This is kind of a systematic problem that we have across the board.” I agree.

I commend the Administrations’ recent steps to strengthen IT management by strengthening the eGov office and focusing on duplications via what is called PortfolioStat reviews.

In its annual reports to Congress, GAO has identified duplicative IT investments as a significant problem. Our oversight hearings confirmed that despite spending more than \$600 billion over the past decade, too often Federal IT investments run over budget, become behind schedule, or never deliver on the promised solution or functionality.

Indeed, industry experts have estimated that as much as 25 percent of the annual \$80 billion spent on IT is attributable to mismanaged or duplicative IT investments.

In terms of potential cost savings, some in the industry have estimated that more than one trillion dollars could be saved over the next ten years if the government adopted the “proven” IT best practices currently in use by the private sector.

We need to enhance the best value to the taxpayer by aligning the cumbersome federal acquisition process to major trends in the IT industry.

FITARA accomplishes this by—

1. Creating a clear line of responsibility, authority, and accountability over IT investment and management decisions by empowering agency CIOs;

2. Accelerating the consolidation and optimization of the Federal Government’s proliferating data centers;

3. Increasing the accuracy and transparency of IT investment scorecards by requiring 80 percent of Government-wide IT spending be covered by a public website called the IT Dashboard; and

4. Ensuring procurement decisions give due consideration to all technologies—including open source—and that contracts are awarded based on long-term best value proposition.

This is a significant and timely reform that will enhance both defense and non-defense procurement. I urge all members to support this amendment.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 98, 107, 108, 109, 111, 116, and 135 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

Page 218, after line 20, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 817. SMALL BUSINESS PRIME AND SUB-CONTRACT PARTICIPATION GOALS RAISED; ACCOUNTING OF SUB-CONTRACTORS.

(a) PRIME CONTRACTING GOALS.—Section 15(g)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “23 percent” and inserting “25 percent”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) The Governmentwide goal for participation by small business concerns in sub-contract awards shall be established at not less than 40 percent of the total value of all subcontract dollars awarded pursuant to section 8(d) of this Act for each fiscal year.”

(b) DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) of this section shall take effect only beginning on the date on which the Administrator of the Small Business Administration has promulgated any regulations necessary, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation has been revised, to implement section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and the amendments made by such section.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISION PERTAINING TO ACCOUNTING OF SUBCONTRACTORS.—Section 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 218, insert after line 20 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 817. SMALL BUSINESS CYBER EDUCATION.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, may make every reasonable effort to promote an outreach and education program to assist small businesses (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) contracted by the Department of Defense to assist such businesses to—

(1) understand the gravity and scope of cyber threats;

(2) develop a plan to protect intellectual property; and

(3) develop a plan to protect the networks of such businesses.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 827. INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

Section 9(jj) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)) is amended to read as follows:

“(jj) INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.—

“(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency required by subsection (n) to establish an STTR program shall carry out a grant program to support innovative approaches to technology transfer at institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)), nonprofit research institutions and Federal laboratories in order to improve or accelerate the commercialization of federally funded research and technology by small business concerns, including new businesses.

“(B) AWARDING OF GRANTS AND AWARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency required by subparagraph (A) to participate in this program, shall award, through a competitive, merit-based process, grants, in the amounts listed in subparagraph (C) to institutions of higher education, technology transfer organizations that facilitate the commercialization of technologies developed by one or more such institutions of higher education, Federal laboratories, other public and private nonprofit entities, and consortia thereof, for initiatives that help identify high-quality, commercially viable federally funded research and technologies and to facilitate and accelerate their transfer into the marketplace.

“(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—Activities supported by grants under this subsection may include—

“(I) providing early-stage proof of concept funding for translational research;

“(II) identifying research and technologies at institutions that have the potential for accelerated commercialization;

“(III) technology maturation funding to support activities such as prototype construction, experiment analysis, product comparison, and collecting performance data;

“(IV) technical validations, market research, clarifying intellectual property rights position and strategy, and investigating commercial and business opportunities;

“(V) programs to provide advice, mentoring, entrepreneurial education, project management, and technology and business development expertise to innovators and recipients of technology transfer licenses to maximize commercialization potential; and

“(VI) conducting outreach to small business concerns as potential licensees of federally funded research and technology, and providing technology transfer services to such small business concerns.

“(iii) SELECTION PROCESS AND APPLICATIONS.—Qualifying institutions seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to a Federal agency required by subparagraph (A) to participate in this program at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the agency may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

“(I) a description of innovative approaches to technology transfer, technology development, and commercial readiness that have the potential to increase or accelerate technology transfer outcomes and can be adopted by other qualifying institutions, or a demonstration of proven technology transfer and commercialization strategies, or a plan to implement proven technology transfer and commercialization strategies, that can achieve greater commercialization of federally funded research and technologies with program funding;

“(II) a description of how the qualifying institution will contribute to local and regional economic development efforts; and

“(III) a plan for sustainability beyond the duration of the funding award.

“(iv) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT BOARDS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Successful proposals shall include a plan to assemble a Program Oversight Board, the members of which shall have technical, scientific, or business expertise three-fifths of whom shall be drawn from industry, start-up companies, venture capital or other equity investment mechanism, technical enterprises, financial institutions, and business development organizations with a track record of success in commercializing innovations. Proposals may use oversight boards in existence on the date of the enactment of the Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 that meet the requirements of this subclause.

“(II) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT BOARDS RESPONSIBILITIES.—Program Oversight Boards shall—

“(aa) establish award programs for individual projects;

“(bb) provide rigorous evaluation of project applications;

“(cc) determine which projects should receive awards, in accordance with guidelines established under subparagraph (C)(ii);

“(dd) establish milestones and associated award amounts for projects that reach milestones;

“(ee) determine whether awarded projects are reaching milestones; and

“(ff) develop a process to reallocate outstanding award amounts from projects that are not reaching milestones to other projects with more potential.

“(III) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—Program Oversight Boards shall be composed of members who do not have a conflict of interest. Boards shall adopt conflict of interest policies to ensure relevant relationships are disclosed and proper recusal procedures are in place.

“(C) GRANT AND AWARD AMOUNTS.—

“(i) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Each Federal agency required by subparagraph (A) to carry out a grant program may make grants up to \$3,000,000 to a qualifying institution.

“(ii) AWARD AMOUNTS.—Each qualifying institution that receives a grant under subparagraph (B) shall provide awards for individual projects of not more than \$100,000, to be provided in phased amounts, based on reaching the milestones established by the qualifying institution’s Program Oversight Board.

“(D) AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURES FOR INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(i) PERCENTAGE.—The percentage of the extramural budget for research, or research and development, each Federal agency required by subsection (n) to establish an STTR program shall expend on the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall be—

“(I) 0.05 percent for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015; and

“(II) 0.1 percent for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF EXPENDITURES.—Any portion of the extramural budget expended by a Federal agency on the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall apply towards the agency’s expenditure requirements under subsection (n).

“(2) PROGRAM EVALUATION AND DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.—

“(A) EVALUATION PLAN AND DATA COLLECTION.—Each Federal agency required by paragraph (1)(A) to establish an Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall develop a program evaluation plan and collect annually such information from grantees as is necessary to assess the Program. Program evaluation plans shall require the collection of data aimed at identifying outcomes resulting from the transfer of technology with assistance from the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program. Such data may include—

“(i) specific follow-on funding identified or obtained, including follow-on funding sources, such as Federal sources or private sources, within 3 years of the completion of the award;

“(ii) number of projects which, within 5 years of receiving an award under paragraph (1), result in a license to a start-up company or an established company with sufficient resources for effective commercialization;

“(iii) the number of invention disclosures received, United States patent applications filed, and United States patents issued within 5 years of the award;

“(iv) number of projects receiving a grant under paragraph (1) that secure Phase I or Phase II SBIR or STTR awards;

“(v) available information on revenue, sales or other measures of products that have been commercialized as a result of projects awarded under paragraph (1), within 5 years of the award;

“(vi) number and location of jobs created resulting from projects awarded under paragraph (1); and

“(vii) other data as deemed appropriate by a Federal agency required by this subparagraph to develop a program evaluation plan.

“(B) EVALUATIVE REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of each Federal agency that participates in the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate an evaluative report regarding the activities of the program. The report shall include—

“(i) a detailed description of the implementation of the program;

“(ii) a detailed description of the grantee selection process;

“(iii) an accounting of the funds used in the program; and

“(iv) a summary of the data collected under subparagraph (A).

“(C) DATA DISSEMINATION.—For the purposes of program transparency and dissemination of best practices, the Administrator shall include on the public database under subsection (k)(1) information on the Innovative Approaches to Technology Transfer Grant Program, including—

“(i) the program evaluation plan required under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) a list of recipients by State of awards under paragraph (1); and

“(iii) information on the use of grants under paragraph (1) by recipient institutions.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Page 370, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 1082. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE TRANSFER OF USED MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should make every reasonable effort, by not later than one year after the date on which a piece of eligible equipment returns to the United States, to transfer such eligible equipment to a Federal, State, or local agency in accordance with subsections (b) and (c) of section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

(b) PREFERENCE.—In considering applications for the transfer of eligible equipment under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may give a preference to Federal, State, and local agencies that plan to use such eligible equipment primarily for the purpose of strengthening border security along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(c) ELIGIBLE EQUIPMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term “eligible equipment” means equipment of the Department of Defense that—

(1) was used in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, or Operation New Dawn;

(2) the Secretary of Defense determines would be suitable for use by a Federal, State, or local agency in law enforcement activities, including—

(A) intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance equipment;

(B) night-vision goggles; and

(C) tactical wheeled vehicles; and

(3) the Secretary determines is excess to military requirements.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 827. REQUIREMENT TO BUY AMERICAN FLAGS FROM DOMESTIC SOURCES.

Section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) A flag of the United States of America (within the meaning of chapter 1 of title 4).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR.
FORTENBERRY OF NEBRASKA

At the end of subtitle A of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. 910. REPORT RELATED TO NUCLEAR FORCES, DETERRENCE, NON-PROLIFERATION, AND TERRORISM.

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 discussing how the Department of Defense will manage its mission with respect to issues related to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 923. MODIFICATIONS TO REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCOUNTING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES LISTED AS MISSING.

(a) DESIGNATION OF OFFICER.—Section 1501(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “PERSONNEL” and inserting “PERSONS”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by designating the second sentence of paragraph (1) as paragraph (2); and

(4) by striking the first sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(A) The Secretary of Defense shall designate a single organization within the Department of Defense to have responsibility for Department of Defense matters relating to missing persons, including accounting for missing persons and persons whose remains have not been recovered from the conflict in which they were lost.

“(B) The organization designated under this paragraph shall be a Defense Agency or other entity of the Department of Defense outside the military departments and is referred to in this chapter as the ‘designated Defense Agency’.

“(C) The head of the organization designated under this paragraph is referred to in this chapter as the ‘designated Agency Director.’”.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Paragraph (2) of such section, as designated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the official designated under this paragraph shall include—” and inserting “the designated Agency Director shall include the following:”

(2) by capitalizing the first letter of the first word of each subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D);

(3) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting a period;

(4) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “responsibility for” after “as well as the”; and

(B) by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) The establishment of a means for communication between officials of the designated Defense Agency and family members of missing persons, veterans service organizations, concerned citizens, and the public on the Department’s efforts to account for missing persons, including a readily available means for communication of their views and recommendations to the designated Agency Director.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “the official designated under paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “the designated Agency Director”; and

(2) in paragraphs (4) and (5), by striking “The designated official” and inserting “The designated Agency Director”.

(d) RESOURCES.—Such section is further amended by striking paragraph (6).

(e) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND OTHER FORMS OF SUPPORT.—Chapter 76 of such title is amended by inserting after section 1501 the following new section:

“§ 1501a. Public-private partnerships; other forms of support

“(a) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary of Defense may enter into arrangements known as public-private partnerships with appropriate entities outside the Government for the purposes of facilitating the activities of the designated Defense Agency. The Secretary may only partner with foreign governments or foreign entities with the concurrence of the Secretary of State. Any such arrangement shall be entered into in accordance with authorities provided under this section or any other authority otherwise available to the Secretary. Regulations prescribed under subsection (e)(1) shall include provisions for the establishment and implementation of such partnerships.

“(b) ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY PERSONAL SERVICES.—The Secretary of Defense may accept voluntary services to facilitate accounting for missing persons in the same manner as the Secretary of a military department may accept such services under section 1588(a)(9) of this title.

“(c) SOLICITATION OF GIFTS.—Under regulations prescribed under this chapter, the Secretary may solicit from any person or public or private entity, for the use and benefit of the activities of the designated Defense Agency, a gift of information and data, books, manuscripts, other documents, and artifacts.

“(d) USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONAL PROPERTY.—The Secretary may allow a private entity to use, at no cost, personal property of the Department of Defense to assist the entity in supporting the activities of the designated Defense Agency.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to implement this section.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Such regulations shall provide that solicitation of a gift, acceptance of a gift (including a gift of services), or use of a gift under this section may not occur if the nature or circumstances of the solicitation, acceptance, or use would compromise the integrity, or the appearance of integrity, of any program of the Department of Defense or any individual involved in such program.”.

(f) SECTION 1505 CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1505(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the office established under section 1501 of this title” and inserting “the designated Agency Director”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “head of the office established under section 1501 of this title” and inserting “designated Agency Director”.

(g) SECTION 1509 AMENDMENTS.—Section 1509 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “PREENACTMENT” in the section heading;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “PROCESS”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “POW/MIA accounting community” and inserting “through the designated Agency Director”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2); and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2):

“(2)(A) The Secretary shall assign or detail to the designated Defense Agency on a full-

time basis a senior medical examiner from the personnel of the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System. The primary duties of the medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall include the identification of remains in support of the function of the designated Agency Director to account for unaccounted for persons covered by subsection (a).

“(B) In carrying out functions under this chapter, the medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall report to the designated Agency Director.

“(C) The medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall—

“(i) exercise scientific identification authority;

“(ii) establish identification and laboratory policy consistent with the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System; and

“(iii) advise the designated Agency Director on forensic science disciplines.

“(D) Nothing in this chapter shall be interpreted as affecting the authority of the Armed Forces Medical Examiner under section 1471 of this title.”.

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by inserting “; CENTRALIZED DATABASE” in the subsection heading after “FILES”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain a single centralized database and case management system containing information on all missing persons for whom a file has been established under this subsection. The database and case management system shall be accessible to all elements of the Department of Defense involved in the search, recovery, identification, and communications phases of the program established by this section.”; and

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “establishing and”; and

(ii) by striking “Secretary of Defense shall coordinate” and inserting “designated Agency Director shall ensure coordination”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “staff” after “National Security Council”; and

(ii) by striking “POW/MIA accounting community”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) In carrying out the program, the designated Agency Director shall coordinate all external communications and events associated with the program.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CROSS-REFERENCE CORRECTION.—Section 1513(1) of such title is amended by striking “subsection (b)” in the last sentence and inserting “subsection (c)”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 76 of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the item relating to section 1501 the following new item:

“1501a. Public-private partnerships; other forms of support.”; and

(B) in the item relating to section 1509, by striking “preenactment”.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS
OF TEXAS

Add at the end of subtitle A of title X the following new section:

SEC. 1005. REPORT ON AUDITABLE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report ranking all military departments and Defense Agencies in order of how advanced they are in achieving auditable financial statements as required

by law. The report should not include information otherwise available in other reports to Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 1005. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTING AUDIT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the barriers to implementing audit reporting requirements contained in section 1003 of Public Law 111-84 and recommendations to ensure reporting deadlines are met.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1027. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PERMITTING ACTIVITIES UNDER THE SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT ACT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to issue a regulation for permitting activities set forth in section 1403 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2907; 10 U.S.C. 113 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. ROSS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1034. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide additional or upgraded recreational facilities for individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA

Page 300, line 12, strike “None of the” and insert “Not more than 50 percent of the”.

Page 301, line 2, insert before the period the following: “until the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary delivers the certification required by subsection (a) to the congressional defense committees”.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BRALEY OF IOWA

Add at the end of subtitle F of title X the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON LONG-TERM COSTS OF OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) **REPORT REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, with contributions from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to Congress a report containing an estimate of previous costs of Operation New Dawn (the successor contingency operation to Operation Iraqi Freedom) and the long-term costs of Operation Enduring Freedom for a scenario, determined by the President and based on current contingency operation and withdrawal plans, that takes into account expected force levels and the expected length of time that members of the Armed Forces will be deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(b) **ESTIMATES TO BE USED IN PREPARATION OF REPORT.**—In preparing the report required by subsection (a), the President shall make estimates and projections through at least fiscal year 2024, adjust any dollar amounts appropriately for inflation, and take into account and specify each of the following:

(1) The total number of members of the Armed Forces expected to be deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, including—

(A) the number of members of the Armed Forces actually deployed in Southwest Asia in support of Operation Enduring Freedom;

(B) the number of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces called or ordered to active duty in the United States for the purpose of training for eventual deployment in Southwest Asia, backfilling for deployed troops, or supporting other Department of Defense missions directly or indirectly related to Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(C) the break-down of deployments of members of the regular and reserve components and activation of members of the reserve components.

(2) The number of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components, who have previously served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom and who are expected to serve multiple deployments.

(3) The number of contractors and private military security firms that have been used and are expected to be used during the course of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(4) The number of veterans currently suffering and expected to suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, or other mental injuries.

(5) The number of veterans currently in need of and expected to be in need of prosthetic care and treatment because of amputations incurred during service in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(6) The current number of pending Department of Veterans Affairs claims from veterans of military service in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the total number of such veterans expected to seek disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(7) The total number of members of the Armed Forces who have been killed or wounded in Iraq or Afghanistan, including noncombat casualties, the total number of members expected to suffer injuries in Afghanistan, and the total number of members expected to be killed in Afghanistan, including noncombat casualties.

(8) The amount of funds previously appropriated for the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Department of Veterans Affairs for costs related to Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom, including an account of the amount of funding from regular Department of Defense, Department of State, and Department of Veterans Affairs budgets that has gone and will go to costs associated with such operations.

(9) Previous, current, and future operational expenditures associated with Operation Enduring Freedom and, when applicable, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn, including—

(A) funding for combat operations;

(B) deploying, transporting, feeding, and housing members of the Armed Forces (including fuel costs);

(C) activation and deployment of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

(D) equipping and training of Iraqi and Afghani forces;

(E) purchasing, upgrading, and repairing weapons, munitions, and other equipment consumed or used in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom; and

(F) payments to other countries for logistical assistance in support of such operations.

(10) Past, current, and future costs of entering into contracts with private military security firms and other contractors for the provision of goods and services associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(11) Average annual cost for each member of the Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, including room and board, equipment and body armor, transportation of troops and equipment (including fuel costs), and operational costs.

(12) Current and future cost of combat-related special pays and benefits, including reenlistment bonuses.

(13) Current and future cost of calling or ordering members of the reserve components to active duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(14) Current and future cost for reconstruction, embassy operations and construction, and foreign aid programs for Iraq and Afghanistan.

(15) Current and future cost of bases and other infrastructure to support members of the Armed Forces serving in Afghanistan.

(16) Current and future cost of providing health care for veterans who served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom, including—

(A) the cost of mental health treatment for veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, and other mental problems as a result of such service; and

(B) the cost of lifetime prosthetics care and treatment for veterans suffering from amputations as a result of such service.

(17) Current and future cost of providing Department of Veterans Affairs disability benefits for the lifetime of veterans who incur disabilities while serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(18) Current and future cost of providing survivors' benefits to survivors of members of the Armed Forces killed while serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or Operation Enduring Freedom.

(19) Cost of bringing members of the Armed Forces and equipment back to the United States upon the conclusion of Operation Enduring Freedom, including the cost of demobilization, transportation costs (including fuel costs), providing transition services for members of the Armed Forces transitioning from active duty to veteran status, transporting equipment, weapons, and munitions (including fuel costs), and an estimate of the value of equipment that will be left behind.

(20) Cost to restore the military and military equipment, including the equipment of the reserve components, to full strength after the conclusion of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(21) Amount of money borrowed to pay for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom, and the sources of that money.

(22) Interest on money borrowed, including interest for money already borrowed and anticipated interest payments on future borrowing, for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 1082. METHODS FOR VALIDATING CERTAIN SERVICE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTIVE SERVICE BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of verifying that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman who is recognized pursuant to section 401 of the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-202; 38 U.S.C. 106 note) as having performed active duty service for the purposes described in subsection (c)(1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall accept the following:

(1) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom no applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record is available, the Secretary shall provide such recognition on the basis of applicable Social Security Administration records submitted for or by the individual, together with validated testimony given by the individual or the primary next of kin of the individual that the individual performed such service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(2) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom the applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record has been destroyed or otherwise become unavailable by reason of any action committed by a person responsible for the control and maintenance of such form, logbook, or record, the Secretary shall accept other official documentation demonstrating that the individual performed such service during period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) For the purpose of determining whether to recognize service allegedly performed during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946, the Secretary shall recognize masters of seagoing vessels or other officers in command of similarly organized groups as agents of the United States who were authorized to document any individual for purposes of hiring the individual to perform service in the merchant marine or discharging an individual from such service.

(b) TREATMENT OF OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—Other documentation accepted by the Secretary of Homeland Security pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall satisfy all requirements for eligibility of service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(c) BENEFITS ALLOWED.—

(1) BURLIAL BENEFITS ELIGIBILITY.—Service of an individual that is considered active duty pursuant to subsection (a) shall be considered as active duty service with respect to providing burial benefits under chapters 23 and 24 of title 38, United States Code, to the individual.

(2) MEDALS, RIBBONS, AND DECORATIONS.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to subsection (a) may be awarded an appropriate medal, ribbon, or other military decoration based on such service.

(3) STATUS OF VETERAN.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to subsection (a) shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled by reason of such recognized service to any benefit that is not described in this subsection.

(d) DETERMINATION OF COASTWISE MERCHANT SEAMAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall verify that an individual performed service under honorable conditions

that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman pursuant to this section without regard to the sex, age, or disability of the individual during the period in which the individual served as such a coastwise merchant seaman.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “coastwise merchant seaman” means a mariner that served on a tug boat, towboat, or seagoing barge that transported war materials to and from ports located in the territorial seas of the United States in support of the war effort during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending December 31, 1946.

(2) The term “primary next of kin” with respect to an individual seeking recognition for service under this section means the closest living relative of the individual who was alive during the period of such service.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. 10 . 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 and Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1046. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 145. Veterans Day

“The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation, beginning at—

- “(1) 3:11 pm Atlantic standard time;
- “(2) 2:11 pm eastern standard time;
- “(3) 1:11 pm central standard time;
- “(4) 12:11 pm mountain standard time;
- “(5) 11:11 am Pacific standard time;
- “(6) 10:11 am Alaska standard time; and
- “(7) 9:11 am Hawaii-Aleutian standard time.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“145. Veterans Day.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 10 . FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Vietnam Veterans Memorial continues to be a popular and important place of reflection and healing for a generation.

(2) The simple inscriptions of the names of the Nation's dead bear mute testimony to the sacrifice of more than 58,000 Americans, serving as a deep source of comfort and pride for the families of those who were lost.

(3) 74 sailors were lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans, which sank after colliding with the HMAS Melbourne on June 3, 1969, during a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization exercise just outside the designated combat zone.

(4) The Frank Evans had been providing support fire for combat operations in Viet-

nam before the exercise that resulted in the accident and was scheduled to return after the exercise.

(5) The families of the 74 men lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans have been fighting for decades to have their loved ones added to the Memorial.

(6) Exceptions have been granted to inscribe the names on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial for other servicemembers who were killed outside of the designated combat zone, including in 1983 when President Ronald Reagan ordered that 68 Marines who died on a flight outside the combat zone be added to the wall.

(7) Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus, in a letter dated December 15, 2010, expressed support for the addition of the 74 names of the men lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

(8) The heroism and sacrifice should never go unrecognized because of an arbitrary line on a map.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should order that the names of the 74 military personnel lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans on June 3, 1969, be added to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. . INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO DISRUPT, DISMANTLE, AND DEFEAT AL-QAEDA, ITS AFFILIATED GROUPS, ASSOCIATED GROUPS, AND ADHERENTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents continue to pose a significant threat to United States national security interests;

(2) al-Qaeda continues to evolve and reorganize to adapt to United States counterterrorism measures; and

(3) al-Qaeda has become more decentralized and less hierarchical over the past decade.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the conduct of an independent assessment of the United States efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, including its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents since May 2, 2011.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of al-Qaeda core's relationship with any and all affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(B) An assessment of the aims, objectives, and capabilities of al-Qaeda core and any and all affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(C) An assessment of the Administration's efforts to combat al-Qaeda core and any and all affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(D) An assessment of the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40) and its relevance to the current structure and objectives of al-Qaeda core, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(E) A comprehensive order of battle for al-Qaeda core, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity selected for the conduct of the assessment required by paragraph (1) shall provide to the Secretary and the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing its findings as a result of the assessment.

(B) FORM.—The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

- (1) the congressional defense committees;
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and
- (3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA

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

SEC. 12 . REPORT ON COLLECTIVE AND NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF CENTRAL ASIAN AND SOUTH CAUCASUS ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Assured access to stable energy supplies is an enduring concern of both the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

(2) Adopted in Lisbon in November 2010, the new NATO Strategic Concept declares that “[s]ome NATO countries will become more dependent on foreign energy suppliers and in some cases, on foreign energy supply and distribution networks for their energy needs”.

(3) The report required by section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) reaffirmed the Strategic Concept’s assessment of growing energy dependence of some members of the NATO alliance and also noted there is value in the assured access, protection, and delivery of energy.

(4) Development of energy resources and transit routes in the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea can diversify sources of supply for members of the NATO alliance, particularly those in Eastern Europe.

(b) REPORT.—

REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the implications of new energy resource development and distribution networks, both planned and under construction, in the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea for energy security strategies of the United States and NATO.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the dependence of NATO members on a single oil or natural gas supplier or distribution network.

(B) An assessment of the potential of energy resources of the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea to mitigate such dependence on a single supplier or distribution network.

(C) Recommendations, if any, for ways in which the United States can help support increased energy security for NATO members.

(3) SUBMISSION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

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

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I concur with the chairman that we should pass the en bloc amendment. I have no speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), my friend and colleague.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, it is great to be here. I know it is at the end of the debate.

First, let me thank BUCK MCKEON for doing a great job as the chairman, and I know as Adam will do, will recognize his years of service, and this is a great bill. Adam, thank you for your friendship and support.

Part of this en bloc amendment is the Black Ribbon Day. I worked really closely with Congressman ENGEL to make sure that it was vetted and cleared.

The basic premise is the country has to understand the importance of knowing the past to survive in the world of the present.

Shimkus is ethnically Lithuanian. I deal with the Baltic issues and Eastern European causes, and the world has significantly changed, as I said earlier in this debate, about the threat from Russia.

So the Black Ribbon Day recognizes the victims of communism and the Holocaust and the gulags and the deportation and the Russification. So when Vladimir Putin makes a claim protecting the Russian minority, it is because what they did post-World War II was they removed forcefully to Siberia ethnics and moved in Russians.

The world is not a safer place today. It is important for us to remember the events of the past so we can defend the freedoms of the future.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for including this in your en bloc amendment.

To my friend Adam from Washington State, thank you for your support. I don’t get a chance to talk about defense and NDAA. As you all know, I served in the military. I have great respect for what you have done in trying to strengthen the force and protect freedom. So thank you for the work you do. It is just an honor to get a chance to work with both of you.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for supporting my amendment and allowing it to come to the floor.

This Amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to get an independent assessment of U.S. efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, its affiliates, and other associated groups.

Al-Qaeda continues to threaten the security of the U.S. and our allies, both at home and abroad.

Our intelligence services and our military have scored some real gains against al-Qaeda, but al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan is still able to provide tactical and ideological direction to its affiliates around the world.

Al-Qaeda has gone from “on the verge of strategic defeat” to a serious and growing threat, depending on who you ask in the Administration or intelligence services.

Today al-Qaeda controls more territory than ever. The fight against al-Qaeda is far from over.

This amendment is necessary so we can have outside experts evaluate this Administration’s efforts against al-Qaeda and what we should do about it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, first, I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for supporting my amendment and allowing it to come to the floor.

The amendment is simple, it urges the Secretary of Defense to make a reasonable effort to make excess intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance equipment, night vision goggles, and tactical wheeled vehicles returning from abroad available to State, Federal, and local law enforcement agencies for the purpose of strengthening border security along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

This amendment is common sense—why not allow excess military equipment to be used by state, local, and federal law enforcement for border security?

Our border sheriffs say they are outmanned, outgunned and out-financed by the drug cartels.

This is not a new idea. DOD already has a program for distribution of surplus DOD equipment. This program has transferred 6 used Humvees to Texas Border Sheriffs in 2010. The purpose of this amendment is to urge DOD to make more equipment available through this existing program.

So let’s put that veteran equipment to work on the border to help fight the drug cartels. America has done our part over the past 10 years to bring safety and security to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan, and now it is time to bring that same safety and security to Americans living along our southern border.

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

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 590, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 6 consisting of amendment Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 128, 136, 145, and 155 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. NUNES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 302, line 22, add the following after the period: "Such assessment shall address the efficacy of Lajes Air Force Base modifying its United States Air Force mission to support a permanent force structure for the United States Special Operations Command, the United States Africa Command, and other overseas United States forces in both the European and African regions, at a force structure at or above the force structure at such Air Force Base as of October 1, 2013."

Page 302, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 303, line 7, and insert the following:

(2) The Secretary of Defense includes in the Assessment under paragraph (1) an analysis of how, with respect to the use and force structure of the Lajes Air Force Base, the United States is honoring the goals of the U.S.-Portugal Permanent Bilateral Commission, particularly how the systematic reduction in force structure at such Air Force Base is within the goals of the commission and the bilateral cooperation between the 2 countries in the fight against terrorism.

(3) The Secretary briefs the congressional defense committees regarding the results of the Assessment under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 1051. MODIFICATIONS TO OH-58D KIOWA WARRIOR HELICOPTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 2244A of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may implement engineering change proposals on OH-58D Kiowa Warrior helicopters.

(b) MANNER OF MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out subsection (a) in a manner that ensures—

(1) the safety and survivability of the crews of the OH-58D Kiowa Warrior helicopters by expeditiously replacing or integrating, or both, the mast-mounted sight engineering change proposals to the current OH-58D fleet;

(2) the safety of flight; and

(3) that the minimum requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands are met.

(c) ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSALS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "engineering change proposals" means, with respect to OH-58D helicopters, engineering changes relating to the following:

(1) Mast mounted sight laser pointer.

(2) Two-card system processor.

(3) Diode pump laser.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON USE OF DRONES TO KILL UNITED STATES CITIZENS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No officer or employee of, or detailee or contractor to, the Department of Defense may use a drone to kill a citizen of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to the use of a drone to kill an individual who is actively engaged in combat against the United States.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create any authority, or expand any existing authority, for the Federal Government to kill any person.

(d) DRONE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "drone" means an unmanned aircraft (as defined in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note)).

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO OF MISSISSIPPI

At the end of subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON FORCE STRUCTURE LAYDOWN OF TACTICAL AIRLIFT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the strategic laydown of tactical airlift forces following the withdrawal of combat forces from Afghanistan is cause for concern.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the five-year plan of the Secretary for the force structure laydown of the tactical airlift.

(c) LIMITATION; REPORT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall brief the congressional defense committees prior to implementing any movements.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON THERMAL INJURY PREVENTION.

The Director of the United States Army Tank Automotive Research, Development, and Engineering Center shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report addressing thermal injury prevention needs to improve occupant centric survivability systems for combat and tactical vehicles against over matching ballistic threat.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. COLE OF OKLAHOMA

Page 340, line 11, insert "either" after "is".

Page 340, line 14, insert ", or participating in the Robotic Aircraft for Public Safety program or other activities of similar nature conducted by the Department of Homeland Security," before "to allow".

Page 340, beginning on line 16, strike "test range program" and insert in its place "a program".

Page 341, beginning on line 5, strike "test range".

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 1082. REVIEW OF OPERATION OF CERTAIN SHIPS DURING THE VIETNAM ERA.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—By not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review the logs of each ship under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy that is known to have operated in the waters near Vietnam during the Vietnam Era (as that term is defined in section 101(29) of title 38, United States Code) to determine—

(1) whether each such ship operated in the territorial waters of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975; and

(2) for each such ship that so operated—

(A) the date or dates when the ship so operated; and

(B) the distance from the shore of the location where the ship operated that was the closest proximity to shore.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Upon a determination that any such ship so operated, the Secretary of Defense shall provide such determination, together with the information described in subsection (a)(2) about the ship, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make publicly available all unclassified information provided to the Secretary under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA OF OHIO

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10 ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALLIED AMPHIBIOUS LANDING ON D-DAY, JUNE 6, 1944, AT NORMANDY, FRANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) June 6, 2014, marks the 70th anniversary of the Allied assault at Normandy, France, by American, British, and Canadian troops, which was known as Operation Overlord.

(2) Before Operation Overlord, the German Army still occupied France and the Nazi government still had access to the raw materials and industrial capacity of Western Europe.

(3) The naval assault phase on Normandy was code-named "Neptune", and the June 6th assault date is referred to as D-Day to denote the day on which the combat attack was initiated.

(4) The D-Day landing was the largest single amphibious assault in history, consisting of approximately 31,000 members of the United States Armed Forces, 153,000 members of the Allied Expeditionary Force, 5,000 naval vessels, and more than 11,000 sorties by Allied aircraft.

(5) Soldiers of 6 divisions (3 American, 2 British, and 1 Canadian) stormed ashore in 5 main landing areas on beaches in Normandy, which were code-named "Utah", "Omaha", "Gold", "Juno", and "Sword".

(6) Of the approximately 10,000 Allied casualties incurred on the first day of the landing, more than 6,000 casualties were members of the United States Armed Forces.

(7) The age of the remaining World War II veterans and the gradual disappearance of any living memory of World War II and the Normandy landings make it necessary to increase activities intended to pass on the history of these events, particularly to younger generations.

(8) The young people of Normandy and the United States have displayed unprecedented commitment to and involvement in celebrating the veterans of the Normandy landings and the freedom that they brought with them in 1944.

(9) The significant material remains of the Normandy landing, such as shipwrecks and various items of military equipment found both on the Normandy beaches and at the bottom of the sea in French territorial waters, bear witness to the remarkable material resources used by the Allied Armed Forces to execute the Normandy landings.

(10) 5 Normandy beaches and a number of sites on the Normandy coast, including Pointe du Hoc, were the scene of the Normandy landings, and constitute both now and for all time a unique piece of humanity's world heritage, and a symbol of peace and freedom, whose unspoiled nature, integrity, and authenticity must be protected at all costs.

(11) The world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the "greatest generation" who assumed the task of freeing the world from Nazi and Fascist regimes and restoring liberty to Europe.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) recognizes the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II;

(2) expresses gratitude and appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the D-Day operations;

(3) thanks the young people of Normandy and the United States for their involvement in recognizing and celebrating the 70th Anniversary of the Normandy landings with the

aim of making future generations aware of the acts of heroism and sacrifice performed by the Allied forces;

(4) recognizes the efforts of the Government of France and the people of Normandy to preserve, for future generations, the unique world heritage represented by the Normandy beaches and the sunken material remains of the Normandy landing, by inscribing them on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage List; and

(5) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and programs to honor the sacrifices of their fellow countrymen to liberate Europe.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY OF FLORIDA

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10 . TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 402 the following new section:

“§ 403. Transportation of supplies from non-profit organizations

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF TRANSPORTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may transport to any country, without charge, supplies that have been furnished by a nonprofit organization and that are intended for distribution to members of the armed forces. Such supplies may be transported only on a space available basis.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The Secretary may not transport supplies under subsection (a) unless the Secretary determines that—

“(A) the transportation of the supplies is consistent with the policies of the United States;

“(B) the supplies are suitable for distribution to members of the armed forces and are in usable condition;

“(C) there is a legitimate need for the supplies by the members of the armed forces for whom they are intended; and

“(D) adequate arrangements have been made for the distribution and use of the supplies.

“(2) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for making the determinations required under paragraph (1). Such procedures shall include inspection of supplies before acceptance for transport.

“(3) PREPARATION.—It shall be the responsibility of the nonprofit organization requesting the transport of supplies under this section to ensure that the supplies are suitable for transport.

“(c) DISTRIBUTION.—Supplies transported under this section may be distributed by the United States Government or a nonprofit organization.

“(d) DEFINITION OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 402 the following new item:

“403. Transportation of supplies from nonprofit organizations.”

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 1082. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AIR FORCE FLIGHT TRAINING AIRCRAFT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Air Force uses the T-1A aircraft to train Air Force pilots to operate tanker and transport aircraft.

(2) The Air Force is seeking a replacement aircraft for the T-1A which is experiencing obsolescence issues and high costs.

(3) An effective way to mitigate the T-1A’s cost, obsolescence, and complexity issues until a permanent replacement aircraft enters service, is to utilize contractor-owned, contractor-operated modern aircraft in the very light jet category.

(4) Conducting very light jet training via a contractor-owned, contractor-operated contract vehicle could provide increased flexibility and reduce unnecessary ownership costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should formally assess the operational feasibility, costs, potential savings, and readiness implications of utilizing contractor-owned, contractor-operated, very light jet aircraft for interim flight instruction until a permanent replacement for the T-1A enters service.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

In section 1216(b), add at the end the following:

(5) A description of efforts of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to engage United States manufacturers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the ANSF.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The people of Afghanistan have taken the lead in providing for the security of their country and the successful elections are a positive step in the self-determination of the future of Afghanistan.

(2) However, no country can be successful in the long-term if a majority of its population is not included in the dialogue and decision-making of such country.

(3) The women of Afghanistan have made historic strides in the last several years and the elections prove that the women need and have a right to have a voice in the future of Afghanistan.

(4) To that end, the women of Afghanistan are vital to the development of Afghanistan and the national security of Afghanistan;

(5) Women are needed to serve Afghanistan in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), not just for the future standing of women in society, but for cultural reasons.

(6) Therefore, it is important that Afghanistan move forward in increasing the number of women in the ANSF with the current facilities and capacity to meet the requirements Afghanistan has proposed to achieve.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the allocation of \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 for the ANSF should be prioritized for the recruitment, retention, and training of women in the ANSF;

(2) current facilities to support women in the ANSF should be fully utilized before additional infrastructure is constructed;

(3) the Government of Afghanistan should ensure that the fund provided prioritize efforts to increase the number of women serving in the ANSF, as proposed in the Master Ministerial Development Plan for Afghan National Army (ANA) Gender Integration;

(4) as part of such plan, the conversion of the 13,000 women that were trained to support the elections is an important step in increasing the number of women in the ANSF;

(5) the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan’s report, “A Way to Go: An Update on Implementation of the Law on Elimination of Violence Against Women in Afghanistan”, should be integrated into efforts to enable women to serve in the ANSF; and

(6) the United States should continue to advocate for the rights and participation of women in Afghanistan in all levels of government and society.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. 12 . LIMITATION ON FUNDS TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR BASES IN AFGHANISTAN.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended by the United States Government to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

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

SEC. . REVIEW PROCESS FOR USE OF UNITED STATES FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN AFGHANISTAN THAT CANNOT BE PHYSICALLY ACCESSED BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for a construction project in Afghanistan in excess of \$500,000 that cannot be audited and physically inspected by authorized United States Government civilian personnel or their designated representatives, in accordance generally-accepted auditing guidelines.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to a project that is initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition in subsection (a) may be waived with respect to a project if not less than 15 days prior to the obligation of funds for the project, the agency responsible for such funds submits to the relevant authorizing committees a plan outlining how the agency will monitor the use of the funds—

(1) to ensure the funds are used for the specific purposes for which the funds are intended; and

(2) to mitigate waste, fraud, and abuse.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. . ACTIONS TO SUPPORT HUMAN RIGHTS, PARTICIPATION, PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, EXISTING FRAMEWORKS, AND SECURITY AND MOBILITY WITH RESPECT TO WOMEN AND GIRLS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that promoting women’s meaningful inclusion and participation in conflict prevention, management, and resolution, as well as in post-conflict relief and recovery, advances core United States national interests of peace, national security, economic and social development, and international cooperation.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote and support the security of women and girls in conflict-affected and post-conflict regions and ensure their protection from sexual and gender-based violence;

(2) to promote and support the security of women and girls in Afghanistan during the

security transition process and recognize that promoting security for Afghan women and girls must remain a priority of United States foreign policy; and

(3) to maintain and improve the gains of women and girls in Afghanistan made since 2002, including in terms of their political participation and integration in security forces.

(c) ACTIONS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure the indicators of success of the security transition process and establishment of an independent Afghanistan as described in paragraph (2) are achieved.

(2) INDICATORS OF SUCCESS.—The indicators of success referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) Support for human rights of women and girls in Afghanistan.

(B) Participation of women in Afghanistan at all levels of decision-making and governance in Afghanistan.

(C) Strategic integration of women in the Afghan National Security Forces.

(D) Support for initiatives to prevent sexual and gender-based violence, including implementation of Afghanistan's Elimination of Violence Against Women law and support for the Ministry of Interior's Family Response Units in the Afghan National Police.

(E) Support for existing frameworks, including the National Action Plan for the Women of Afghanistan, the Afghanistan National Development Strategy, and the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework.

(F) Recognition of the ability of women in Afghanistan to move freely and securely throughout Afghanistan.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on efforts by the United States Government to support the human rights, participation, prevention of violence, existing frameworks, and security and mobility with respect to women and girls in Afghanistan.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate 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. 123 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO OF CONNECTICUT

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

SEC. 1228. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS WITH ROSOBORONEXPORT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 may be used to enter into a contract (or subcontract at any tier under such a contract), memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, to make a grant to, or to provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability of subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, certifies in writing to the congress-

sional defense committees, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge, the following:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

(2) The armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation has withdrawn substantially all of the armed forces of the Russian Federation from the immediate vicinity of the eastern border of Ukraine.

(4) Agents of the Russian Federation have ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to which a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) ELEMENTS.—A review conducted under paragraph (1) shall assess the accuracy of the factual and legal conclusions made by the Secretary of Defense in the waiver covered by the review, including—

(A) whether there is any viable alternative to Rosoboronexport for carrying out the functions for which funds will be obligated;

(B) whether the Secretary has previously used an alternative vendor for carrying out the same functions regarding the military equipment in question, and what vendor was previously used;

(C) whether other explanations for the issuance of the waiver are supportable; and

(D) any other matter with respect to the waiver the Inspector General considers appropriate.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) with respect to such waiver.

AMENDMENT 124 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. . REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN DEFENSE TRANSFERS TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to oppose the transfer of defense articles or defense services (as defined in the Arms Export Control Act) from any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to, or on behalf of, the Russian Federation, during any period in which the Russian Federation forcibly occupies the territory of Ukraine or of a NATO member country.

(b) NATO POLICY.—The President shall use the voice and vote of the United States in NATO to seek the adoption of a policy by NATO that is consistent with the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DEFENSE TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States to monitor all transfers of defense articles or defense services from NATO member countries to the Russian Federation and identify those transfers that are contrary to the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit a written report to the chairmen and ranking members of the appropriate committees of Congress within 5 days of the receipt of information indicating that a transfer described in paragraph (1) has occurred.

(B) FORM.—The report required under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in classified form.

(C) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(i) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(d) LICENSING POLICY FOR CERTAIN DEFENSE TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a NATO member country transfers, or allows a transfer by a person subject to its national jurisdiction of, a defense article or defense service on or after the date of the enactment of this Act that is contrary to the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a) and is identified pursuant to subsection (c), an application for a license or other authorization required under the Arms Export Control Act for the transfer of any defense article or service to, or on behalf of, that NATO member country shall be subject to a presumption of denial.

(2) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—A presumption of denial shall apply to an application for a license or other authorization under paragraph (1) only during a period in which the Russian Federation forcibly occupies the territory of Ukraine or of a NATO member country.

(3) AMENDMENT TO ITAR.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall amend the International Trafficking in Arms Regulations for purposes of implementing this subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON OF NEW YORK

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. . RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against Syria or Iran.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 1266. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Protecting cultural property abroad is a vital part of United States cultural diplomacy, showing the respect of the United States for other cultures and the common heritage of humanity.

(2) Cultural property abroad has been lost, damaged, or destroyed due to political instability, armed conflict, natural disasters, and other threats.

(3) In Egypt, political instability has led to the ransacking of its museums, resulting in the destruction of countless ancient artifacts that will forever leave gaps in humanity's knowledge of the ancient Egyptian civilization.

(4) In Syria, the ongoing civil war has resulted in the shelling of medieval cities, damage to World Heritage Sites, and the looting of museums and archaeological sites. Archaeological and historic sites and artifacts in Syria date back more than six millennia, and include some of the earliest examples of writing.

(5) In Mali, the Al-Qaeda-affiliated terrorist group Ansar Dine destroyed tombs and shrines in the ancient city of Timbuktu, once a major center for Islamic learning and scholarship in the 15th and 16th centuries, and threatened collections of ancient manuscripts.

(6) In Afghanistan, the Taliban decreed that the Bamiyan Buddhas, ancient statues carved into a cliff side in central Afghanistan, were to be destroyed. In 2001 the Taliban carried out their threat and destroyed the statues, leading to worldwide condemnation.

(7) In Iraq, after the fall of Saddam Hussein, thieves looted the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, resulting in the loss of approximately 15,000 items. These included ancient amulets, sculptures, ivories, and cylinder seals. Many of these items remain unrecovered.

(8) The destruction of these and other cultural properties represents an irreparable loss to humanity's common cultural heritage, and therefore to all Americans.

(9) The Armed Forces have played important roles in preserving and protecting cultural property. On June 23, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas to provide expert advice to the military on the protection of cultural property. The Commission formed Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) teams which became part of the Civil Affairs Division of Military Government Section of the Allied armies. The individuals serving in the MFAA were known as the "Monuments Men" and have been credited with securing, cataloguing, and returning hundreds of thousands works of art stolen by the Nazis during World War II.

(10) The U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield was founded in 2006 to support the implementation of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, and to coordinate with the Armed Forces, other branches of the United States Government, and other cultural heritage nongovernmental organizations in preserving cultural property abroad threatened by political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Armed Forces play an important role in preserving and protecting cultural property in countries at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters; and

(2) the United States must protect cultural property abroad pursuant to its obligations under the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and customary international law in all conflicts to which the United States is a party.

(c) REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN REGARDS TO PROTECTING CULTURAL PROPERTY ABROAD.—The Secretary of Defense 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 efforts of the Department of Defense to protect cultural property abroad, including activities undertaken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, other cultural protection statutes, and international agreements, including—

(1) directives, policies, and regulations the Department has instituted to protect cultural property abroad at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters;

(2) actions the Armed Forces have taken to protect cultural property abroad, including efforts made to avoid damage, to the extent possible, to cultural property through construction activities, training to ensure deploying military personnel are able to identify, avoid, and protect cultural property abroad, and other efforts made to inform military personnel about the protection of cultural property as part of the law of war; and

(3) the status and number of specialist personnel in the Armed Forces assigned to secure respect for cultural property abroad and to cooperate with civilian authorities responsible for safeguarding cultural property abroad, as required by existing treaty obligations under Article 7 of the 1954 Hague Convention.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

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

SEC. 1636. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR REMOVAL OR CONSOLIDATION OF DUAL-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT FROM EUROPE.

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used for the removal or consolidation of dual-capable aircraft from the area of responsibility of the United States European Command until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory;

(B) the Russian Federation is no longer violating the INF Treaty; and

(C) the Russian Federation is in compliance with the CFE Treaty and has lifted its suspension of Russian observance of its treaty obligations.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply in instances where a dual-capable aircraft is being replaced by an F-35 aircraft.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a)(1) if—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) a notification that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States and a description of the national security interest covered by the waiver;

(B) certification that such consolidation is consistent with the policy established in the NATO Deterrence and Defense Posture Review of 2012 concerning reciprocal non-strategic nuclear weapons reductions by the Russian Federation; and

(C) a report, in unclassified form, explaining why the Secretary of Defense cannot make the certification under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the information in the report under paragraph (1)(C).

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide a report on the cost and burden sharing arrangements of forward-deployed nuclear weapons in place with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its members and any recommendations for changes to these arrangements.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "CFE Treaty" means the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed at Paris November 19, 1990, and entered into force July 17, 1992.

(2) The "dual-capable aircraft" means tactical fighter aircraft that can perform both conventional and nuclear missions.

(3) 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 3134. PLAN FOR VERIFICATION AND MONITORING OF PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND FISSILE MATERIAL.

(a) PLAN.—The President, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall develop an interagency plan for verification and monitoring relating to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons, components of such weapons, and fissile material.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An interagency plan and road map for verification and monitoring, with respect to policy, operations, and research, development, testing, and evaluation, including—

(A) identifying requirements (including funding requirements) for such verification and monitoring; and

(B) identifying and integrating roles, responsibilities, and planning for such verification and monitoring.

(2) An engagement plan for building cooperation and transparency to improve inspections and monitoring.

(3) A research and development program to—

(A) improve monitoring, detection, and in-field inspection and analysis capabilities, including persistent surveillance, remote monitoring, rapid analysis of large data sets, including open-source data; and

(B) coordinate technical and operational requirements early in the process.

(4) Engagement of relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the military departments (including the Open Source Center and the U.S. Atomic Energy Detection System), national laboratories, industry, and academia.

(c) SUBMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 1, 2015, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the plan developed under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term appropriate congressional committees means the following:

(A) The congressional defense committees.

(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(D) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(E) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2130

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the Committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I concur. We should adopt the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, this en bloc includes two of my amendments. The first amendment provides an incentive for NATO member countries to align their policies on defense exports to Russia with the restrictions that the United States has imposed.

As of March 1st, the United States stopped approving licenses of munitions and dual-use items to Russia if they would be used by the Russian military. The U.S. restrictions would apply to any defense items of other countries if they contain U.S. components.

While several European governments have imposed restrictions similar to ours, neither NATO nor the European Union has moved to restrict defense exports to Russia that are not covered by the U.S. restrictions.

This raises the disturbing prospect that a NATO member could transfer military items to Russia during this dangerous period when Russia forcibly occupies Ukrainian territory in Crimea or, worse, could seize territory in the Baltics, the Balkans or elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

The risk is real. For example, France has a contract to provide Russia with two Mistral-class helicopter assault ships, the first one to be delivered as early as this October. These warships would significantly strengthen Russia's ability to launch an amphibious attack.

Under my amendment, if a NATO member country transfers significant defense items to Russia, inconsistent with the restrictions that the U.S. has imposed, then there would be a "presumption of denial" for applications to export U.S. defense items to that NATO country. This policy would be in effect during any period when Russia either occupies Ukrainian territory or the territory of a NATO member.

A "presumption of denial" is a well-established concept in U.S. export controls. It provides sufficient flexibility to the Executive Branch to approve defense transfers, if the presumption of denial is over-ridden by U.S. security interests.

If NATO countries continue to arm Russia at this dangerous time, we have to ask ourselves: "what kind of alliance is NATO?" My amendment is not a sanction, but it is a warning to our NATO allies that we have to stand together against Russian aggression, or risk arming a country that might become an adversary.

The en bloc also includes my amendment requiring the Secretary of Defense to do a one-time report on activities of the Department of Defense with regards to protecting cultural property abroad, including activities under-

taken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

War is inherently destructive, and all too often it results in the ruin of irreplaceable artifacts, monuments, and archeological sites.

In Egypt, political instability has led to the ransacking of its museums and destruction of countless ancient artifacts that will forever leave gaps in humanity's knowledge of the ancient Egyptian civilization.

In Syria, the ongoing civil war has resulted in the shelling of medieval cities, damage to World Heritage Sites, and the looting of museums and archeological sites. Historic sites and artifacts in Syria date back more than six millennia and include some of the earliest examples of writing.

In Mali, the Al-Qaeda affiliated terrorist group Ansar Dine destroyed tombs and shrines in the ancient city of Timbuktu—once a major center for Islamic learning and scholarship in the 15th and 16th centuries—and threatened collections of ancient manuscripts. In Afghanistan, the Taliban destroyed the Bamiyan Buddhas, ancient statues carved into a cliff, leading to worldwide condemnation.

In Iraq, after the fall of Saddam Hussein, thieves looted the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, resulting in the loss of approximately 15,000 items. These included ancient amulets, sculptures, ivories, and cylinder seals. Many of these items remain unrecovered.

Threats to cultural property are not new. Just as Adolf Hitler and the Nazis aimed to eliminate entire groups of people from the planet, they also sought to erase culture by stealing or destroying Europe's great works of art and other cultural property.

Protecting cultural property abroad is a vital part of United States cultural diplomacy, showing the respect of the United States for other cultures and the common heritage of humanity.

The Armed Forces have played and continue to play an important role in preserving and protecting cultural property in countries at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters.

On June 23, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas to provide expert advice to the military on the protection of cultural property. The Commission formed Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives (MFAA) teams which became part of the Civil Affairs Division of Military Government Section of the Allied armies. The individuals serving in the MFAA were known as the "Monuments Men" and have been credited with securing, cataloguing, and returning hundreds of thousands works of art stolen by the Nazis during World War II.

The amendment included in the en bloc requires the Secretary of Defense to do a one-time report on all Department of Defense activities related to the protection of cultural property abroad—including those taken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

This report will not only highlight the Defense Department's critical role in protecting cultural property and sites, but will also help us determine what more the United States can do to ensure that priceless work produced over the ages will remain with us for generations to come.

I thank the managers for including both of my amendments in the en bloc.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 590, 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. 57, 65, 67, 106, 114, 117, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 134, 137, 142, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 158, 159, and 162 printed in part A of House Report No. 113-460, offered by Mr. McKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. 5 ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESERVATION OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED OR RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

(2) Approximately 40,000 servicemen and women across all branches of the Armed Forces either live in or are stationed on active duty within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Unless these individuals are granted a waiver as serving in a law enforcement role, they are subject to the District of Columbia's onerous and highly restrictive laws on the possession of firearms.

(3) Military personnel, despite being extensively trained in the proper and safe use of firearms, are therefore deprived by the laws of the District of Columbia of handguns, rifles, and shotguns that are commonly kept by law-abiding persons throughout the United States for sporting use and for lawful defense of their persons, homes, businesses, and families.

(4) The District of Columbia has one of the highest per capita murder rates in the Nation, which may be attributed in part to previous local laws prohibiting possession of firearms by law-abiding persons who would have otherwise been able to defend themselves and their loved ones in their own homes and businesses.

(5) The Gun Control Act of 1968 (as amended by the Firearms Owners' Protection Act) and the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act provide comprehensive Federal regulations applicable in the District of Columbia as elsewhere. In addition, existing District of Columbia criminal laws punish possession and illegal use of firearms by violent criminals and felons. Consequently, there is no need for local laws that only affect and disarm law-abiding citizens.

(6) On June 26, 2008, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller* held that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm for traditionally lawful purposes, and thus ruled that the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirements that rifles and shotguns in the home be kept unloaded and disassembled or outfitted with a trigger lock to be unconstitutional.

(7) On July 16, 2008, the District of Columbia enacted the Firearms Control Emergency Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Act 17-422; 55 DCR 8237), which places onerous restrictions on the ability of law-abiding citizens from possessing firearms, thus violating the spirit by which the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

(8) On February 26, 2009, the United States Senate adopted an amendment on a bipartisan vote of 62-36 by Senator John Ensign to S. 160, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009, which would fully restore Second Amendment rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that active duty military personnel who are stationed or residing in the District of Columbia should be permitted to exercise fully their rights under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and therefore should be exempt from the District of Columbia's restrictions on the possession of firearms.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

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

SEC. 703. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES UNDER TRICARE.—Section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g)(1) Subject to paragraph (4), in providing health care under subsection (a), the treatment of developmental disabilities (as defined by section 102(8) of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002(8))), including autism spectrum disorder, shall include behavioral health treatment, including applied behavior analysis, when prescribed by a physician or psychologist.

“(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) except as provided by subparagraph (B), behavioral health treatment is provided pursuant to this subsection—

“(i) in the case of such treatment provided in a State that requires licensing or certification of applied behavioral analysts by State law, by an individual who is licensed or certified to practice applied behavioral analysis in accordance with the laws of the State; or

“(ii) in the case of such treatment provided in a State other than a State described in clause (i), by an individual who is licensed or certified by a State or an accredited national certification board; and

“(B) applied behavior analysis or other behavioral health treatment may be provided by an employee, contractor, or trainee of a person described in subparagraph (A) if the employee, contractor, or trainee meets minimum qualifications, training, and supervision requirements as set forth in applicable State law, by an appropriate accredited national certification board, or by the Secretary.

“(3)(A) This subsection shall not apply to a medicare eligible beneficiary (as defined in section 1111(b) of this title).

“(B) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting or otherwise affecting the benefits provided to a covered beneficiary under—

“(i) this chapter;

“(ii) title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

“(iii) any other law.

“(4) In addition to the requirement under section 1100(c)(1) of this title, with respect to retired members of the Coast Guard, the

Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, or dependents of any such retired members, treatment shall be provided under this subsection in a fiscal year only to the extent that amounts are specifically provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the Defense Health Program Account for the provision of such treatment for such fiscal year.”

(b) FUNDING MATTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1100 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TREATMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES.—(1) Funds for treatment under section 1077(g) of this title may be derived only from the Defense Health Program Account. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may not be reimbursed from any account that would otherwise provide funds for the treatment of retired members of the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, or dependents of any such retired members.

“(2) As provided for in paragraph (4) of section 1077(g), with respect to retired members of the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, or dependents of any such retired members, treatment under such section shall be provided in a fiscal year only to the extent that amounts are specifically provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the Defense Health Program Account for the provision of such treatment for such fiscal year.”

(2) INCREASE AND OFFSET.—

(A) 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 \$20,000,000.

(B) 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 270) is hereby reduced by \$20,000,000.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 729. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON USE OF HYPERBARIC OXYGEN THERAPY TO TREAT TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY AND POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder are the signature injuries of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(2) Post-traumatic stress disorder is prevalent throughout the regular component of the Armed Forces.

(3) For example, with respect to Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, which has a base

population of 41,753 active duty personnel, including 38,020 marines and 3,533 sailors—

(A) 6,616 patients with a principal diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder had at least one visit for post-traumatic stress disorder between February 2013 and April 2014; and

(B) the Naval Hospital Camp Lejeune, which had a total of approximately 600,000 outpatient visits during 2013, recorded 15,043 outpatient visits for which post-traumatic stress disorder was the primary reason for the visit between February 2013 and April 2014.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) hyperbaric oxygen therapy is a medical treatment that can be used to treat active duty members of the Armed Forces for traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder if—

(A) such treatment is prescribed by a military medical doctor; and

(B) a hyperbaric chamber that is owned by the Department of Defense and cleared for clinical use is locally available; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense should increase awareness among members of the Armed Forces, including military medical doctors, of hyperbaric oxygen therapy to treat traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD OF KENTUCKY

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

SEC. 1082. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish an Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health, as described in the report of the Comptroller General of the United States titled “Energy Employees Compensation: Additional Independent Oversight and Transparency Would Improve Program’s Credibility”, numbered GAO-10-302, to—

(1) advise the President concerning the review and approval of the Department of Labor site exposure matrix;

(2) conduct periodic peer reviews of, and approve, medical guidance for part E claims examiners with respect to the weighing of a claimant’s medical evidence;

(3) obtain periodic expert review of evidentiary requirements for part B claims related to lung disease regardless of approval;

(4) provide oversight over industrial hygienists, Department of Labor staff physicians, and Department of Labor’s consulting physicians and their reports to ensure quality, objectivity, and consistency; and

(5) coordinate exchanges of data and findings with the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health to the extent necessary (under section 3624 the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384o).

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 384, line 21, strike “and”.

Page 385, line 2, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 385, after line 2, add the following:

(3) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) That Pakistan is not using its military or any funds or equipment provided by the United States to persecute minority groups for their legitimate and nonviolent political and religious beliefs, including the Balochi, Sindhi, and Hazara ethnic groups and minority religious groups, including Christian, Hindu, and Ahmadiyya Muslim.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR.
ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XII of division A, add the following:

SEC. . 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 leveled 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. 126 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-
LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 1259. COMBATING CRIME THROUGH INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to deploy assets, personnel, and resources to the Joint Interagency Task Force South, in coordination with SOUTHCOM, to combat the following by supplying sufficient intelligence capabilities:

- (1) Transnational criminal organizations.
- (2) Drug trafficking.
- (3) Bulk shipments of narcotics or currency.
- (4) Narco-terrorism.
- (5) Human trafficking.
- (6) The Iranian presence in the Western Hemisphere.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-
LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. . STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to undertake a whole-of-government approach to bolster regional cooperation with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere, with the exception of Cuba, to counter narcotics trafficking and illicit activities in the Western Hemisphere.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF
ARIZONA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. . DECLARATION OF POLICY REGARDING ISRAEL'S LAWFUL EXERCISE OF SELF-DEFENSE.

Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to fully support Israel's lawful exercise of self-defense, including actions to halt regional aggression.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM
OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . STATEMENT OF POLICY AND REPORT ON THE INHERENT RIGHT OF ISRAEL TO SELF-DEFENSE.

(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 (22 U.S.C. 8601 et seq.) expressed the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should transfer to the Government of Israel defense articles and defense services such as air refueling tankers, missile defense capabilities, and specialized munitions.

(3) The inherent right of Israel to self-defense necessarily includes the possession and maintenance by Israel of an independent capability to remove existential threats to its security and defend its vital national interests.

(b) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to take all necessary steps to ensure that Israel possesses and maintains an independent capability to remove existential threats to its security and defend its vital national interests.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that air refueling tankers and advanced bunker-buster munitions should immediately be transferred to Israel to ensure our democratic ally has an independent capability to remove any existential threat posed by the Iranian nuclear program and defend its vital national interests.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed four years, the President shall submit to the House and Senate Armed Services committees, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House and Senate Appropriations committees a report that—

(1) identifies all aerial refueling platforms, bunker-buster munitions, and other capabilities and platforms that would contribute significantly to the maintenance by Israel of a robust independent capability to remove existential security threats, including nuclear and ballistic missile facilities in Iran, and defend its vital national interests;

(2) assesses the availability for sale or transfer of items necessary to acquire the capabilities and platforms described in paragraph (1) as well as the legal authorities available for making such transfers; and

(3) describes the steps the President is taking to immediately transfer the items described in paragraph (1) pursuant to the policy described in subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF
ARIZONA

Add at the end of subtitle F of title XII of division A the following:

SEC. 1266. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NIGERIA AND BOKO HARAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In recent years, Boko Haram has furthered violence and instability in Nigeria and bordering countries.

(2) The terrorist group known as "Boko Haram," which translates to "Western education is forbidden," perpetrates violent attacks in Nigeria and has grown in strength and sophistication since its founding in 2002.

(3) Boko Haram kidnapped over 200 female students on April 14, 2014, killed over 50 male students on February 25, 2014, and continues to violently attack innocent civilians throughout Nigeria.

(4) Boko Haram has previously attacked Western interests, bombing the United Nations building in Abuja on August 26, 2011, and was affiliated with taking Western hostages in Bauchi on February 16, 2013, and later killing seven hostages.

(5) As stated by United States Ambassador to Nigeria Terrence P. McCulley in 2012, the threat of Boko Haram is growing: "We've seen an increase in sophistication, we've seen increased lethality. We saw at least a part of the group has decided it's in their interest to attack the international community."

(6) In June 2012, the Department of State added three leaders of Boko Haram, Abubakar Shekau, Abubakar Adam Kamar, and Khalid al-Barnawi, to the Specially Designated Global Terrorist list.

(7) In November 2013, the Department of State designated Boko Haram and its splinter group, Ansaru, as Foreign Terrorist Organizations.

(8) Boko Haram shares the ideological designs of al Qaeda, and has made public pledges of support to Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda, and al-Shabaab.

(9) Boko Haram poses a broader threat to interests in Nigeria, the Sahel, Europe, and the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings specified in subsection (a), it is the

sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should—

(1) take appropriate action with allies and partners of the United States to fight Boko Haram's violence and ideology;

(2) partner with Nigeria's regional neighbors to counter Boko Haram's cross-border activity and respond to emerging threats; and

(3) develop a long-term, interagency strategy to combat Boko Haram and Ansaru, reassess United States assistance to Nigeria, and brief Congress on this strategy.

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle F of title XII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1266. RECOGNITION OF VICTIMS OF SOVIET COMMUNIST AND NAZI REGIMES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On August 13, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill issued a joint declaration “of certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they based their hopes for a better future for the world” and “the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them” and that the people of countries may live in freedom.

(2) The United States Government has actively advocated for and continues to support the principles of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations General Assembly resolution 260 (III) of December 9, 1948.

(3) Captive Nations Week, signed into law by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959, raised public awareness of the oppression of nations under the control of Communist and other nondemocratic governments.

(4) The European Parliament resolution on European conscience and totalitarianism of April 2, 2009, and the “Black Ribbon Day” resolution adopted by the Parliament of Canada on November 30, 2009, establish a day of remembrance for victims of Communist and Nazi regimes to remember and commemorate their victims.

(5) The extreme forms of totalitarian rule practiced by the Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes led to premeditated and vast crimes committed against millions of human beings and their basic and inalienable rights on a scale unseen before in history.

(6) Fleeing the Nazi and Soviet Communist crimes, hundreds of thousands of people sought and found refuge in the United States.

(7) August 23 would be an appropriate date to designate as “Black Ribbon Day” to remember and never forget the terror millions of citizens in Central and Eastern Europe experienced for more than 40 years by ruthless military, economic, and political repression of the people through arbitrary executions, mass arrests, deportations, the suppression of free speech, confiscation of private property, and the destruction of cultural and moral identity and civil society, all of which deprived the vast majority of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe of their basic human rights and dignity, separating them from the democratic world by means of the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall.

(8) The memories of Europe's tragic past cannot be forgotten in order to honor the victims, condemn the perpetrators, and lay the foundation for reconciliation based on truth and remembrance.

(b) RECOGNITION.—Congress supports the designation of “Black Ribbon Day” to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT RELATING TO RESCUE EFFORTS IN NIGERIAN KIDNAPPING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall transmit to Congress a report on the findings of U.S. military personnel assisting in the search and rescue efforts of the more than 200 girls and young women who were abducted from the Government Secondary School in Chibok, Nigeria by Boko Haram. Such report shall include—

(1) the location, health, and safety of the abducted girls, to the extent such information is ascertainable;

(2) recommendations on what the Nigerian government can do to protect the girls and similarly situated girls moving forward;

(3) an assessment of the threat of Boko Haram to Nigeria and other countries in the region;

(4) information regarding efforts by the Department of Defense and Department of State to build the capacity of the Nigerian security forces to combat the threat of Boko Haram;

(5) information regarding efforts underway to address poverty and governance in Nigeria to improve the stability of that nation; and

(6) an assessment of the efforts of the government of Nigeria to address security challenges and the willingness of that government to cooperate with the efforts of the United States, including efforts to address human rights abuses by the security forces of the government of Nigeria.

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO OF KANSAS

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1622. DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CERTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO THE MISSION ANALYSIS FOR CYBER OPERATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 933 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 830) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “before the submittal of” and all that follows and inserting “or 2015 before the Secretary submits the report required by subsection (d) and the Director of National Intelligence submits a certification described in subsection (g).”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “and the Director of National Intelligence submits a certification described in subsection (g).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CERTIFICATION.—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the recommendations of the report required under subsection (d) are consistent with the cyber operations capability needs of the United States.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 1643. STUDY ON TESTING PROGRAM OF GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into an arrangement with the Institute for Defense Analyses under which the Institute shall carry out a study on the testing program of the ground based midcourse missile defense system.

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

(1) An assessment of whether the testing program described in subsection (a) has established, as of the date of the study, that the ground-based midcourse missile defense system will perform reliably and effectively under realistic operational conditions, including an explanation of the degree of confidence supporting such assessment.

(2) An assessment of whether the currently planned testing program, if implemented, is sufficient to establish that the ground-based midcourse missile defense system will perform both reliably and effectively against current and plausible near- and medium-term ballistic missile threats under realistic operational conditions, and if any gaps are identified, an evaluation of what improvements could be made to the testing program to achieve reasonable confidence that the system would be reliable and effective under realistic operational conditions.

(3) Any necessary recommendations to improve the effectiveness and reliability of the ground-based midcourse missile defense system.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MR. SABLON OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

In title XXIII, insert after section 2303 the following new section (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 2304. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 992) relating to Saipan for the construction of a maintenance facility, a hazardous cargo pad, or an airport storage facility in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out such construction at any suitable location in the Northern Mariana Islands.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2805. REPORT ON PREVALENCE OF BLACK MOLD IN BUILDINGS LOCATED ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress on the prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military installations.

(b) ACTION REQUIRED.—Based on the report required under subsection (a), buildings identified in such report as containing black mold shall be added to the appropriate branch's construction priority list for building replacement or renovation.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO OF GUAM

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

SEC. 2832. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURFACE DANGER ZONE, RITIDIAN UNIT, GUAM NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH.—In order to accommodate the operation of a live-fire training range complex on Andersen Air Force Base-Northwest Field and the management of the adjacent Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of

1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), may enter into an agreement providing for the establishment and operation of a surface danger zone which overlays the Ritidian Unit or such portion thereof as the Secretaries consider necessary.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENT.**—The agreement to establish a surface danger zone over all or a portion of the Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge shall include—

(1) measures to maintain the purposes of the Refuge; and

(2) as appropriate, measures, funded by the Secretary of the Navy from funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act and otherwise available to the Secretary, for the following purposes:

(A) Relocation and reconstruction of structures and facilities of the Refuge in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) Mitigation of impacts to wildlife species present on the Refuge or to be reintroduced in the future in accordance with applicable laws.

(C) Use of Department of Defense personnel to undertake conservation activities within the Ritidian Unit normally performed by Department of the Interior personnel, including habitat maintenance, maintaining the boundary fence, and conducting the brown tree snake eradication program.

(D) Openings and closures of the surface danger zone to the public as may be necessary.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 2867. ENSURING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SUMMIT OF RATTLESNAKE MOUNTAIN IN THE HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior, acting as the administrator of land owned by the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy known as the “Hanford Reach National Monument”, shall provide public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes, including—

(1) motor vehicle access; and
(2) pedestrian and other nonmotorized access.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements to facilitate access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain—

(1) with the Secretary of Energy, the State of Washington, or any local government agency or other interested persons, for guided tours, including guided motorized tours to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain; and

(2) with the Secretary of Energy, and with the State of Washington or any local government agency or other interested persons, to maintain the access road to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Page 649, after line 10, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsection accordingly):

(d) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN OPTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The study under subsection (b)(1) and the report under subsection (c)(1) shall not include any assessment or discussion of options that involve moving plutonium to a State where the Federal Government—

(A) is not meeting all legally binding deadlines and milestones required under the Tri-Party Agreement and the Consent Decree;

(B) has provided notification that any element of the Tri-Party Agreement or the Consent Decree is at risk of being breached; or

(C) is in dispute resolution with the State regarding the Tri-Party Agreement or the Consent Decree.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) The term “Tri-Party Agreement” means the comprehensive cleanup and compliance agreement between the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Washington entered into on May 15, 1989.

(B) The term “Consent Decree” means the legal agreement between the Secretary of Energy and the State of Washington finalized in 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle H—National Commission on the Future of the Army

SEC. 1091. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the National Commission on the Future of the Army (in this subtitle referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—The Commission shall be composed of eight members, of whom—

(A) four shall be appointed by the President;

(B) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(E) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) **APPOINTMENT DATE.**—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **EFFECT OF LACK OF APPOINTMENT BY APPOINTMENT DATE.**—If one or more appointments under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in paragraph (2), the authority to make such appointment or appointments shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number of appointments so not made. If an appointment under subparagraph (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in paragraph (2), the authority to make an appointment under such subparagraph shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number otherwise appointable under such subparagraph.

(4) **EXPERTISE.**—In making appointments under this subsection, consideration should be given to individuals with expertise in reserve forces policy.

(c) **PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.**—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) **CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.**—The Commission shall select a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members.

(e) **INITIAL MEETING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its initial meeting.

(f) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(g) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum,

but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(h) **ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROCEDURAL AUTHORITIES.**—The following provisions of law do not apply to the Commission:

(1) Section 3161 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 1092. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **STUDY ON STRUCTURE OF THE ARMY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army, and policy assumptions related to the size and force mixture of the Army, to—

(A) determine the proper size and force mixture of the regular component of the Army and the reserve components of the Army, and

(B) make recommendations on how the structure should be modified to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements for the Army in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In undertaking the study required by subsection (a), the Commission shall give particular consideration to the following:

(A) An evaluation and identification of a structure for the Army that—

(i) has the depth and scalability to meet current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands;

(ii) achieves a cost-efficiency balance between the regular and reserve components of the Army, taking advantage of the unique strengths and capabilities of each, with a particular focus on fully burdened and lifecycle cost of Army personnel;

(iii) ensures that the regular and reserve components of the Army have the capacity needed to support current and anticipated homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States;

(iv) provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Army to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components of the Army could be recruited; and

(v) maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness.

(B) An evaluation and identification of force generation policies for the Army with respect to size and force mixture in order to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements for the Army in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources, including policies in connection with—

(i) readiness;

(ii) training;

(iii) equipment;

(iv) personnel; and

(v) maintenance of the reserve components in an operational state in order to maintain the level of expertise and experience developed since September 11, 2001.

(b) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Commission shall submit to the President and the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission as a result of the study required by subsection (a), together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as the Commission considers appropriate in light of the results of the study.

SEC. 1093. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Commission shall hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties under this Act.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its duties under this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

SEC. 1094. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chair of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Chair of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(c) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(d) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chair of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 1095. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its final report under section 1092(b).

SEC. 1096. FUNDING.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 and available for operation and maintenance for the Army may be available for the activities of the Commission under this subtitle.

AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 1643. BUDGET INCREASE FOR AEGIS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aegis BMD (Line 030) is hereby increased by \$99,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aerial Common Sensor (Line 003) is hereby reduced by \$75,300,000; and

(2) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, Marine Corps, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for RQ-21 UAS (line 023) is hereby reduced by \$23,700,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF INDIANA

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

SEC. 28. INDEMNIFICATION OF TRANSFEREES OF PROPERTY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED SINCE OCTOBER 24, 1988, THAT REMAIN UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 330(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(B) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2) contributed to any such release or threatened release, paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (3) contributed to any such release or threatened release, paragraph (1) or (2)”;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) The responsibility of the Secretary of Defense to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify in full certain persons and entities described in paragraph (3) also applies with respect to any military installation (or portion thereof) that—

“(A) was closed during the period beginning on October 24, 1988, and ending on the date of the enactment of this paragraph, other than pursuant to a base closure law; and

“(B) remains under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph.”.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 134 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1266. RECOGNITION OF VICTIMS OF SOVIET COMMUNIST AND NAZI REGIMES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On August 13, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston

Churchill issued a joint declaration “of certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they based their hopes for a better future for the world” and “the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them” and that the people of countries may live in freedom.

(2) The United States Government has actively advocated for and continues to support the principles of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations General Assembly resolution 260 (III) of December 9, 1948.

(3) Captive Nations Week, signed into law by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959, raised public awareness of the oppression of nations under the control of Communist and other nondemocratic governments.

(4) The European Parliament resolution on European conscience and totalitarianism of April 2, 2009, and the “Black Ribbon Day” resolution adopted by the Parliament of Canada on November 30, 2009, establish a day of remembrance for victims of Communist and Nazi regimes to remember and commemorate their victims.

(5) On the 70th anniversary of the formal adoption by the Nazi leadership of the “Final Solution of the Jewish Problem”, members of the European Parliament and the national parliaments of the European Union rejected attempts to obfuscate the Holocaust by persons who sought to diminish the uniqueness of the Holocaust by deeming the Holocaust to be equal, similar, or equivalent to Communism.

(6) Extreme forms of totalitarian rule have led to premeditated and vast crimes committed against millions of human beings and their basic and inalienable rights on a scale unseen before in history.

(7) The Nazi regime committed mass genocide during the Holocaust, killing millions of Jews, political opponents, and minority populations.

(8) August 23 would be an appropriate date to designate as “Black Ribbon Day” to remember and never forget the terror millions of citizens in Central and Eastern Europe experienced for more than 40 years by ruthless military, economic, and political repression of the people through arbitrary executions, mass arrests, deportations, the suppression of free speech, confiscation of private property, and the destruction of cultural and moral identity and civil society, all of which deprived the vast majority of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe of their basic human rights and dignity, separating them from the democratic world by means of the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall.

(9) The memories of Europe’s tragic past cannot be forgotten in order to honor the victims, condemn the perpetrators, and lay the foundation for reconciliation based on truth and remembrance.

(b) RECOGNITION.—Congress supports the designation of “Black Ribbon Day” to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes.

Mr. MCKEON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED
BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 159 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment as modified is as follows:

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

SEC. 1643. BUDGET INCREASE FOR AEGIS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aegis BMD (Line 030) is hereby increased by \$99,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Aerial Common Sensor (Line 003) is hereby reduced by \$75,300,000; and

(2) the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for operation and maintenance pertaining to implementation of benefit reform proposals, is hereby reduced by \$23,700,000.

Mr. MCKEON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I concur in support for the en bloc amendments. This is the last amendment, and I just want to say thank you again to Chairman MCKEON. I think it is right that this bill is named after him. As I have said, he has done a fabulous job on our committee. I appreciate his hard work and for, once again, putting together this product.

I also want to thank the staff. This is a very large bill. Lots of amendments are offered both on the committee level and on the House level. Staff has to pour through all of that and make sense of it and keep us informed. They do an incredible job and an incredible service to our country and to the men

and women who serve in the military by making sure that this bill gets done every year, so I very much appreciate that.

I want to particularly recognize Debra Wada from the HASC staff, who will soon be leaving us. She has been promoted to be the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Debra has served for 15 years as staff on this committee and as an invaluable source of knowledge on personnel and on many, many other issues. It has been great working with her. We congratulate her on her appointment and wish her the best. Again, she is but one example of an absolutely fantastic staff and of the great work that they do to put this product together every single year.

So we thank you.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my simple amendment to ensure fairness in how we treat military installations after they are closed.

Most military installations are closed through the BRAC process. As such, they are granted certain legal protections, including indemnification from claims arising from environmental hazards created by previous DOD operations. However, some installations can be closed unilaterally by the Defense Secretary outside of the normal BRAC process. In these instances, the facilities are not granted the same protections. As it turns out, many former Army ammunition plants were closed outside the normal procedure. As you might imagine, facilities where chemicals for ammunition production were once mixed and discarded tend to pose some risk to the environment, and yet, merely because of the way they were closed down, cities and towns which later try to redevelop that property must assume the risk for any lingering environmental hazards.

My amendment would simply extend the same protection enjoyed by most closed installations to all closed installations.

Two years ago, I offered a similar amendment that was added to the House-passed NDAA, but it was not included in the Senate-passed version nor was it included in the conference report. That version would have retroactively applied this protection to properties which have already been transferred.

I have heard the concerns from the DOD and from others about adding this benefit on top of previously negotiated contracts. I am sensitive to those concerns, so this updated language only applies to those properties which are still under DOD's control today. I think this adequately addresses those concerns, and it still ensures that there is equity in how we handle these properties in the future.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman MCKEON, for his work once again in putting together this NDAA. I would also like to thank him and his staff for working with our office to draft this amendment and include it as part of this amendment package.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Mr. GRAVES from Missouri for taking the lead on this amendment, and I would like to thank Chairman MCKEON for including this amendment in this en bloc package.

After 12 years of combat coming to a close and shifting security priorities, a commission to evaluate Army force structure is, indeed, appropriate. The Pentagon is still operating with assumptions, metrics and policies from the early 2000s. What we need to be doing is looking at shaping the force of the future. What the future missions and force mixture between active-guard-reserve should be is a question that should be thoroughly assessed.

To determine how the future of our total Army will be shaped for decades to come, we should select the more comprehensive commission and take the additional few months to do a comprehensive analysis with the best personnel and minds available.

Madam Chairman, the security of the Nation depends upon it.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I think we are about done.

At this time, I would like to thank my partner. For 4 years, we have had the opportunity of leading this committee, and I could not have had a better person to be working with than Mr. SMITH from Washington. He is straightforward; he is honest; he is hard-working, and we just, I think, have had a really good working relationship. I consider him—and I will always consider him—a friend.

Likewise, I want to echo the things he said about the committee. I want to thank them. We get all of the plaudits. People get up and thank us and say we have done a great job, but it is these people behind us—our committee, our staff—that make it easy to do this. I mean, we could have been here until 1 or 2 o'clock this morning, but to make it look kind of easy, kind of smooth, they have been working on it for hours, for days, for weeks, and for months leading up to this point.

I don't know much more to say other than "thank you." You are great Americans.

People like to beat up on government workers. All I can say is that they are not paid enough for what they do. They can't be paid enough. They are patriots. They are dedicated to this work and to our men and women in uniform and their families, and I thank them for that.

With that, Madam Chair, I encourage our colleagues to support the en bloc

amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which requires a report to Congress on the prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military installations. Additionally, once the report is complete, buildings identified as containing black mold shall be added to the appropriate branch's construction priority list for building replacement or renovations. I would like to thank Mr. NUGENT and Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their support and agreeing to include my language in an en bloc amendment.

Taking care of our troops is one of our country's top priorities. After these brave men and women have put themselves in harm's way on the battlefield, it is essential that we ensure once they are back on base they are living and working in a safe nonhazardous environment. We must root out dangerous health hazards—like black mold—on military installations to protect the health of military personnel on base.

One example of where this is an issue is at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida. MacDill is home to the 6th Air Mobility Wing and 39 Mission Teammates, including the United States Central Command, United States Special Operations Command. MacDill is home to over 13,000 military and civilian personnel and approximately 170,000 retirees live in the Tampa area and depend on the base for many necessary services. Black mold has been found on the first floor of the Mission Support Facility located on base. This building houses the mission support squadron and the ID services. Employees working in the Mission Support Facility supply all employees—military, civilian and contractor—and veterans with their ID credentialing and they assist veterans with additional paperwork that will help them obtain the benefits they have earned during service. Imagine how many of our active duty personnel, military retirees and civilians have visited this facility over the years. The Defense Department must keep a critical eye out not only for this facility at MacDill, but on all bases so we can maintain a high standard for our military men and women.

In addition to being a health hazard, the mold in the Mission Support Facility takes up valuable workspace and is cordoned off. Base personnel are doing the best they can and they have found a way to ensure that no service member or their family member has suffered, but they should not have to.

As you may know, black mold thrives in indoor spaces where there is moisture and humidity. As any tourist or native Floridian, like me, can tell you, Florida is well known for its humidity. It likely is happening at other bases located in humid areas. If we do not maintain these facilities defense-wide, issues like black mold can lead to expensive and harmful consequences down the road. We have seen examples over the years of black mold being found in homes where military families live and the horrendous stories centered around mold that came out of Walter Reed less than 10 years ago. We need to make certain our servicemembers, veterans, their families and civilians live and work in a healthy environment and that is why I have introduced my amendment to NDAA.

I would like to thank my friend and fellow Tampa Bay member, Representative RICH

NUGENT, for his partnership on this amendment. His tireless dedication to the men and women serving in the Armed Forces at MacDill and around the globe are laudable. Active duty personnel and veterans throughout the Tampa Bay area are fortunate to have such a strong leader serving on the House Armed Services Committee and I am fortunate to call him a colleague.

Madam Chair, again, I would like to thank Mr. NUGENT, Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their hard work on this legislation and for including my amendment en bloc. Protecting the health of our servicemembers and all individuals who work, live or visit any military installations is imperative. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Graves Amendment to the National Defense Authorization bill.

My home state of Pennsylvania is proud of its National Guard—the fourth largest in the country and part of the fabric of our community.

We need the Guard—particularly in times of disaster.

After Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee in 2011, many of our citizens simply would not have made it without the help of our National Guard.

I support ensuring that the National Guard is appropriately protected in any force restructuring.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment number 129 as part of en-bloc package 7. The overall intent of this amendment is to address potential legal impediment of allowing a surface danger zone (SDZ) over the Ritidian unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge. My amendment would allow the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Interior to enter into agreement over the establishment of an SDZ over the refuge. It would also outline areas that would need to be mitigated if an SDZ were located over the Ritidian Unit. The amendment is similar to compromise language developed by Navy and Fish and Wildlife Service following an April 29, 2014 hearing in the House Committee on Natural Resources on this bill.

I believe this amendment will keep the Navy and the Fish and Wildlife Service talking about the potential impacts of a firing range on Northwest Field. In fact, I believe this amendment is important to keep the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process on track so that these two agencies can discuss potential mitigations should this location ultimately be chosen as the location for a firing range on Guam. The Navy has just commenced the draft supplemental environmental impact statement hearings (SEIS) so there is ample time to review all alternatives. The amendment does not prejudge the outcome of this NEPA process, indeed it is intended to keep the process on track so we do not suffer any unnecessary delays in the realignment of Marines from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. As the Navy has testified and stated publicly, without H.R. 4402 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 the military build-up would likely suffer significant delays and could significant consequences for our bilateral relationship with Japan.

I fully respect and appreciate the Guam community's close engagement on these issues and their participation during the draft

SEIS public meetings this past week. I was able to hear directly from our community on this amendment over the past week, and community feedback is absolutely critical to the process. It provides the Navy and other stakeholders with important viewpoints to consider when final decisions are made for the Record of Decision.

I would also like to underscore the importance of training to the overall readiness of Marines in the Asia-Pacific region. This importance is highlighted by Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel in a letter to Congress, stating a live-fire training range is critical to, "maintain the military training and readiness of Marine Corps personnel relocating to the island". I have been and remain a staunch advocate for the military build-up on Guam. I believe that this bill keeps the process moving forward and ensures that we have no further unnecessary delays. The bottom line and undeniable fact is that without a live-fire training range on Guam, we will not have a military build-up.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for agreeing to put this amendment in en-bloc package 7 and urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment, which directs the Department of the Interior to provide the American public with reasonable motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain, located in the Hanford Reach National Monument. This 195,000-acre monument, designated by President Clinton in 2000, is near the Hanford Nuclear Site and is the only one in the continental United States managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Although administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the site itself remains under the ownership of the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management.

At 3,600 feet, Rattlesnake Mountain is the highest point in the region, and it provides unparalleled views for miles around the monument, including the Hanford Site, the Snake River, the Columbia River, and the Yakima River. Unfortunately, it took the Fish and Wildlife Service eight years to write a management plan that effectively closed Rattlesnake Mountain to public access, despite the vast majority of public comments favoring just the opposite.

After I first introduced this bill in 2010, the Fish and Wildlife Service offered two public tours for selected individuals and then suddenly reneged on the offer just days before the tours were to occur. During a 2011 committee hearing on the bill, the Interior Department's testimony suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports tours of Rattlesnake, but very carefully didn't go the extra step of ensuring the Service would allow public access to the summit.

Finally, last summer, the Fish and Wildlife Service granted a few dozen people the opportunity to access the Rattlesnake Mountain summit over two tours. These were the first two public tours offered since the monument was designated. The seats for the 2013 tours were snapped up online in just 21 seconds of being made available.

This year, the Fish and Wildlife Service is proposing tours on six days, and used a lottery system to distribute the tickets. While I appreciate the Interior Department's tentative steps in recent years toward allowing the public access to this area, it's clearly not enough, and even the limited opportunities being offered now can be reversed at any time.

My amendment is necessary to ensure reasonable and regular public access can be guaranteed by law to the citizens of that area. This language is supported by many stakeholders in the local area including the Benton County Commissioners, the Tri-Cities Development Council (TRIDEC), the Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau, and the Back Country Horsemen of Washington.

I would also note that this amendment has passed this chamber previously as stand-alone legislation. Last year, and in the previous Congress, this body approved this language on strong bipartisan votes with no votes in opposition.

I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee and their staff for allowing this amendment to be adopted en bloc today. Hopefully, this will move us closer to ensuring the American people have access to special places on their public lands, like Rattlesnake Mountain.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

The en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERRY) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, 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. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S DEFENSE POLICY

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we just heard an extensive debate about the future of America's defense policy. I want to commend the chairman for including an important amendment that I offered that does address a serious, serious issue.

It is very hard to react to something that has not happened yet. Frankly, we are in a race between collaboration or catastrophe in regards to nuclear security and the threat of nuclear proliferation around the world. This technology is spreading very, very rapidly.

With the Department's effort at cost savings and reorganization, it is impor-

tant that our nonproliferation efforts not slip, not become a second priority. It may be easy to do that because, again, when things don't happen, it appears that we are secure. This is one of the most grave difficulties facing not only the United States, but all of humanity.

So I am very grateful that in this bill we now have an effort to demand that the Department explain its important reorganization efforts and how it is going to address the future of nonproliferation issues as we work toward nuclear security, robust force strength, and deterrence. Nonproliferation goes hand-in-hand with those important national security elements.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUELSKAMP (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a family obligation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1209. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

H.R. 685. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 309. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 21, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 685. American Fighter Aces Congressional Gold Medal Act To award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5727. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0093; FV14-945-1 FR] received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5728. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Cape Gooseberry From Colombia Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0038] (RIN: 0579-AD79) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5729. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Washington: Puget Sound Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2008-0122; FRL-9910-02-Region 10] received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5730. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenoxaprop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0588; FRL-9909-72] received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5731. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Identification of Nonattainment Classification and Deadlines for Submission of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Provisions for the 1997 Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0694; FRL-9909-93-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS12) received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5732. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0546; FRL-9910-18-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS21) received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5733. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tebuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0653; FRL-9909-31] received May 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5734. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter informing the Congress that approximately 80 U.S. Armed Forces personnel were deployed to Chad as part of the U.S. efforts to locate and support the safe return of over 200 schoolgirls who are reported to have been kidnapped in Nigeria; (H. Doc. No. 113-115);

to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5735. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Naval Base Point Loma; Naval Mine Anti Submarine Warfare Command; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0580] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5736. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Fireworks Display, Patapsco River, Northwest Harbor (East Channel) Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0236] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5737. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Giants Enterprises Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0174] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5738. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile 803.5 to 804.5 Henderson, KY [USCG-2014-0186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5739. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Eighth Coast Guard District Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1060] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5740. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Xterra Swim, Myrtle Beach, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0161] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5741. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; BWRC West Coast Nationals; Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0140] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5742. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lucas Oil Drag Boat Racing Series; Thompson Bay, Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0153] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5743. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Lucas Oil Drag Boats Racing Series; Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0058] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5744. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; The Boat Show Marathon; Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0102] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5745. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Sea World San Diego Fireworks, Mission Bay; San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5746. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones, Delaware River, Pea Patch Island Anchorage No. 5 and Reedy Point South Anchorage No. 3 [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0051] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5747. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Helicopter Lift Operations, Main Branch Chicago River, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0128] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5748. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., transmitting proceedings of the 114th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Louisville, Kentucky, July 21-24, 2013, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 118 and 44 U.S.C. 1332; (H. Doc. No. 113-114); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 4121. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers; with an amendment (Rept. 113-461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 776. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to revise requirements related to assets pledged by a surety, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-462, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 776. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to revise requirements related to assets pledged by a surety, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-462, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with eligible Indian tribes to manage land buy-back programs, to require that certain amounts be deposited into interest bearing accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add sleep apnea screening to the initial preventive physical examination under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for startup businesses to use a portion of the research and development credit to offset payroll taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 4697. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a well-known seasoned issuer to reduce the worldwide market value threshold under the definition; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 4698. A bill to prohibit recovery of damages in certain wrongful birth and wrongful life civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 to require the Secretary of Commerce to prepare and submit to Congress a report and recommendations to promote the sustained economic development of Indian tribes and Indian lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for scientific frameworks with respect to vector-borne diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4702. A bill to extend until 2030 the time period required to be covered by the United States Space Protection Strategy; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 relating to

determinations with respect to efforts of foreign countries to reduce demand for commercial sex acts under the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of

Texas (for herself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4704. A bill to expand the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 to include combating the transfer of permanent custody or control of a minor in contravention of a required legal procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 to authorize the Secretary of Defense to decontaminate certain portions of the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 4706. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs and activities that connect Americans, especially children, youth, and families, with the outdoors; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 4707. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 4708. A bill to provide for the establishment of an office within the Internal Revenue Service to focus on violations of the internal revenue laws by persons who are under investigation for conduct relating to the promotion of commercial sex acts and trafficking in persons crimes, and to increase the criminal monetary penalty limitations for the underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 4709. A bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program to include all lands owned by the United States Government

that are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense within the definition of entitlement lands for which payments are made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIRETS:

H.R. 4711. A bill to establish a regulatory framework for the comprehensive protection of personal data for individuals under the aegis of the Federal Trade Commission, to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to improve provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 4712. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide priority for the establishment of new national cemeteries by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to exempt school-based enterprises from nutrition standards; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself,

Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 115. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give States the right to repeal Federal laws and regulations when ratified by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. DUFFY):

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a "National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H. Res. 591. A resolution commending the Government of Afghanistan for certifying the results of the national election held on April 5, 2014, and urging the Government of Afghanistan to continue to pursue a "transparent, credible, and inclusive" run-off presidential election on June 14, 2014, while ensuring the safety of voters and candidates; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H. Res. 592. A resolution calling for free and fair elections in Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

mitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Const. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 4696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCARTHY of California:

H.R. 4697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) Article I Section 8—The Commerce Clause, granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several States;

(2) Article I, Section 8—The Necessary and Proper Clause, granting Congress the power to make all laws which are necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers vested by the Constitution of the United States; and

(3) The 14th Amendment, granting Congress the power to ensure equal protection under the laws.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; the following statements are sub-

By Mr. GIBSON:
H.R. 4701.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause I, of section 8, of article I.

By Mr. GRAYSON:
H.R. 4702.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 4703.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
“clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution”—to regulate Commerce with Nations and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

and
“clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution”—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers. . .

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 4704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. PIERLUISI:
H.R. 4705.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 4706.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 4707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 4708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which provides Congress with the power to lay and collect taxes and regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. MARINO:
H.R. 4709.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution’s Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:
H.R. 4710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Consitution.

By Mr. SIRES:
H.R. 4711.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 4712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WOMACK:
H.R. 4713.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.J. Res. 115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment X:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 6: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 259: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 269: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 401: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 447: Mr. JOLLY.
- H.R. 702: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 708: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO AND MR. ELLISON.
- H.R. 920: Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 956: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
- H.R. 988: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 997: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 1125: Mr. HARPER.
- H.R. 1250: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H.R. 1317: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1515: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 1527: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 1566: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 1617: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1761: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 1767: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 1771: Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H.R. 1801: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 1812: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 1840: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 1861: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 1915: Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 1998: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 2000: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 2366: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2415: Mr. CONNOLLY.
- H.R. 2417: Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 2607: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2652: Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 2663: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 2673: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
- H.R. 2827: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 2933: Mr. PETERS of California.
- H.R. 2945: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 2959: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. SALMON.
- H.R. 2994: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 3116: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 3135: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 3137: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3382: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3426: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3707: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 3709: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3722: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. O’ROURKE.

H.R. 3740: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 3747: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3774: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3877: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3905: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3929: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 3935: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 3982: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3991: Mr. LATTA, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4031: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4060: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 4079: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4086: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 4119: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4158: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4187: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 4200: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 4205: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 4221: Mr. LANCE and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 4236: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4351: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4365: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4383: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 4387: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 4395: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4399: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4406: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 4411: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MICA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HALL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BARBER, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BARR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. NUNES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. YODER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HANNA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. O’ROURKE, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 4421: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4430: Mr. ENYART and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4447: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4498: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4510: Mr. HURT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 4511: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 4515: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4521: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 4526: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4569: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4571: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HURT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4577: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 4582: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4590: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 4612: Mr. COTTON.
 H.R. 4619: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 4622: Mr. ENYART, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BEATY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 4630: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 4631: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4635: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 4636: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 4641: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 4647: Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 4653: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 4664: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.J. Res. 24: Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.J. Res. 40: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.J. Res. 68: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. STIVERS.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H. Res. 112: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 153: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Res. 169: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 190: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. MCCAUL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
 PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4286: Mr. CRAMER



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2014

No. 77

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Thank you, dear God, for the gift of this day and for the opportunity to serve both You and country. We are not worthy of the least of Your blessings, yet You give us the privilege of working to keep our Nation strong.

As our lawmakers this day seek to be responsible stewards of their high calling, make them salt and light to this generation. May, as salt, they help make our world safer and more palatable. May, as light, they eliminate the dark corridors of disunity and contention, replacing them with harmony and civility.

Our Father, this is the day that You have given us to seek to leave our world better than we found it. Use us as instruments of Your glory.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

CHAPLAIN BARRY BLACK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have heard the good Chaplain talk about some of the things we should not do, and one of them is be envious. I try not to be, but I have to admit that every morning I hear his speech I am envious of his voice. I have what I have. It is not much in the way of a voice. Boy, it would be great if I could stand here and give that Dr. Barry Black voice, but I cannot do that. Even though I know it is not the right thing to do, I am still envious of his voice and I will always be.

JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 92, the Franken Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 92, S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, if any, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business until 12:15 today.

Because of a change in schedule, the Republicans will have their caucus today rather than yesterday as we normally do.

The time until 12:15 will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 12:15 there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the Fischer nomination to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. I am happy we are going to get this good man confirmed, but, as I will talk about in a minute, this obstruction is unbelievable. Fischer is going to now be a member of the Federal Reserve Board. He also has been chosen to be the Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve Board.

Janet Yellen, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has called many of my colleagues saying: Why do we need another vote? I need him here. There are administrative duties—this is a huge organization—waiting to be done.

But we are going to have to go through the cloture process all over again on this man. What a waste of our time—our time—the people's time. Anyway, that is what we are going to do. We are going to vote to confirm him today and then come back at some later time and confirm him to be the Vice Chair. We could not confirm him as Vice Chair first because he is not a member of the Board.

Following that vote, the Senate will be in recess until 2 p.m. today, allowing for the Republican caucus meeting.

At 2:10 there will be up to five rollcall votes in relation to several nominations: cloture on the Barron nomination to be a circuit court judge for the First Circuit; confirmation of the Cook nomination as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberty Oversight Board; confirmation of the Daly nomination to be U.S. attorney in Connecticut; confirmation of the Green nomination to

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3195

be U.S. attorney for Louisiana; and confirmation of the Martinez nomination to be U.S. attorney in New Mexico.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2363

I am told that S. 2363 is due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2363) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

HARD WORKING SENATORS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my good friend the Democratic whip, the assistant leader, is seated next to me. He and I came to Washington at the same time many years ago. Judging from what he does, I think he works very hard. The Presiding Officer served with us in the House of Representatives. It is a hard job, the jobs we have. We seek these jobs. They are the choice of our lives. It is an extreme honor to be a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, but we have traditionally worked very hard. I have seen it. Our families recognize how hard we work. It is not uncommon for us to wake up in the middle of the night: I should have done that. Then you write yourself a note. This has been going on since we have had a Senate, I am sure.

I have seen Members of Congress work themselves to exhaustion. But I confess, I have never seen some Senators—those Senators on the other side of the aisle—work so hard to do nothing, so little. My Republican colleagues have exerted so much effort to cause nothing to get done. They prefer it that way. They have broken their backs ensuring that nothing happens here on the Senate floor.

Last week was another example of the Democrats' fruitless hard work. The Republicans blocked debate on the bill that would reinstate important and expired tax provisions—tax cuts. This legislation extends tax cuts and helps American families and American businesses as they recover from the recession.

The bill they stopped last week extends current tax provisions that have bolstered students, teachers, workers and employers, American families and businesses, saving money and growing our economy.

Listen to this. Now the Republicans are against tax breaks. They have been against extended unemployment benefits in recent weeks. They have been against raising the minimum wage. They have been against pay equity. They deny climate change. Now they have added a new one to that. They are against tax cuts. It is hard to com-

prehend how hard they work to get nothing done.

Stunningly—listen to this one—stunningly, some of the very Republicans who helped craft the legislation that they killed helped filibuster the bill. The primary Republican who negotiated this, the ranking member of the Finance Committee, voted against his own bill. That is what I said. It is true. Republicans are voting against their own legislation again. For what? To stop President Obama from accomplishing anything. That is what they set out to do 5½ years ago. They have stuck to that, to the detriment of the American people.

We have a letter signed by 152 different organizations—152. That is pretty stunning. There are so many names on this, it takes three or four pages to get all of the names. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. There are conservative organizations such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers—two of the most conservative organizations in the world, certainly in our country, but they are joined by 150 others saying: We want tax breaks. Everybody in America wants them. Democrats want them. Independents want them. Republicans want them; that is, Republicans who are located everywhere except in the Congress of the United States.

Now we have a new one. The Republicans in Congress are against tax breaks. So what have they accomplished? Nothing but bringing anxiety to the American people, businesses, individuals, and certainly hurting our economy. They continue to obstruct. They have broken my legislative heart so many times.

Yesterday afternoon, in a couple of conversations here with the Republicans, they said they are going to try to do this. They are going to meet with their caucus today. Well, that caucus has ruined a lot of legislation. I hope the people I talked to are strong and emphatic in saying: It is not good for the country, and it is certainly not good for this body. We need to move forward and get certain things done, some things done.

So I hope that my legislative heart is not broken again, that I can respond to the people of Nevada that we are going to have a tax deduction and subsidies for transit. We have a lot of transit now. In the wisdom of the Congress, we created a tax break for those people who take the trains, subways, monorails, and buses.

The Presiding Officer has worked really his entire career to do something about the environment. That tax break I talked about is part of what the Presiding Officer has always advocated: Let's do what we can to get people off the highways to reduce pollution.

We have in this bill something for Nevada that gives—it is not for Nevada; it is for everybody—that sales tax is a deductible item.

We have not been able to bring up these tax breaks. There are many other things all across this country.

Tax cuts—that is what the Republicans have stopped. So I hope the few Republicans I talked to yesterday will be extremely strong in their caucus and say: This is the right thing for the country. We have done enough to try to embarrass the President. Let's try to do something that helps our people in all 50 States.

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

MAY 20, 2014.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned organizations urge the U.S. Senate to pass the EXPIRE Act as soon as possible. The EXPIRE Act will extend the tax provisions that expired at the end of 2013. These tax provisions benefit a wide range of taxpayers, including associations, businesses, individuals, community development organizations and non-profit organizations and are important to U.S. jobs and the broader economy.

The lack of timely action to extend these provisions injects instability and uncertainty into the economy and weakens confidence in the employment marketplace. Moreover, the extension of the expired provisions should not be delayed until the end of the year since companies are making decisions right now related to taxes that will have an immediate impact on the economy.

We urge you to pass these important tax provisions as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Advanced Biofuels Association (ABFA), Advanced Energy Economy, Advanced Ethanol Council (AEC), Aerospace Industries Association, Affordable Housing Tax Credit Coalition, Algae Biomass Organization, Alternative Simplified R&D Credit Coalition, American Apparel & Footwear Association, American Beverage Association, American Biogas Council, American Chemistry Council, American Coatings Association, American Council of Life Insurers, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Foundry Society, American Institute of Architects, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Wind Energy Association, Arizona Manufacturers Council, Arizona Technology Council.

Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association (ARMA), Associated Equipment Distributors, Association of Equipment Manufacturers (AEM), Austin Technology Council, Automation Alley, Biotechnology Industry Organization, BSA | The Software Alliance, Business Roundtable, California Manufacturers & Technology Association, California Taxpayers Association, California Wind Energy Association, Chesapeake Regional Tech Council, Colorado Cleantech Industries Association (CCIA), Colorado Technology Association, Composite Lumber Manufacturers Association (CLMA), Connecticut Technology Council, Council for Affordable and Rural Housing.

CSH (formerly Corporation for Supportive Housing), CTIA—The Wireless Association, Extruded Polystyrene Foam Association (XPSA), Feeding America, Fiber to the Home Council Americas, Financial Executives International, General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Geothermal Energy Association, Growth Energy, Housing Advisory Group, IGPI, the Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute, Idaho Technology Council, Illinois Technology Association (ITA), INDA, Association of the Nonwoven Fabrics Industry, Independent Sector, Information Technology Industry Council (ITI), International

Franchise Association, International Sign Association, Interwest Energy Alliance, ISSA—the Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association.

ITTA—the Voice of Mid-Size Telecommunications Carriers, KcNext—The Technology Council of Greater Kansas City, Land Trust Alliance, LIHTC Working Group, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), Massachusetts Housing Investment Corporation, Massachusetts Technology Leadership Council (MassTLC), Metals Service Center Institute, Metroplex Technology Business Council, Minnesota High Tech Association (MHTA), Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, National Air Transportation Association, National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of State and Local Equity Funds (NASLEF), National Association of State Energy Officials, National Automatic Merchandising Association (NAMA).

National Automobile Dealers Association, National Biodiesel Board, National Business Aviation Association, National Cable & Telecommunication Association, National Council of State Housing Agencies, National Development Council, National Employment Opportunity Network, National Farmers Union, National Foreign Trade Council, National Housing and Rehabilitation Association.

National Housing Conference, National Housing Trust, National Hydropower Association, National Lime Association (NLA), National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Multi Housing Council, National Propane Gas Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Rural Housing Coalition, National School Transportation Association, National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Tooling and Machining Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, New Jersey Technology Council, New Markets Tax Credit Coalition, New Mexico Technology Council, NMTC Working Group, North American Die Casting Association, North Carolina Technology Association, Northeast Ohio Software Association, Northeast Pennsylvania Manufacturers and Employers Association, Northern Virginia Technology Council (NVTC), NPES The Association for Suppliers of Printing, Publishing and Converting Technologies, Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, Pittsburgh Technology Council, Precision Machined Products Association.

Precision Metalforming Association, R&D Credit Coalition, Renewable Northwest, Research!America, Rhode Island Manufacturers Association, Roof Coatings Manufacturers Association (RCMA), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA), Semiconductor Equipment & Materials International (SEMI), Semiconductor Industry Association, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Silicon Valley Tax Directors Group, Software and Information Industry Association, Software Finance and Tax Executives Council, SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, Tech Council of Maryland, TechAmerica, powered by CompTIA, TechMaine, TechNet, Technology Association of Georgia, Technology Association of Iowa.

Technology Association of Louisville Kentucky, Technology Association of Oregon, Telecommunications Industry Association, The National Pasta Association, The Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association, The State Chamber of Oklahoma, The Wind Coalition, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Union of Concerned Scientists, United Motorcoach Association, United States Council for Inter-

national Business, United States Telecom Association, United Way Worldwide, Utah Technology Council, Volunteers of America, Washington Technology Industry Association (WTIA), West Virginia Manufacturers Association, Wisconsin Technology Council, Work Opportunity Tax Credit Coalition.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:15 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday I was visited by several hospitals from Chicago. Mount Sinai is an amazing hospital. It originally—you can tell by its name—was founded by Jewish families living in a section of Chicago. The families have moved on. The remaining population is largely African American and Hispanic. It is a very poor neighborhood. It is a violence-ridden neighborhood. But in an amazing show of magnanimity and charity, many of the Jewish families whose ancestors and predecessors predated them and founded this hospital continue to support Mount Sinai. It is a beacon of quality medical care in one of the toughest, meanest neighborhoods in that great city.

They came to speak yesterday, to meet with me. They just merged with another extraordinary hospital, Holy Cross Hospital in Marquette Park. I have a special affection for this hospital because for decades it was run by the Sisters of St. Casimir, a Lithuanian Catholic order of nuns who devoted their lives first to the Lithuanian population that lived in that neighborhood and then, after that population left, to those who came after them, many of them very poor people.

Mount Sinai and Holy Cross merged, and between the two of them, I can't think of better examples of hospitals with a mission to help the poorest people and to make certain they have care that all of us would like to have for our families. They came yesterday to talk to me about the Affordable Care Act.

There are so many speeches on the floor about the Affordable Care Act. Most of them from the other side of the aisle are entirely negative. But there are some things about the Affordable Care Act which were brought to my attention from these two intercity hospitals which I think we should all look at carefully.

First, they are telling me that at these hospitals more people are showing up and paying. In days gone by, many of those who came in for services

were charity cases. The cost of their service was passed on to everyone else. Now, under the Affordable Care Act, many of these lower-income families have health insurance for the first time in their lives.

I have met some of these families, and I know what it means to them. It was several years ago when I was approached by the chairman of the Cook County board, Toni Preckwinkle, the president, and we asked for a waiver from the Obama administration to enroll families in Cook County in the Medicaid portion of the Affordable Care Act before it actually went into effect.

We were given that waiver. We now have 100,000 individuals in Cook County—low-income individuals—who have Medicaid protection.

This Medicaid protection has allowed them to have quality health insurance for the first time in their lives, in many cases, and also it means when they present themselves for care in hospitals, they are paying. They are paying through the Medicaid program rather than coming in as charity cases.

What we are finding as well is that as more and more Americans have the option of health insurance through the Affordable Care Act, the percentage of Americans who are uninsured has gone down. The share of adults without health insurance declined to 13.4 percent last month from 15.6 percent just a few months before. It is an indication of more and more people in America having the peace of mind that comes with health insurance coverage.

I see the Senator from Kentucky is here, and I know he reserved the floor this morning, and I don't want to take his time.

I also want to make the point as well that as we are bringing in more cost savings in health care through the Affordable Care Act, we are seeing the overall increase in health care costs starting to decline and slow down. That is what we were shooting for—more and more accessibility in coverage, more affordability for those who have that coverage and the overall cost in health care systems starting to come down. It is an experiment which is starting to show good results.

Let me add that as proud as I am to have supported this law, it is not perfect. There are things we need to do to improve it and to refine it. We should do those on a bipartisan basis. That is what we are waiting for.

The House of Representatives has now voted—I believe the number is 50 times—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I hope they have gotten it out of their system and now will sit down with us and work on a bipartisan basis to make it a better law. We can do that and we should do it together.

So I commend this effort to both sides of the aisle—in the Senate as well as in the House—and I hope that we can achieve something that will make a difference.

I would like to close by mentioning two of my constituents in Illinois before I turn the floor over to the Senator from Kentucky.

Philosophy Walker is a 28-year-old graduate student in biblical studies at the University of Chicago. Her husband Adam is 31 years old and a part-time youth minister. Philosophy's school provides health insurance, but it is \$900 per month for her and her husband. That would require them to take out additional student loans to pay their health insurance while they are in school.

Before moving to Chicago, they were paying \$700 per month for health insurance through COBRA, which is an option for those who have lost health insurance—but an expensive one. The \$700 payment depleted their savings because her husband struggled to find a full-time job. Going without health insurance wasn't an option because Philosophy Walker has some severe allergy problems.

Last November they signed up through the Affordable Care Act exchange and purchased a plan comparable to the COBRA coverage that had cost them \$700 a month, but the plan also included dental insurance, which they never had before.

Philosophy and her husband Adam, under this Affordable Care Act plan, pay \$200 a month. It went from \$700 to \$200. Philosophy also receives her monthly allergy medication for free, rather than the previous \$10 monthly copay.

If we listen to some of the stories on the floor of the Senate, you would never believe this story, but it is true.

I wish also to talk about Laurel Tyler, who runs a small business with her husband in Illinois. Because they have two employees and one of the children of one of their employees has asthma, the policies they were sold in the past were extremely expensive.

Because of the Affordable Care Act and the Illinois marketplace, Laurel's business is going to save 20 percent on health care costs, and the 22-year-old son with asthma can stay on the employee's plan. That, to me, is a success story.

Let's build on that success. Let's work together to make this law even stronger.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

BARRON NOMINATION

Mr. PAUL. I rise today in opposition to the killing of American citizens without trials. I rise today to oppose the nomination of anyone who would argue that the President has the power to kill an American citizen not involved in combat and without a trial.

I rise today to say that there is no legal precedent for killing American citizens not involved in combat, and that any nominee who rubber stamps and grants such power to a President is

not worthy of being placed one step away from the Supreme Court.

It isn't about just seeing the Barron memos. Some seem to be placated by the fact that: Oh, they can read these memos.

I believe it is about what the memos themselves say. I believe the Barron memos, at their very core, disrespect the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights isn't so much for the American Idol winner, the Bill of Rights isn't so much for the prom queen or the high school football quarterback. The Bill of Rights is especially for the least popular among us. The Bill of Rights is especially for minorities, whether you are a minority by virtue of the color of your skin or the shade of your ideology. The Bill of Rights is especially for unpopular people, unpopular ideas, and unpopular religions.

It is easy to argue for trials for prom queens. It is easy to argue for trials for the high school quarterback or the American Idol winner. It is hard to argue for trials for traitors and for people who would wish to harm our fellow Americans. But a mature freedom defends the defenseless, allows trials for the guilty, and protects even speech of the most despicable nature.

After 9/11, we all recoiled in horror at the massacre of thousands of innocent Americans. We fought a war to tell other countries we would not put up with this and we would not allow this to happen again.

As our soldiers began to return from Afghanistan, I asked them to explain in their own words what they had fought for. To a soldier, they would tell me they fought for the American way. They fought to defend the Constitution, and they fought for our Bill of Rights.

It is a disservice to their sacrifice not to have an open and full-throated public debate about whether an American citizen should get a trial before they are killed.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am not referring to anybody involved in a battlefield, anybody shooting against our soldiers. Anybody involved in combat gets no due process.

What we are talking about is the extraordinary concept of killing American citizens who are overseas but not involved in combat. It doesn't mean that they are not potentially—and probably are—bad people, but we are talking about doing it with no accusation, no trial, no charge, and no jury. The nomination before us is about killing Americans not involved in combat.

The nominee, David Barron, has written a defense of executions of American citizens not involved in combat. Make no mistake, these memos do not limit drone executions to one man. These memos become historic precedent for killing Americans abroad.

Some have argued that releasing these memos is sufficient for his nomination. This is not a debate about transparency. This is a debate about

whether or not American citizens not involved in combat are guaranteed due process.

Realize that during the Bush years, most of President Obama's party—including the President himself—argued against the detention—not the killing—of American citizens without a trial. Yet now the President and the vast majority of his party will vote for a nominee who advocates the killing of American citizens without trial. How far have we come? How far have we gone? We were once talking about detaining American citizens and objecting that they would get no accusation and no trial. Now we are condoning killing American citizens without a trial.

During President Obama's first election, he told the Boston Globe:

No. I reject the Bush administration's claim that the President has plenary authority under the Constitution to detain U.S. citizens without charges as unlawful combatants.

As President, not only has he signed legislation to detain American citizens without trial, but he has now approved of killing American citizens without a trial. Where has candidate Obama gone?

President Obama now puts forward David Barron, whose memos justify killing Americans without a trial. I can't tell you what he wrote in the memos; the President forbids it. I can tell you what Barron did not write. He did not write or cite any legal case to justify killing an American without a trial because no such legal precedent exists. It has never been adjudicated. No court has ever looked at this. There has been no public debate because it has been held secret from the American people.

Barron creates out of whole cloth a defense for executing American citizens without trial. The cases he cites—which I am forbidden from talking about, which I am forbidden from citing today—are unrelated to the issues of killing American citizens because no such cases have ever occurred. We have never debated this in public. We are going to allow this to be decided by one branch of government in secret.

Yet the argument against the Barron memo, the argument against what Barron proposes should be no secret and should be obvious to anyone who looks at this issue. No court has ever decided such a case. So Barron's secret defense of drone executions relies on cases which, upon critical analysis, have no pertinence to the case at hand.

Am I the only one who thinks that something so unprecedented as an assassination of an American citizen should not be discussed, that we should discuss this in the light of day. Am I the only one who thinks that a question of such magnitude should be decided in the open by the Supreme Court?

Barron's arguments for the extrajudicial killing of American citizens challenges over 1,000 years of jurisprudence. Trials based on the presumption of innocence are an ancient

rite. The Romans wrote that the burden of proof is on he who declares, he who asserts that you are guilty, not on he who denies. The burden is on the government.

We describe this principle as the principle of being considered innocent until guilty. This is a profound concept. This is not something we should quietly acquiesce to having it run roughshod on or diluted and eventually destroyed.

In many nations the presumption of innocence is a legal right to the accused, even in the trial. In America we go one step further to protect the accused. We place the burden of proof on the prosecution. We require the government to collect and present enough compelling evidence to a jury—not to one person who works for the President, not to a bunch of people in secret, but to a public jury. The evidence must be presented.

But then we go even further to protect the possibility of innocence. We require that the accused be guilty beyond reasonable doubt. If reasonable doubt remains, the accused is to be acquitted.

We set a very high bar for conviction and an extremely high bar for execution, and even doing all of the most appropriate things, we still sometimes have done it wrong and have executed people after jury trials mistakenly, erroneously. But now we are talking about not even having the protection of a trial. We are talking about only accusations.

Are we comfortable killing American citizens no matter how awful or heinous the crime they are accused of? Are we comfortable killing them based on accusations that no jury has reviewed?

Innocent until proven guilty—the concept—is tested. We are being tested. It is being tested when the consensus is that the accused is very likely guilty in this case. The traitor who was killed, in all likelihood, was guilty. The evidence appears to be overwhelming. Yet why can't we do the American thing—have a public trial, accuse them, and convict them in a court?

It is more difficult to believe in the concept of innocent until proven guilty when the accused is unpopular or hated. The principle of innocent until proven guilty is more difficult when the accused is charged with treason. The Bill of Rights is easy to defend when we like the speech or sympathize with the defendant. Defending the right of trial for people we fear or dislike is more difficult. It is extremely hard. But we have to defend the Bill of Rights or it will slip away from us.

It is easy to support a trial for someone who looks like you, for someone who has the same color skin, or for someone who has the same religion. It is easy. Presumption of innocence is, however, much harder when the citizen practices a minority religion, when the citizen resides in a foreign land or sym-

pathizes with the enemy. Yet our history is replete with examples of heroes who defended the defenseless, who defended the unpopular, who sometimes defended the guilty.

We remember John Adams, when he defended the British soldiers—the ones who were guilty of the Boston massacre. We remember fondly people who defend the unpopular, even when they end up being declared guilty, because that is something we take pride in—our system. We remember his son John Quincy Adams when he defended the slaves who took over the Amistad. We remember fondly Henry Selden who defended the unpopular when he represented Susan B. Anthony, who voted illegally as a woman. We remember fondly Eugene Debs who defended himself when he was accused of being against the draft and against World War I and was given 10 years in prison.

We defend the unpopular. That is what the Bill of Rights is especially important for. We remember fondly Clarence Darrow who defended the unpopular in the Scopes monkey trial. We remember fondly Thurgood Marshall who defended the unpopular when he convinced the Supreme Court to strike down segregation.

Where would we be without these champions? Where would we be without applying the Bill of Rights to those we don't like, to those we don't associate with, to those who we actually think are guilty?

Where would the unpopular be without the protection of the Bill of Rights?

One can almost argue that the right to trial is more precious the more unpopular the defendant. We cannot and we should not abandon this cherished principle.

Critics will argue these are evil people who plot to kill Americans. I don't dispute that. My first instinct is, like most Americans, to recoil in horror and want immediate punishment for traitors. I can't stand the thought of Americans who consort with and advocate violence against Americans. I want to punish those Americans who are traitors. But I am also conscious of what these traitors have betrayed. These traitors are betraying a country that holds dear the precept that we are innocent until proven guilty. Aren't we, in a way, betraying our country's principles when we relinquish this right to a trial by jury?

The maxim that we are innocent until proven guilty is in some ways like our First Amendment which presumes that speech is okay. It is easy to protect complimentary speech. It is easy to protect speech you agree with. It is harder to protect speech you abhor. The First Amendment is not so much about protecting speech that is easily agreed to; it is about tolerating speech that is an abomination. Likewise, the Fourth, the Fifth, and the Sixth Amendments are not so much about protecting majorities of thought, religion or ethnicity. Due process is

about protecting everyone, especially minorities.

Unpopular opinions change from generation to generation. While today it may be burqa-wearing Muslims, it has, at times, been yarmulke-wearing Jews. It has, at times, been African Americans. It has, at times, been Japanese Americans. It is not beyond belief that someday evangelical Christians could be a persecuted minority in our own country.

The process of determining guilt or innocence is an incredibly important one and a difficult one. Even with a jury, justice is not always easily discovered. One has only to watch the jurors deliberate in "Twelve Angry Men" to understand that finding justice, even with a jury, is not always straightforward. Today, virtually everyone sympathizes with Tom Robinson who was unfairly accused in "To Kill a Mockingbird" because the reader knows that Robinson is innocent, because the reader knows his accusation was based on race. It is a slam dunk. It is easy for all of us to believe that he should get a trial.

It is easy to object to vigilante justice when you know the accused is innocent. When the mob attempts an extrajudicial execution, we stand with Atticus Finch. We stand for the rule of law. But what of an American citizen who, by all appearances, is guilty; what of an American citizen who, by all appearances, is a traitor, who we all agree deserves punishment? Are we strong enough as a country to believe still that this person should get a trial?

Do we have the courage to denounce drone executions as nothing more than sophisticated vigilantism? How can it be anything but vigilantism? Due process can't exist in secret. Checks and balances can't exist in one branch of government. Whether it be upon advice of 1 lawyer or 10,000 lawyers, if they all work for one man—the President—how can it be anything but a verdict outside the law—a verdict that could conceivably be subject to the emotions of prejudice and fear; a verdict that could be wrong? This President, above all other Presidents, should fear allowing so much power to gravitate to one man.

It is admittedly hard to defend the right to a trial for an American citizen who becomes a traitor and appears to aid and abet the enemy, but we must. If we cannot defend the right to trial for the most heinous crimes, then where will the slippery slope lead us? The greatness of American jurisprudence is that everyone gets his or her day in court, no matter how despicable the crime they are accused of.

Critics say: How would we try these Americans? They are overseas. They won't come home. The Constitution holds the answer. They should be tried for treason. If they refuse to come home, they should be tried in absentia. They should be given the right to a legal defense. It should be provided. There should be an independent legal

defense that does not work for the government. If they are found guilty, the method of punishment is not the issue. The issue is, and always has been, the right to a trial, the presumption of innocence, and the guarantee of due process to everyone.

For these reasons I cannot support the nomination of David Barron. Even if the administration releases a dozen Barron memos, I cannot support Barron. The debate is not about partisan politics. I have supported many of the President's nominees. The debate is not about transparency. It is about the substance of the memos. I cannot and will not support the lifetime appointment of someone who believes it is OK to kill an American citizen not involved in combat without a trial.

Some will argue and say: The President, yesterday, has now changed his mind. He is going to release these memos to the public. Well, if that is true, why don't we wait on the vote and let the public read the memos? Why don't we have a full-throated debate over this? Why don't we actually see what the public thinks about the right to trial by jury? One would think that something we have had for over a thousand years deserves a bit of debate. Wouldn't you think we would at least take the time? Realize, this is not the position of the administration, this is the position of the administration now that it is relenting to the verdict of the Second Circuit Court. They are releasing this memo under duress. My guess is they are releasing this memo because they need a few more votes, and they will get a few more votes by releasing these memos to the public—or promising to release these memos. They will not be released—the memos justifying the killing of an American without a trial—will not be released before the vote takes place.

So the question is, Is this transparency good enough for you to cast aside the whole concept of presumption of innocence, the whole concept that an accusation is different than a conviction?

There has been much discussion of what due process is, and as we have looked at this debate there are some valid questions and some good writings on this. Conor Friedersdorf has written extensively on this, and he writes about the lawyer who enabled the extrajudicial killing of an American. He asks the question, Should the Constitution be entrusted to a man—and this is essentially what happens; the Constitution will be entrusted to an appellate court judge—should the Constitution be entrusted to a man who thinks Americans can be killed without due process?

The Fifth Amendment, Conor Friedersdorf says, is very clear. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless upon the presentment or indictment of a grand jury. It doesn't say except or on presentment of an accusation by the executive branch without a trial. The

Fifth Amendment actually says, "Nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process."

The question is, What is due process? One would think this would be pretty clear and there wouldn't be much dispute over due process. But listen to some of these descriptions. This is the description Glenn Greenwald writes about in describing both the Bush and the Obama administrations. He says:

The core of the distortion on the war on terror under both Bush and Obama is the Orwellian practice of equating government accusation of terrorism with proof of guilt.

Realize what we are talking about. There is a big difference between an accusation and a conviction. If we want to realize how important this is, there are Senators on the other side of the aisle who have called Senators on this side of the aisle terrorists on multiple occasions. Who are we potentially going after with these directives toward killing? People who are either senior operatives of Al-Qaeda—of which there are no membership cards, so that is somewhat open to debate—but we are also going after people who are associated with terrorism.

The definition of terrorism—since on some occasions we have been accused of terrorism by the other side—can be somewhat loose. The Bureau of Justice put out a memo describing some of the characteristics of people who might be terrorists—which might alarm you, if you are traveling overseas: people who are missing fingers, people who have stains on their clothing, people who have changed the color of their hair, people who have multiple weapons in their house, people who have more than 7 days worth of food in their house.

These are people you should be suspicious of, according to the government; these are people who might be terrorists; and these are people you should talk to and inform the government about these people.

If these are the definitions of someone who might be a terrorist, wouldn't we kind of want to have a lawyer before the accusation becomes a conviction?

When we talk about conviction, we talk about the conviction or the bar for conviction being beyond a reasonable doubt. One can pretty much think—you can be in a jury pool and pretty much think someone killed someone—you have a suspicion, you have an inclination they are probably guilty, but you are supposed to be so convinced that it is beyond a reasonable doubt. In these memos there is a different standard.

Realize what the standard is of the person whom we will now be appointing to a lifetime appointment—one step away from the Supreme Court. That standard is an assassination is justified when an informed high-level official of the U.S. Government has determined that the targeted individual poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States.

We are not talking here about beyond a reasonable doubt anymore. That standard is gone. We are talking about an informed, unnamed high-level official in secret deciding an imminent attack is going to occur.

The interesting thing about an imminent attack is we don't go much by the plain wording of what one would think would be imminent anymore. The memo expressly states it is inventing—this is also from Glenn Greenwald—the memo expressly states it is inventing a broader concept of innocence that is typically not used.

Specifically, the President's assassination power does not require that the United States have clear evidence that a specific attack will take place in the immediate future. So you wonder about a definition of "imminence" that no longer includes the word "immediate."

The ACLU's Jameel Jaffer, as quoted by Glenn Greenwald, explains that the memo redefines the word "imminence" in a way that deprives the word of its ordinary meaning.

When we talk about due process, it is important to understand where due process can occur. Due process has to occur in the open. It has to occur in an adversarial process. If you don't have a lawyer on your side who is your advocate, you can't have due process. Due process cannot occur in secret, but it also can't occur in one branch of government. This is a fundamental misconception of the President.

The President, with regard to either privacy in the fourth amendment or killing American citizens with regard to the fifth amendment, believes that if he has some lawyers review this process, that is due process. This is appalling because this has nothing to do with due process and can in no way be seen as due process.

Some have said: Well, this is a judicial opinion. Barron has written an opinion; he has justified the President's actions. People have also said with regard to the NSA spying case that 15 judges have approved it. Well, the majority of the judges were in secret in the FISA Court, and that is not due process.

But the memo written by David Barron as recounted by Glenn Greenwald is not a judicial opinion. It was not written by anyone independent of the President. On multiple occasions they have justified and the memo argues that due process can be decided by internal deliberations of the executive branch.

The comedian Stephen Colbert mocked this and presented:

Trial by jury, trial by fire, rock, paper scissors, who cares? Due process just means that there is a process that you do.

The current process is apparently, first the president meets with his advisers and decides who he can kill. Then he kills them.

It is actually called "Terror Tuesday" with flashcards and powerpoint presentation.

Noah Feldman, a colleague of David Barron, writes:

. . . no precedent for the idea that due process could be satisfied by some secret, internal process within the executive branch.

So to those of my colleagues who will come on down here today and just stamp “approval” on someone who I believe disrespects the Bill of Rights, realize that other esteemed professors, other esteemed colleagues at Harvard disagree and that you cannot have due process by a secret internal process within the executive branch.

To those who say, oh, the memos are now not secret, are we going to be promised that from now on this is going to be a public debate and that there will be some form of due process? No. I suspect it will be done in secret by the executive branch because that is the new norm. You are voting for someone who has made this the historic precedent for how we will kill Americans overseas—in secret, by one branch of the administration, without representation based upon an accusation. We have gone from having to be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt to an accusation being enough for an execution. I am horrified that this is where we are.

To my colleagues, I would say that to make an honest judgment, you should look at this nomination as if it came from the opposite party. I can promise—and this would absolutely be my opinion, and this isn’t the most popular opinion to take in the country—that I would oppose this nomination were it coming from a Republican President.

But what I would ask of my Democratic colleagues is to look deeply within their soul, to look deeply within their psyche and say: How would I vote if this were a Bush nominee? If this were a Bush nominee who had written legal opinions justifying torture in 2007, 2006, 2005, how would I have voted?

I think 90 percent would have voted against and would now vote against a Bush nominee.

This has become partisan and this body has become too partisan. There was a time when there were great believers in the Constitution in this body, and we have degenerated into a body of partisanship. There was a time when the filibuster actually could have stopped this nomination. There was a time when there would have been compromise. There was a time in this body when we would get people more toward the mainstream of legal thought because those on each extreme would be excluded from holding office.

The people who have argued so forcefully for majority vote, for not having the filibuster, are the ones who are responsible now for allowing this nomination to go forward. This nomination would not go forward were it not for the elimination of the filibuster.

Some say about the filibuster: Oh, that was obstructionism.

The filibuster was also in many cases about trying to prevent extremists from getting on the bench. We will now allow someone who has an extreme

point of view, someone who has questioned whether guilt must be determined beyond a reasonable doubt, someone who now says that an accusation is enough for the death penalty. Now, that person may say: Only if you are overseas. Well, some consolation if you are a traveler.

What I would say is we need to think long and hard and examine this nomination objectively as if this were a nomination from a President of the opposite party. We need to ask ourselves: How precious is the concept of presumption of innocence? How precious are our Bill of Rights?

We need to examine—and it is hard when you know someone is guilty, when you have seen the evidence and you feel that this person deserves punishment. I sympathize with that and think that this person did deserve punishment. But I also sympathize so greatly with the concept of having a jury trial, so greatly that an accusation is different from a conviction, that I can’t allow this to go forward without some objection. I hope this body will consider this and will reconsider this nomination.

At the appropriate time I will offer a unanimous consent request to delay the David Barron nomination until the public has had a chance to read his memo. I will return at an appropriate time, and we will offer that as a unanimous consent.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the nomination of David Barron to be U.S. circuit judge be delayed until such time that the public can review documents that are now being promised to be revealed by the President, that have not yet been revealed. So I ask that we delay until such time that the public can review the text of his memos on the use of targeted force against Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARKEY. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

BARRON NOMINATION

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, it wasn’t very long ago when the Senator

from Kentucky and I were on the floor talking about drones, and I want to make sure it is understood that Senator PAUL’s passion, intellectual rigor, and devotion to these issues of liberty and security—which he and I have worked on together now for a number of years—is much appreciated.

I come to the floor today to address the issue Senator PAUL and I have discussed in the past, and that is how vigorous oversight—and particularly vigorous oversight over the intelligence field—needs more attention. It is not something we can minimize. It goes right to the heart of the values the Senator from Kentucky and I and others have talked about, and that is liberty and security are not mutually exclusive. We can have both.

The Senator from Kentucky and I often joke about how the Senate would benefit from a Ben Franklin caucus. Ben Franklin famously said, in effect, that anybody who gives up their liberty for security doesn’t deserve either.

The Senator from Kentucky and I have certainly had some disagreements from time to time on a particular judicial nomination, but I thank him for his time this morning, and I thank him for the opportunity we have had over the years to make the case about how important these issues are. The American people ought to insist that their elected officials put in place policies which ensure we have both liberty and security. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for that, and I have some brief remarks this morning.

Of course, the Senate is going to vote on the nomination of David Barron to serve as a judge for the First Judicial Circuit. His nomination has been endorsed by a wide variety of Americans, including respected jurists from across the political spectrum.

Mr. Barron has received particularly vocal endorsements from some of our country’s most prominent civil rights groups. Of course, the aspect of his record that has perhaps received the closest scrutiny in recent weeks is his authorship of a legal opinion regarding the President’s authority to use military force against an individual who is both a U.S. citizen and senior leader of Al-Qaeda. I am quite familiar with this particular memo.

The executive branch first acknowledged its existence 3 years ago in response to a question I asked at an open hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. I followed up by working with my colleagues and pressing the executive branch to provide this memo to the intelligence committee.

This month, of course, the administration made this memo available to all Members of the Senate. Executive branch officials have now said they will provide this memo to the American people as well. This is clearly, in my view, a very constructive step, and I am going to vote yes on Mr. Barron’s nomination.

I want to take a minute to outline that this whole matter is about much

more than a single memo. It drives home how incredibly important vigorous congressional oversight is, which is, of course, the mission of the intelligence committee, and it is the mission of all of us.

In his classic work on democratic government, Woodrow Wilson wrote that conducting oversight was one of the most important functions of Congress. He suggested it might be more important than passing legislation. Woodrow Wilson wrote:

It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees.

He added that Congress must examine “the acts and disposition” of the executive branch and “scrutinize and sift them by every form of discussion.” Woodrow Wilson said if the Congress failed in this duty, then the American people would remain ignorant “of the very affairs which it is most important that [they] understand and direct.”

Woodrow Wilson might not have been able to anticipate the size and scale of the modern national security apparatus, but I believe his words are as true today as they were a century ago.

As the elected representative of nearly 4 million Americans, I have spent years now working from the theory that all of us in the Senate have an obligation to understand how the executive branch is interpreting the President's authority to use military force against Americans who have taken up arms against our Nation. I have long believed it is my obligation to make sure that those I am honored to represent in Redmond, Troutdale, and Dallas, and all across Oregon, understand that as well. I believe every American has the right to know when their government believes it is allowed to kill them.

In the case in question, as I have said before, I believe the President's decision to authorize a military strike in those particular circumstances was legitimate and lawful. I have detailed my views on this case in a letter to the Attorney General that is posted on my Web site.

I agree with the conclusion Mr. Barron reached in what has now certainly become a famous memo. To be clear, while I agree with the conclusion, this is not a memo I would have written. It contains, in effect, some analytical leaps I would not endorse. It jumps to several conclusions, and it certainly leaves a number of important questions unanswered.

I am hopeful that making this memo public will help generate the public pressure that is needed to get those additional questions answered. I am talking here about fundamental questions, such as: How much evidence does the President need to determine that a particular American is a legitimate target for military action? Can the President strike an American anywhere in the world? What does it mean to say that capture must be “infeasible”? And ex-

actly what other limits and boundaries apply to this authority?

Mr. Barron was not asked to answer these questions, but it is my view it is vitally important that the American people get answers to those questions. In my view, those questions are essential to understanding how Americans' constitutional rights will be protected in the age of 21st century warfare, and I am going to stay at it until the American people get answers to those questions.

In addition to getting detailed public answers to these matters, another important step will be for the Congress to review the other Justice Department memos regarding the President's authority to use military force outside of an active war zone. Clearly, the most important memos on this topic are the ones the Congress has now seen regarding the use of lethal force against Americans, but it is also going to be important for the Senate to review the memos on other aspects of this authority as well.

The past few years have shown when the public is allowed to see and debate how our government interprets the law, it has led to meaningful changes in terms of ensuring that there are additional protections for privacy and civil liberties without sacrificing our country's security at a dangerous time.

It is unfortunate that it took Mr. Barron's nomination for the Justice Department to make these memos public. I will say it has been frustrating over the past few years to see the Justice Department's resistance to providing Congress with memos that outline the executive branch's official understanding of the law. When Mr. Barron was the head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, I believe congressional requests to see particular classified memos and legal opinions were appropriately granted. However, in the years since Mr. Barron moved on from that position, congressional requests to see memos and opinions have frequently been stonewalled—and I use those words specifically—frequently stonewalled.

The executive branch often makes the argument that these memos constitute confidential, predecisional legal advice to the President. Here is the problem with that argument: The President has to be able to get confidential legal advice before he makes a decision, but once a decision has been made and the legal memo from the Justice Department has been sent to the agencies that will carry out the President's decision, that memo is no longer predecisional advice; it is the government's official legal basis for actual acts of war, and as such, in my view, it is entirely unacceptable to withhold it from the Congress.

Congress has the power to declare war, and Congress votes on whether to continue funding wars, so it is vital for the Congress to understand what the executive branch believes the President's war powers actually are. In that

classic work I have discussed from Woodrow Wilson, he said:

It is even more important to know how the house is being built than to know how the plans of the architect were conceived.

As a former basketball player, I often say that sections of the playbook for combating terrorism will often need to be secret, but the rule book the United States follows should always be available to the American people—all of the American people. Our military intelligence agencies often need to conduct secret operations, but they should never be placed in the position of relying on secret law.

I am very pleased this morning that we know the executive branch is going to provide this memo to the American people, and I believe this constructive step must lead to additional steps that are equally important. This episode is an object lesson in how the U.S. Congress can use the levers it has to fulfill one of the most important functions of government. As my colleagues and I engage in our personal discussions about how to make Congress more functional, I hope this is an experience we will remember.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about the continuing concerns we see in our office and hear from Missourians about what is happening with the implementation of the health care plan. The more people know about the path we are on with health care, the more concerned they appear to become.

I know the White House has suggested that somehow the numbers would reflect that people have responded to this program in a positive way. When you take away the health insurance people have and there is only one place they can go to get the insurance they think they need, obviously they are going to go there, but that doesn't mean they like it.

In fact, there is a new political poll that suggests nearly half of the American voters say they are for outright repeal of this law, and nearly 90 percent say it will be important to them in determining how they will vote this year.

Another point in terms of why we want to start over again is everybody knows what the consequences are when you make a bad decision about people's health care in a way that I think most Americans would not have anticipated in 2009 and 2010. When you fundamentally get involved in issues that impact people and their families, such as health care, and do things that fundamentally impact the way their money is going to be spent, and that decision is made by the Federal Government instead of by that family whose only decision might be to pay a penalty or not have insurance at all or

pay a whole lot more than they were paying, the government has involved itself in an area where the government should have looked for better choices, more options, more ways to seek coverage, and better ways to be sure you can have coverage if you had a pre-existing condition. All of those, by the way, were proposed. These are not ideas that weren't out there a few years ago, but they would be taken much more seriously today if we did what nearly half of the American voters say we should be doing, and let's just see what would happen if we start all over.

Several States have announced that their Web sites will not work. This includes Oregon and Massachusetts. There is a report that four of the failed State exchanges cost \$474 million of taxpayer money, spent in Nevada, Massachusetts, Maryland, Oregon—just those four—for systems that then wouldn't work.

Many of these systems around the country that now are being abandoned were put in place partially, if not totally, with grants from the Federal Government. If a State gets a grant from the Federal Government to do something and then it doesn't do it, every other grantee has to give the money back. A State can't say it is going to take millions of dollars from Federal taxpayers to put together an exchange and then announce it didn't work out very well and then have no obligation to give that money back. There was a time when there appeared to be great concern in Washington that States weren't putting an exchange in place. Now we find out that States with this particular plan, ill-conceived as it was, can't put a system in place apparently that works. The State of Oregon, one of the earliest advocates of adopting this system, my belief is and I have read, wasn't able to sign up one single person from October 1 until they abandoned their Web site just a few days ago—not one person.

Subsidies appear to be incorrect. The Washington Post reported last weekend that 1 million Americans who have enrolled in the plan may be getting incorrect health care subsidies because the Web site was defective and didn't appropriately calculate what the subsidy would be. If people get too much of a subsidy, they have to pay it back. If they get too little of a subsidy, they may decide they are not going to take the health insurance available because they are not getting the assistance they had hoped for. Potentially hundreds of thousands of Americans are, according to that article, receiving bigger subsidies than they deserve and will be required to return the excess next year.

Under Federal rules, consumers are notified if there is a problem with their application and asked to send in or upload pay stubs or other proof of their income. Apparently, only a fraction have done what they are supposed to do. Whose fault is that? If the govern-

ment allocates the subsidy and if a person hasn't complied with the law, is that the person's fault or the government's fault? It is the government's job to comply with the law and to insist that people comply if they are going to be part of a Federal program. It is not a person's absolute obligation to say, I need to send that final piece of paper in, if the government is saying we are going to give you this subsidy. Don't worry about sending this in, we are going to do this anyway. But there will be a reconciliation moment where people find out their subsidy was more than they deserved and suddenly they have to pay it back.

The processing centers. KMOV, a television station in St. Louis, recently broke a story regarding the claims of workers at a Wentzville, MO, facility that was one of a handful of facilities the Federal Government financed around the country to handle paper applications. Not only, on one side, did the applications not appear to work coming in on the Web site—the easiest thing one would have thought possible—the easier thing, I guess, suddenly we find out, would have been to fill out the paper application and send it to one of these locations that was set up.

Contract costs of over \$1 billion, 600 people working at the Wentzville site, and the allegations from people working there are that there is just nothing to do. They are told to refresh their computers once every 10 minutes—hit the refresh button—so it appears they are doing something, so 600 people don't process more than one or two applications a month and that way everybody has a chance to process one application. My belief is these are the kinds of applications people would have assumed every individual would have easily processed dozens a day. Yet they are told not to process more than one or two a month because there just aren't that many people making applications at these centers.

The television station KMOV did a Freedom of Information Act request to CMS on April 8. They are 2 weeks past the 20 days the government is supposed to have to comply. I wonder what would happen if a taxpayer had an EPA penalty and the taxpayer was a couple of weeks late in complying with whatever that penalty is.

Last week I joined Senator ALEXANDER, who is the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor & Pensions, in a letter to the CMS Administrator expressing my concerns and his concerns and requesting answers to a number of questions no later than the end of this month. Hopefully, they will do better complying with us than they did with the Freedom of Information Act and the St. Louis reporter.

The full 5-year contract has a balance of up to \$1.25 billion. The Wentzville facility reportedly employs about 600 people. We are now hearing from a couple of the other facilities

that they have exactly the same problem. They are going to work, they have a library with books stacked on the table so people can read a book during the day so they can wait for what I guess they think eventually will be this onslaught of applications coming in, but so far it hasn't happened. We have passed October 1, November 1, December 1, January 1, February 1, March 1, April 1, May 1, and soon June 1. One would think these would be coming in because we are paying these people to do this.

Frankly, people need jobs, so it is hard to fault them for showing up every day until somebody says: The truth is there is no work here for maybe 590 of the 600 employees; maybe we need to eliminate these particular jobs which were supposedly to help implement this system. Facilities in Missouri, Kentucky, Arkansas, Oklahoma—there are lots of indications that everybody is having the same experience.

The American part of this company, Serco, is based in Reston, VA, but this is a British company. They were already in trouble with the British Government, I have read, for not providing the services they guaranteed to provide. It is amazing to me that to do the work to implement this program, we get a Canadian company to design the Web site, which is already in trouble with the Canadian Government for failure to do what they said they would do, but we hired that company anyway. One would think there would be American companies that aren't in trouble with anybody's government that could design the Web site. Then we got a British company that is in trouble with the British Government to operate these centers for the written applications. No wonder taxpayers are wondering, Who is minding the store? Who is managing the government? Who is doing this work that would make common sense anywhere else?

I continue to hear from Missouri families every week about the problems they have. We talk to them and we verify these problems. We then try to find a solution, including going through the Affordable Care Act, trying to find assistance so they can afford to pay for a policy that costs more than they ever thought they would pay, but we are not finding those solutions.

I have a few letters, one from a retired substitute teacher who is no longer able to work the substitute hours they were able to work because of the unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act. Thirty hours, the law says, is when employers have to provide full-time benefits. Different companies had different rules in the past. If we go back to the 40-hour workweek, a lot of people would be working 35, 36, and 38 hours. Now they are working 25 and 26 and 28 hours.

Another letter is from a student, Stephanie, in Jackson, MO. The school-teacher was in Kansas City. Stephanie

in Jackson is trying to go to school and trying to do everything she can to pay her own way through school, but her hours have been cut at work. She was working in the past more than 30 hours to try to do what kids used to do. What is one of the solutions to not having a lot of debt when you get out of college? Work your way through school. What is one of the things the Affordable Care Act has made it harder to do? Work your way through school. So Stephanie, the student, says she is looking for a second part-time job now that would give her the hours she used to have in her other part-time job because of the consequences of the Affordable Care Act.

Just a couple more examples. Rich from Portageville, MO, his rates have increased from \$412 a month to \$732 a month. Rick says he is 49 years old. His policy covers him and his son who is 22 years old. They are both healthy, but their insurance went up \$320 a month.

Roy from Oak Ridge, MO, says his deductible has gone from \$250 to \$650, and if his wife wasn't a veteran and couldn't get her medications through the Veterans' Administration, they would have real health care problems.

Just one last example. Rodney from New Franklin, MO, says his rates have jumped. He says: My health insurance for my wife and myself has jumped from \$320 per month to over \$700 per month, and now there is a \$5,000 deductible, despite the fact that we are both in great health. It doesn't include eye or dental coverage. I am self-employed, Rodney says. So it makes a very big difference to him whether he can continue to pay well over two times what he was paying before, with a higher deductible.

Problems with implementing the system appear to not be dealt with in the right way, and then what happens when people do get coverage. It turns out for them not to be coverage they can afford. Of course, whether they had a policy they liked, almost nobody has been able to keep the policy they had, particularly if they had it as an individual. I think we are going to see fewer and fewer people having the policies they have had at work.

I will go back to the almost 50 percent of Americans who say: Why don't we start over and do this the common-sense way and solve these problems in a way that benefits families and their health care rather than benefiting more government employees and more government regulations?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BARRON NOMINATION

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to discuss the nomination of David Barron to be a Federal court of appeals judge. I commend my friend Senator RAND PAUL for his excellent remarks earlier today and his leadership against Mr. Barron's nomination.

I have known Mr. Barron for a long time. He and I were classmates in law school. He is a smart man. He is a talented man. He is a professor at Harvard Law School and he is a well-respected professor. However, Mr. Barron is an unabashed judicial activist. He is an unapologetic and vocal advocate for judges applying liberal policy from the bench and disregarding the terms of the Constitution and the laws of the land. If the Members of this body vote to confirm him, we will bear responsibility for undermining liberty and undermining the rule of law in this country.

It is well known that Mr. Barron, as a senior official in the Obama Justice Department, authored memos allowing the U.S. Government to use drones to kill American citizens abroad who were known and suspected to be terrorists, without any trial, without any due process. To date, we still don't have the details of all of those memos. A number of us, including myself, have called for releasing the memos that would allow the U.S. Government to use lethal force against U.S. citizens. I am pleased to say the administration has, in part, complied, but we don't have all of those memos. Yet this body is being asked to proceed with giving Mr. Barron a lifetime appointment without knowing the full context of the advice he gave.

I would note that Mr. Barron previously, in 2006, joined a group of legal scholars calling for more transparency in the OLC opinions that he subsequently wrote and that the administration is now keeping secret.

But beyond that, beyond Mr. Barron providing the legal basis for the targeted killings of American citizens abroad without judicial process, Mr. Barron, both in law school and in his writings as a law professor, has been an enthusiastic advocate of judicial activism. It has become de rigeur for judicial nominees to forswear activism, to say—even if their record is to the contrary—no, no, no, Senator, I will comply with the law. To Mr. Barron's credit, his writings have a degree of candor that are unusual.

So, for example, he has argued that courts should override elected State legislatures and enforce leftwing policies. Mr. Barron, in one particular law review, wrote:

State supreme Courts, not state legislatures, have also led the revolution in school financing equality, though judicial actions have catalyzed political responses.

He went on to say that liberals should not object to conservative court decisions because "progressive constitutionalists enamored of the Anti-Court rhetoric rarely take account of its potential downstream effects on state-court interpretation and legitimacy."

In other words, he is worried that people on the left might be arguing that courts should follow the law because that would constrain the ability of courts to instead impose a far-left political policy agenda.

Likewise, in a different article, he argues:

It is precisely because the Anti-Court strain singles out conservative judicial activism as the problem that it threatens to work progressive constitutional theory into a corner: it needlessly rejects the progressive potential of a significant wielder of power—the courts. . . .

Let me underscore that. Every Member of this body who votes to confirm Mr. Barron is voting for a candidate who has stated he intends to use the courts as a "significant wielder of power." Indeed, what is the agenda that he would embrace? He has elsewhere written:

We contend that the constitutional argument favoring preclusive executive power necessarily rests on a strong form of living constitutionalism.

There are Members of this body—Democratic Members of this body—who are campaigning right now in their home State saying they do not support judicial activism, they do not support a so-called living constitution, judges imposing far-left policies and disregarding the law. Well, let me say, any Democratic Member of this body who votes for Mr. Barron is on record in support of judicial activism and living constitutionalism.

Beyond that, Mr. Barron has explicitly written his opposition to federalism. Indeed, he says, "There is precious little in the Constitution's text or the history of its adoption that compels the particular conservative allocation of national local powers favored by the Rehnquist Court."

He has made clear his agenda to overturn or ignore Supreme Court precedents. When he says there is "little in the . . . text or the history," it seems somehow that he has not read or focused on the Tenth Amendment or the Federalist Papers or the debates on ratification.

Beyond that, he is an emphatic advocate of the takings clause, of government power taking private property, such as the Kelo decision—big money interests going to government and using government power to condemn your private land. He is an emphatic advocate of that and of courts facilitating and expanding that.

He has written that the executive branch should be able to waive laws with which it disagrees—a lawlessness that, sadly, has run rampant in this administration.

Anyone who cares about property rights should be dismayed by this nomination and should vote against it if you do not want to see overly aggressive takings jurisprudence that allows the government to take your private property.

Anyone concerned about free speech should be concerned about this nomination if you do not want to see expansive government power taking away the rights of citizenry to free speech.

Anyone who cares about local control and federalism and the ability of local school boards and legislatures to make policy decisions should be concerned.

Anyone concerned about our right to life should be concerned about drones having the power to take our life without judicial process.

Anyone concerned about liberty and the rule of law should be deeply concerned about a judicial nominee who embraces courts as a tool of power and the President disregarding the law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 12:15 p.m.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for as much time as I may consume until that time.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, Senator CRUZ makes an impassioned plea against a nominee who is considered by some to be exemplary. It is his right to do that, but let me say before my friend leaves the floor, as impassioned as he is, calling Mr. Barron a liberal, I have heard many call Mr. Barron a conservative. So he must be doing something right. I think it is interesting. So let's keep politics out of this and look at someone's record.

WRRDA

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, with all the arguments and debate that go on around here in a very legitimate way—it is fair. The parties have grown very far apart—whether you look at the minimum wage, with the Democrats wanting to raise it, with some Republicans who say do away with it altogether; with extended unemployment benefits, where we can barely get a handful of them to go along with us—I could go on through the list. We are going to have a chance to make sure students have a fair shot at refinancing their student loans. We do not know where they are, but so far I have not seen them join Senator WARREN in her very important move to allow students to refinance their student loans. I could go through a list longer than I am tall. I am not that tall, but still it is 5 feet of differences.

We finally have come together in a way that I am very proud. As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, we have two sides of our committee—the environment side, which tends to be very difficult, very difficult, with big splits; and then we have the public works side. By putting aside our differences—our deep differences—on the environment and focusing on the other side, we have been able to come up with a couple of really good bills.

The first one is the Water Resources Reform and Development Act called WRRDA. It is so important to our Na-

tion, whether you are a coastal port or an inland port, and it is crucial that this get done.

The last WRDA bill was nearly 7 years ago. I was proud to be involved in that at that time. This one—7 years later—is long overdue. I am going to talk to you more about it. We also voted out a highway bill out of our committee. We are very proud of that. Senator VITTER and I worked very closely, and Senator BARRASSO, Senator CARPER, and all the Members on both sides and their wonderful staffs.

So tomorrow, I believe, we are going to vote on WRRDA, we are going to vote on the water bill. I know we have a very hectic day tomorrow, so rather than take the time then, I am going to take the time now, and I am hoping to be joined by some colleagues today. But if not, I will lay out why we need to do this bill.

First, I want to say a wonderful thing happened in the House yesterday when the conference report passed over in the House 412 to 4. That was really pretty terrific. Everyone pretty much rose above partisan politics. I am very pleased that Senator REID is moving forward with this report and all colleagues on both sides want us to pass that conference report and send it to the President. He will sign this bill.

Let me tell you what is at stake: at least half a million jobs—half a million jobs.

First of all, we deal with ports and waterways. The conference agreement makes important investments in reforms related to our Nation's ports. Our Nation's ports and waterways move over 2.3 billion tons of goods—that is amazing—every year; 2.3 billion tons of goods. So we need to keep our ports modernized. We need to invest in our ports. So in this bill we do.

We include a project in Texas, for example, to widen and deepen the Sabine-Neches waterway, which will have over \$115 million in annual benefits. This critical waterway transports over 100,000 tons of goods every year. It is the Nation's top port for movement of commercial military goods. And it is vital to our Nation's energy security.

This bill will allow the Corps to address dangerous cross currents at the Port of Jacksonville, FL—that is another example—that create safety concerns for ships entering and exiting the port. It also allows the deepening of this vital hub of commerce.

The bill also authorizes a project to deepen the Boston Harbor to 50 feet. This will prevent heavier road traffic in the busy Northeastern corridor by allowing larger vessels coming through the newly deepened Panama Canal to transport cargo all the way north to Boston Harbor. Without the access to Boston, these vessels would have to offload in other ports and put the cargo on trucks to their final destinations in the Northeast.

Madam President, what I would like to do now is yield to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU.

I just want to say—and I will finish my remarks when she has completed hers because she has a very hectic schedule and I am able to stay on the floor for a while—whenever I see Senator LANDRIEU she talks to me about her State. And her State is magnificent. I have been there. I was there after Katrina, at her urging. I have been there since to see some of the progress we have made. But Louisiana is a special place. And this special Senator never forgets what needs to be done, and part of it is playing a big role in a bill like the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

So at this time I will yield, if it is all right, through the Chair. Am I permitted to do this? Can I yield the time that I took to my friend for as much time as she may consume?

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank you, Madam President.

I thank the courtesy of the chairwoman from California and for her really extraordinary leadership to bring such an important infrastructure bill to the floor of the Senate.

Without her dogged determination, we would not be here today and Louisiana and so many other States that are benefiting from the projects authorized and green-lighted in this bill would simply still be waiting, with jobs not being created, people not being employed, and the future looking a lot less bright than it does today. I thank the Senator so very much.

Mrs. BOXER. You're welcome.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Not only has she given attention to her home State of California, but she has been very mindful of several other States in the Union that have particularly difficult water challenges. Louisiana would be one such State. Louisiana is not our largest State. It is not small. It is in the medium size. It has 4.5 million people. But yet our State is positioned geographically in the country, in the Lower 48, that we drain almost 50 percent of the continent. The water of this continent comes through this extraordinary delta almost without peer on the planet. It is the seventh largest delta on Earth.

While some States are struggling to find water, we normally have too much of it in the wrong places—or at times we have too much of it in the wrong places, such as when Lake Pontchartrain breached the drainage project program. The project collapsed and two-thirds of the city of New Orleans went under water—some neighborhoods 14 feet. When Isaac hit or Ike or other hurricanes, we had really been bombarded with tremendous challenges to the southern part of the United States.

Every region has their challenges. But the southern part of the United States, what I like to call America's energy coast—Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama—has particular challenges that need addressing in this

bill. I thank Senator BOXER for addressing some of them, particularly as it relates to Louisiana's challenges because our challenge is not only to keep commerce open for everyone so the entire country can benefit—especially when the Panama Canal opens; larger ships are going to be moving across the oceans into our ports. The Mississippi River port system combines all the four southern ports of the Mississippi River, and it is the largest port system in the world—not second; the largest port system in the world—so we have a responsibility to make sure this commerce continues to move.

So we have to have rivers and bodies of water that are open for commerce but protected with the right kinds of levees that protect the people who live there so we do not drown every time it rains heavily. We are not talking about category 4 and 5 hurricanes. We are talking about highways that go underwater in a heavy rain because the delta is sinking due to several factors. The waters are rising due to several factors. This WRRDA bill is one of the only answers to build a resilient and sustainable coast. That is why the Louisiana delegation fights so hard for it, why we are so anxious for this bill, why we do not like to wait 7 years for a WRDA bill, because we need new authorizations every 2 to 3 years.

In fact, we need a whole new way of funding some of these projects, which is a work in progress. I look forward to continuing to work with Senator BOXER. As an appropriator, I am very anxious to find a new, more expedited way. I have proposed revenue sharing and will continue to propose revenue sharing as a way for not only Louisiana but coastal States to redirect a portion of offshore oil and gas revenues to come back to the coastal communities, America's energy coast, America's working coast, and build the infrastructure that helps our economy continue to grow, create jobs and, most importantly or equally importantly, protect the people that have to live close to the water for those jobs and for those jobs to be made real and for the economy to benefit.

Not everybody can live in Vail, CO, and commute to the coast every day to work. It is not going to happen. We have to live along these rivers, and we have been living there an awfully long time—300 years as far as Natchitoches, Baton Rouge, and New Orleans. They will be celebrating—just three cities in our State—their 300th birthday.

We did not move there in the 1980s to sunbathe. We have been down there for hundreds of years building the economy of this country. We are proud to do it. We are happy to do it. But we need help every now and then. This bill helps us. The WRRDA bill is important.

There are a couple of projects—I am going to finish in about 3 or 4 minutes, and turn it back over to Senator BOXER. First, there is Morganza to the Gulf, which was originally authorized

over 20 years ago. That is going to provide levee and flood control protection to one of the fastest growing, most dynamic cities in this country—Houma, LA. It is an energy epicenter. It is an energy powerhouse for the people of Houma, the fabrication, the supply companies—such as in North Dakota—which is really one of the fastest growing communities in our country.

The Presiding Officer can appreciate this. We are like that on the coast, except that when the hurricanes come, it literally threatens to wash away the whole place because there are no levees around Houma.

The Presiding Officer had terrible flooding in her State, so she can appreciate what happens when the levee system fails. But we are not only along rivers, we are also along the coast, and we are also a strong energy center. It is not just the people and the companies, which range from very small mom-and-pop businesses to some of the largest international energy companies in the world, but it is international fabricators that have billions of dollars of infrastructure along this coast that are at risk.

So this Morganza project, it was not originally in the House bill. I fought very hard to make sure that it was in the Senate version. I want to give Senator VITTER a good bit of credit for his leadership on the committee. I do not want to underestimate the role that he played in securing all of these projects. But we worked together as a team to make sure that Morganza to the Gulf was included.

I am very proud that it was in the final conference report, a \$10.3 billion authorization. The Louisiana coastal area for \$2.1 billion is also included. It is one of the only new starts in the President's budget. It is authorized at a higher level in this bill. Again, we are going to have to find some additional funding, which is where revenue sharing comes in. I hope to convince my colleagues to move in that direction for the benefit of not just our State but for many coastal States in the country.

Building this coastal protection for Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, and Florida is critical, but so are the east coast and the west coast in great need as well. One of the projects—and I have two more to talk about that I am particularly proud of—is the authorization for us to get about the work of dredging the New Iberia port. I have tried to explain it on this floor because we only think about ports such as the traditional big cargo ports.

You think about Long Beach, you think about the Port of Seattle or you think about New York and New Jersey. That is what people think when they think ports. Those are big cargo ports and big container ports. They are very important. But also tucked along our coasts are energy ports that people completely forget about. They do not even know what an energy port looks like. I am very proud to be taking Sec-

retary Moniz to his first energy port next week in Louisiana. These energy ports are not bringing in big containers and big cargo ships, but they are bringing in liquefied natural gas, or taking it out, or they are bringing in oil imported from the rest of the world or exporting—when we can export. But right now they are bringing crude oil in. They are manufacturing the huge platforms and fabricating the huge platforms that go out into the Gulf of Mexico.

Without the proper dredging of those ports, without the proper security of these ports, America cannot be an energy powerhouse. We just cannot do it. We have to have that port infrastructure. So one of my big pushes since I have been a Senator is to try to get the Federal Government to understand that one size does not fit all. There are certain projects that work well for these big container ports and big cargo ports, but there are other important ports in our country, particularly along America's energy coast, which is the Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama coast, the only coast that allows offshore oil and gas drilling, to allow that industry to continue to grow, so that the country prospers and all the States are benefited by the work that goes on there.

So the New Iberia port channel will be dredged deeper. Fabricators will be able to have more projects domestically here and not have to do so much work in Korea and other places around the world. We can produce using American steel, American workers, American fabrication techniques to create jobs right here at home.

Finally, Senator BOXER was so helpful in pressing for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, to authorize the trust fund, to basically say that moneys that are collected will stay in the trust fund and be used and authorized to help our dams and inland waterways around the country.

Senator CASEY and I have an amendment pending on the floor that would make sure that the increases in user fees could potentially be applied this year so that it is not just an authorization but so there is actually funding in the trust fund to pay for these projects which are so important to keep our maritime industry moving and growing, which is a real feather in our cap right now.

The maritime industry is expanding. It pays much above the average wage. They are really high-paying jobs. Instead of stymieing their growth, we need to be expanding that part of our economy.

So this WRRDA bill, because of Senator BOXER's leadership, first of all, has gotten to the floor for a vote. It never would have happened without her dogged determination. There are wonderful projects, necessary projects for the whole country, but particularly for Louisiana, a State that has an awful lot of water. We are happy to have it, but it has to be directed correctly or it

can cause many disasters and much heartache and pain.

So getting our rivers dredged correctly, getting our levees built so they do not fail, and continuing to be diligent in helping our people live safely along the coast is something that I know Senator BOXER shares with me. The people of California have some similar challenges that she is well aware of in the Sacramento Valley. So I want to thank Senator BOXER. I appreciate her help and her several visits to Louisiana, particularly after the storm, helping to make a firm imprint on her about the importance of this. I am excited about looking into the Netherlands for a possible partner with building even stronger infrastructure using really first class technology for our States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I reclaim my time. I want to again say to the Senator that she has made this case. This WRRDA bill is life and death. It truly is in so many of our States. We all saw Katrina. We all saw Superstorm Sandy. I can tell you—I know it sounds like an overstatement, but I can assure you it is not—if we have a situation like that in the Sacramento area, because of the businesses located there and how many people are there—our State has 38 million people—the devastation would be worse than we have ever seen because of the number of people.

This bill takes care of that problem too so we can fix our levees. That is critical. Our levees are falling apart. The Senator has made the case so forcefully for her State, but also she calls attention to the fact that we are experiencing extreme weather. We cannot put our heads in the sand. I was thinking the other day that if you put your head in the sand, you are going to get sand in your eye and you will never be able to see too well.

We have got to get our heads out of the sand. Extreme weather is here. It is here because of climate change. We have to deal with it. My preference is to do what we can to avoid climate change. But it is late in the game even now. So we have to adapt. My friend from Louisiana, I have to say, has been a stalwart in protecting her State.

We have heard from the Senator from Louisiana as to why WRRDA is so important. You have heard a little bit from me. I was talking about the important projects across this Nation. I discussed the one in Texas, through which they move so many military goods. I discussed the one in Florida where they have these cross currents that are dangerous. I began to discuss a project to deepen Boston Harbor to 50 feet. This will prevent heavier road traffic in the busy Northeast corridor by allowing the larger vessels coming through from the newly deepened Panama Canal to transport cargo all the way north to Boston Harbor.

Without that access to Boston, these vessels would have to offload in other

ports and put the cargo on trucks to their final destination in the Northeast. We really have to think about our ports as the alternative, in many cases, to putting cars on the road. In our State, we call it kind of the “sea highway.” Our idea in California is to tie our ports together so there can be a seamless way to transport cargo.

In addition to authorizing crucial port projects, the bill reforms the harbor maintenance trust fund to increase port investment. Despite significant maintenance needs at our Nation’s ports, only roughly half of the fees collected in the harbor maintenance trust fund go to port activities. These are user funds. They ought to be used for the purpose for which they were intended. This conference report calls for a full expenditure of all revenues collected in the trust fund by 2025.

I want to say, I have had some very good talks with the appropriators, Chairman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member SHELBY. They have ports in their great States. They know the need to utilize these funds at the ports. We collect funds for the harbor maintenance trust fund, and then they are going to every other kind of use. It does not make sense. It is not right. I believe in user funds, whether it is the highway trust fund, the harbor maintenance trust fund, whether it is Social Security, Medicare—they are targeted funds. They should stay and be used for those purposes.

We do set priorities for our larger ports, smaller ports, for the Great Lakes, the seaports that are large donors. We say, if you are a large donor port, you ought to deserve to have some attention. I can tell you, I represent the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, through which 40 percent of U.S. container imports pass.

They put so much money into the trust fund and they get so little back. There are many cases like that. I am particularly familiar with these because I hear from the folks from those particular ports.

We also have very important inland waterway systems, and this conference report makes important reforms to those. It is essential for transporting goods throughout the country. These include efforts to expedite project delivery and better prepare for future floods and droughts that can slow or even stop navigation at our inland waterways.

We talked a little bit about extreme weather. In the Presiding Officer’s State, I will never forget, just before your arrival in the Senate, seeing pictures of what was happening in North Dakota with floods and fires. It was just the most apocalyptic scene that Senator Conrad had photos of. It was shocking.

We are seeing more and more of this extreme weather. We need to get ahead of it. We need to do much needed flood control and coastal hurricane protection projects around the country.

We talked a little bit about Sacramento, our State capital. It faces

some of the Nation’s most severe flood risks.

The bill contains flood protection measures that will allow the port to strengthen the levees in the Natomas Basin in Sacramento. Here is how many people will be safeguarded: 100,000 people will be safeguarded and \$8 billion worth of property.

The bill also focuses on lifesaving flood protection for more than 200,000 residents of Fargo, ND, and Moorhead, MN.

We are talking about States all across our great Nation that have to protect their people.

The bill will restore the reliability of the levee system that protects Topeka, KS. These levees protect thousands of homes and businesses in the city, and this project will return over \$13 in benefits for every \$1 invested.

The bill will provide lifesaving protection for coastal communities in coastal Louisiana. We heard from Senator LANDRIEU. Senator VITTER was very strong on this as we worked together.

When we are chairmen, we have to do what is right for the country and also do what is right for our States. The conference report is going to improve our responses to extreme weather events whether they occur in Fargo, Sacramento, or New Orleans.

After the devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina and Superstorm Sandy, it became clear that communities needed assistance to protect lives, property, and to improve infrastructure resiliency. What does “resiliency” mean? It means that you build your infrastructure in a resilient way so that it lasts and doesn’t collapse when you need that protection.

For the first time, this bill allows the Corps to conduct immediate assessments of affected watersheds following an extreme weather event. In the old days, before all this extreme weather, the Corps would come back and fix places and make them just the way they were before the event. Now we are saying: If there is an extreme weather event, please, Corps, identify and look at the ability to construct small flood-control and ecosystem restoration projects, such as levees and floodwalls, and restore wetlands without going through the full study process and receiving additional congressional authorization.

We don’t waive any environmental laws. We just say: When you have an emergency and you can show us there are small projects that can work, just go do it because we want people to have their communities back.

The conference report calls for the Corps to use resilient construction techniques that are far more durable. I remember I was in a big debate with a Republican Senator when we had a bridge collapse after an earthquake—an approach to a bridge—and he said: Well, why are you spending more money than it cost to build it?

I said: Because we don’t want to rebuild it the same way because it didn’t withstand an earthquake.

It is kind of a “duh” moment. You don’t want to spend taxpayer money rebuilding a flawed piece of infrastructure. Make it strong, and make it resilient. That is what we have to do. For the first time, we are going to make sure this happens.

We require the National Academy of Sciences and the GAO to evaluate options for reducing risk. It is not only the Corps going out there. They are going to depend upon the scientists and they are going to depend upon the GAO, the Government Accountability Office.

The bill authorizes investment in vital ecosystem restoration projects across this Nation. These projects not only preserve our precious natural heritage, they also provide essential benefits to local communities, such as improved flood protection and a boost to local tourism.

A lot of people don’t understand the function of a wetland. You see a stretch of wetland and you say: Wow, that is flat land. I can go build on it.

Frankly, over the course of our great Nation’s history, that is what we used to do. We filled in those wetlands. We ignored the fact that they were a gift for us to protect. Not only were they beautiful, a place for wildlife, and they helped the air quality, but they acted as natural flood control. When we hear Senator LANDRIEU discuss this—I went to Louisiana, and I saw how critical that was. The wetlands restoration is critical to absorbing the floodwaters so they don’t destroy property and lives.

WRRDA continues the commitment to restoring one of the Nation’s greatest environmental treasures—the Florida Everglades.

If you have never seen the Florida Everglades, you need to see the Florida Everglades. It is called a river of grass. It is extraordinary. I will never forget it. Senator NELSON invited my husband and me. He, his wife, my husband, and I went out, saw this river of grass, flora and fauna, and deer jumping from a little patch of grass in the water. It is a miracle from God.

What we do is we allow four Everglades restoration projects to move forward.

We also reauthorize important restoration programs in the Chesapeake Bay and the Columbia River Basin. I thank Senator CARDIN for his amazing leadership and, of course, Senator MIKULSKI as well.

We enable the Corps to work with the States along the North Atlantic coast to restore vital coastal habitats from Virginia to Maine, and we allow the Corps to implement projects to better prepare for extreme weather in the Northern Rocky Mountain States of Montana and Idaho.

If you have been following this speech, I think what you will recognize is how broad a swath we cut with the WRRDA bill. We truly tried to step back and help everybody. This is one Nation, and we need to take care of our heritage. That means we have to pro-

tect it from floods and hurricanes, we have to make sure commerce can move forward from our ports, and we want to restore this God-given environment we are supposed to protect.

We direct the Corps to give priority to ecosystem restoration projects that will also provide benefits for public health. This ensures that projects such as the restoration of the Salton Sea—where I live—which both restores vital habitat and addresses serious air-quality concerns, can move forward.

The Salton Sea is amazing. It is an incredible lake. It is the stop-off point for the most amazing array of wildlife. It is drying up. If it continues to go this way, it will not only be a disaster for the wildlife, but it will be a disaster for the people because the odors that are coming from this drying-up sea float all the way to Los Angeles, where we have millions of people. And the jobs we could create there with clean energy and other types of development—we have to move on that.

So I was excited to see that everyone agrees that if you have a body of water that is deteriorating, that, if you don’t pay attention to it, could cause a public health crisis, then it should have some kind of a priority.

The conference report also addresses important ocean and coastal resiliency issues, allowing the Corps to carry out ocean and coastal resiliency projects in coordination with a broad range of stakeholders, including States, Federal agencies, and NGOs.

I compliment SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for the work he put into this provision. It is very important. Our oceans and our coasts are not only magnificent gifts, but they truly are important to our economy.

People who come to California like to see the whole State, but people gravitate to the coast. It is so magnificent, and we have to make sure we treat our coasts and oceans right. That means making sure that if they are endangered, we do something about it.

This is a first. This is exciting for SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, and I am very thrilled to have been able to help him.

I have to give a shout-out to Senator REID, without whom this provision wouldn’t have made it in the bill. We were down to that one issue. We had taken care of 150 issues, but we were down to that one issue. Leader REID was able to help us. And I thank the House for working with us.

I don’t know how many of you have heard of TIFIA, which is a program we expanded in the highway bill. What it does is it leverages funds. So if our States or localities in our States passed a half-cent sales tax to build transportation, the Federal Government now has a way, through the TIFIA Program, to come around up front, take a project that has, say, 20 years of revenue coming in, pay that up-front cost right there, and build that project quickly.

We did the same for water. We call it WIFIA, and it is a new initiative. We

hope that it will be interesting to folks and that they will use it. We will assist localities in need of loans for flood control or wastewater and drinking water infrastructure to receive those loans from this new funding mechanism, the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act.

WIFIA will allow localities an opportunity to move forward with water infrastructure projects in the same way TIFIA does in transportation. Where there is a local source of funding, the Federal Government can front those funds.

The TIFIA Program is working so well. I just went to an amazing press conference with the folks from Los Angeles. They have been given an \$800 million TIFIA loan that is enabling them to build a subway. It is very exciting, and the Federal Government has no risk—almost zero risk—because the funds will be paid back from the sales tax.

These new WIFIA funding arrangements supplement existing programs to help leverage more investment in our Nation’s aging infrastructure. The conference report also updates the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to ensure that our existing sources of water infrastructure funding are able to continue to meet pressing needs.

Chief’s reports: The conference report authorizes 34 critical Army Corps projects where the Chief of Engineers has completed a comprehensive study.

This was an absolute necessity for the Senate. The House and Senate came at this in a very different way. Their priority was making sure they could hold hearings on all the chief’s reports. Our priority was saying: Look, we are not going to go ahead with any project that doesn’t have a completed chief’s report. So that is the “r” for reform—their reform, making sure Congress holds the hearings; our reform, making sure that we include completed chief’s reports.

We are very happy about these chief’s reports. They are all over the Nation. I gave some examples in the beginning of my statement. These projects will restore vital ecosystems, preserve our natural heritage, and maintain navigation routes for commerce and movement of goods.

In the future, looking forward, how are we going to continue, because these WRDA bills come every 7 years. It is very slow. What is a better way to deal with the future needs of our States?

We developed a system with the House that allows local sponsors—such as someone from the State of the Presiding Officer, a flood control agency in the State—to make their case now directly to the Army Corps, and then the Corps would recommend those projects to Congress.

It is interesting that we took ourselves—because of the earmark ban—out of the picture. It allows people from Fargo, from Los Angeles, from Humboldt—wherever they are from—to go and see the Corps and make the case

for their project. Then the Corps would say: We sat down with these local officials. There are 10 or 15 projects we think are important.

That is going to be a new way we are going to give more local input.

I am very excited and happy to be standing on the floor today on this issue because it was 1 year ago almost to the day that the Senate passed the Boxer-Vitter WRDA bill by a vote of 83 to 14. It was just over 1 year ago. It has been 1 year—1 year of being in conference; 1 year of struggling with issue after issue; 1 year of people saying: That is it, we are done, we are walking out the door—wait, come back. It has been a year. When you read how a bill becomes a law, it sounds so simple. It says the House passes a bill, then the Senate passes a bill, then there are conferees and they get together and they work it out, and then it comes back and everyone is smiling and happy and they pass it, and then the bill goes to the President. Well, it is not exactly that way. It is a lot of give and take.

Sometimes you do have a bill that is not as complex as these here, and it can go smoothly. But how a bill becomes a law depends on who is in the room, it depends on what is happening nationwide, it depends on who the President is, and so many different things. But we were able to do this.

So 1 year ago we passed it in the Senate, and tomorrow, I believe, we are going to pass the conference report. The agreement will cost roughly the same as the Senate-passed bill and well below the last WRDA bill. One might ask why? Well, it is because as we authorized new projects, we deauthorized old projects. And that is important. We were able to go better than one-for-one in deauthorizing and authorizing.

Also, we had a very good talk with the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office. It is rare I have ever said a “good talk” with the CBO, because while the Presiding Officer is very good at accounting—a genius at that—I can tell you they do not make any sense to me. But Senator VITTER and I were actually able to persuade them on this bill to be realistic in the way we score it. If a State isn't going to be able to come up with their matching funds for 10 years, don't put this in as a cost in the first year. So the CBO was very open to working with us, and for that I thank them. It is a rarity, putting common sense on the table.

In closing, I thank all of the staff on both sides of the aisle who put in countless hours to develop this bipartisan, bicameral agreement. They didn't just work until midnight, 3 a.m., they worked on it 24/7 for all these months. I thank Bettina Poirier, my incredible chief of staff of the EPW Committee, my chief counsel, our guiding light, our guiding star; Jason Albritton, who is here with me today, who has worked nonstop, and will continue to do it until it is over, right, and get it ready for the President to sign;

and Ted Illston, who is on the floor and is a wonderful, wonderful staffer; and Tyler Rushforth.

These are the key people on my staff. One would think it would be 20 or 30 more, but it is not. It is this handful of people who made this happen for all of us.

I have to say I got to know Senator VITTER's staff so well, and we laughed at times. There was some irony involved in all of this. I would like to thank Zak Baig, Charles Brittingham, Chris Tomassi on Senator VITTER's staff. And Senator VITTER himself. Again, we were able to set aside a lot of differences we have on climate, on environment, on clean air, clean water, safe drinking water, where we go at it—nuclear power safety. We go at it. But we were able to say for the good of the people, we have to show people we can set aside our differences and come together. We did it here, we did it on the highway bill, and now it is time for the Senate to show the American people we can truly come together and pass this bill.

I do want to show one more thing before I leave the floor, and that is some of the organizations that have supported us and that support this bill. I can't read them all; it would take too long, but I will highlight some of these: the AFL-CIO, Transportation Trades Department, the American Association of Port Authorities, the American Concrete Pavement Association—I am passing over a lot of these—the Associated General Contractors of America, the Association of California Water Agencies, the Association of State Dam Safety Officials, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Let me give a few more. These are the supporters. The Arkansas Waterways Commission, the Big River Coalition, the City of Sacramento, the City of Los Angeles, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Fairness Coalition, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, the National League of Cities, the National Governors Association, the National Asphalt Paving Association, and the National Association of Clean Water Agencies.

The list goes on. Here are a few more, in case anyone is interested. The National Ready Mix Concrete Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association, the Santa Clara Valley Water District, The Nature Conservancy, the Texas Department of Transportation, the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, the U.S. Society of Dams, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Vinyl Institute, the Water Resources Coalition, the Waterways Council, Inc.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire list of these supporters.

Mrs. BOXER. To those who are listening as I read from this list, it did include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, it did include the AFL-CIO, Transportation Trades Department, which is so encouraging, and the National Governors Association. And I guess I will read this one:

The nation's governors applaud Congress for reaching an agreement that provides states with the resources to address their critical water infrastructure needs . . . governors urge the House and Senate to pass the WRRDA conference report and send it to the President for signature as soon as possible.

I want to say how much I endorse what the Governors said. Send this bill to the President as soon as possible.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention Congressman SHUSTER, who heads my counterpart committee in the House. Congressman SHUSTER was a delight to work with, even when it got tough for me. We had some tough, tough disagreements, but he stuck with it.

I also want to congratulate him on his victory yesterday, and I want to tell him, through this statement, how much I look forward to working with him on the Transportation bill. If we can do this, we can do that. That is important because we have to keep America moving. We are the greatest Nation on Earth, but you can't be the greatest Nation on Earth if you don't have modern water infrastructure, if your cities are flooding, if your ports can't move products. You can't. And you certainly can't have a great nation when you cannot have a highway system that functions, a transportation system that functions. You can't. There is no such thing. Because if you can't move commerce, if you can't move people, you can't move America forward.

I will say again, my deepest thanks to staff, my deepest thanks to Senator VITTER, my deepest thanks to Senator CARPER, to my entire committee, Senator BARRASSO, to Congressman SHUSTER, to Senator REID, to all of you, because this was one of those labors of love in which we all engage. We all wanted a bill, and we put away our little side arguments, came together, and now we have a bill that is a multibillion-dollar bill that will build our Nation and that is going to help our commerce and it is going to put 500,000 people to work. I couldn't be happier. I look forward to this vote tomorrow.

One more person I will thank: Congressman NICK RAHALL, who worked as the ranking member with Mr. SHUSTER. The two of them were a great team, and we were able to cut across the partisan divide, cut across the House-Senate divide, tough as it was.

It is a great day. It is a great day in the U.S. Senate and in the Congress, and I look forward to the President's signing this bill.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF STANLEY FISCHER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley Fischer, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of Dr. Stanley Fischer to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. While we are only voting on Dr. Fischer's nomination to be a member of the Board today, he has also been nominated to be Vice Chair of the Board of Governors, which we will need to vote on in the near future.

As you all know, Dr. Fischer is a distinguished economist who is immensely qualified to serve on the Federal Reserve Board. In his two decades on the MIT faculty, he was primary adviser for 49 Ph.D. students, including former Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke, and current European Central Bank President Mario Draghi. In addition, he has previously served on the frontlines in making public policy decisions during periods of financial crisis—including as the head of the Bank of Israel during the last financial crisis. He is supported by experts from both sides of the aisle and respected by leaders throughout the world. His wisdom on the economy, monetary policy, and banking would be extremely valuable to the Board.

It is important that we move quickly to confirm Dr. Fischer to the Board. Next week, the Federal Reserve Board will only have 3 out of 7 confirmed Board members. In addition to Dr. Fischer, the Senate needs to quickly confirm Dr. Lael Brainard and Mr. Jerome Powell. There is a lot of work to do at the Board, including conducting monetary policy, drafting rules implementing Wall Street reform, and taking other actions to improve financial stability and economic growth, so it is important we fill the Board vacancies with highly qualified nominees like Dr. Fischer as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support Dr. Fischer.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we yield back all of our time.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Stanley Fischer, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System?

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Booker	Heinrich	Pryor
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Burr	Isakson	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Johanns	Sanders
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Stabenow
Chambliss	Kirk	Tester
Coburn	Klobuchar	Udall (CO)
Collins	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Coons	Leahy	Walsh
Corker	Levin	Warner
Cornyn	Manchin	Warren
Donnelly	Markey	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Heller	Risch
Blunt	Hoeven	Roberts
Cochran	Inhofe	Rubio
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Cruz	Lee	Sessions
Enzi	McCain	Shelby
Fischer	McConnell	Thune
Graham	Moran	Toomey
Grassley	Paul	Vitter

NOT VOTING—5

Ayotte	Coats	Shaheen
Boozman	McCaskill	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:47 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Barron nomination.

The Senator from Louisiana.

GREEN NOMINATION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, the Senate is about to proceed to several votes on important nominees, and I wanted to put in a strong word of support for James Walter Green, who has been nominated by the President to serve as U.S. attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana.

I was very pleased to recommend Mr. Green to the President for his consideration. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote with me to confirm him today. He has served our country in a variety of capacities, most notably 20 years of military service. He has been involved in multiple deployments, is the recipient of numerous military awards, including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, the Combat Action Ribbon, and the Iraq Campaign Medal.

Not only is he a strong patriot who has been of extraordinary service to our country, he has also served for an additional 15 years in a variety of capacities in this office and supported their work through Republican and Democratic administrations.

He comes highly recommended by a broad cross section of individuals in my State, and I am pleased I was able to recommend this kind of high-caliber person to continue to serve in the full capacity as U.S. attorney.

Mr. Green will bring a wealth of legal experience to his role as U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana. He has served in a variety of roles within the U.S. Attorney's office in both the Baton Rouge and Las Vegas offices, including as a trial attorney, trial section supervisor, acting criminal chief, acting administrative officer and first assistant U.S. attorney.

He is currently the acting U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana and a member of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves.

I have every confidence that James Walter Green will be exceptional in his role as the chief Federal law enforcement official in the Middle District of Louisiana.

I thank Senator DURBIN for his courtesy. I wanted to put in a strong word for this nominee. He is supported by both Senator VITTER and myself, and I hope to get a strong vote on him today.

I ask that the time be equally divided between the majority and minority.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, before we vote on the Barron nomination, I want my colleagues to know the White House continues to keep the Senate in the dark. Yesterday I called upon the White House to state once and for all whether it has provided to the Senate any and all materials written by this nominee on the drone program. The White House refuses to answer that simple question.

One hour after I spoke, the White House Press Secretary refused for a third time to confirm that the Senate has been provided all of this nominee's writings on the drone program. Why is that? Why will this White House not give us a simple, straightforward answer? We still don't know how much more is out there on this subject that this nominee has been involved with.

After this vote, my colleagues still will not be able to tell their constituents that the White House has provided all of this nominee's materials on the drone program because we simply don't know that is true.

Finally, I wish to emphasize one more point about that court order requiring the administration to make a redacted copy of one memo public. Senators should know the court also ordered the trial court to take a second look at the other additional secret documents to see whether any of those additional documents should be made public in redacted form.

If some of those documents were written by this nominee, and if the court orders them to be made public, Senators' constituents are going to ask why they didn't stand today to get that information. Their constituents are going to ask why they didn't stand up to this White House and demand to see any and all memos this nominee wrote on this subject before this vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of anyone who advocates for the executive branch killing American citizens not involved in combat without trial. I strongly believe any nominee who rubberstamps and grants such power to a President is not worthy of being placed one step away from the Supreme Court. It isn't about seeing the memos, it is about

what they say and how they disrespect the Bill of Rights.

Due process can't exist in secret. Checks and balances can't exist in one branch of government. Whether it be upon the advice of one lawyer or 10,000 lawyers, if they all work for one man, the President, how can there be anything but a verdict outside the law, a verdict that could conceivably be subject to the emotions of prejudice and fear, a verdict that could be wrong?

The nomination before us is about a nominee who supports killing American citizens not engaged in combat without a trial. These memos don't limit drone executions to one individual, they become historic precedent for killing citizens abroad.

Barron's arguments for extrajudicial killing of American citizens challenges over 1,000 years of jurisprudence. It is quite simple; an accusation is different from a conviction, and due process is different from internal deliberations. The executive can accuse, but it cannot try and it cannot convict someone.

Critics will argue, but these are evil people who plot against and plan to kill Americans. I understand that. My first instinct is—similar to most Americans—to immediately want to punish these traitors. The question is, How do we decide guilt? Aren't we, in a way, betraying our country's principles when we relinquish the right to trial by jury?

Due process can't exist in secret. Checks and balances can't exist within one branch of government. If we can't defend the right to a trial for the most heinous crimes, then where will the slippery slope lead us?

Critics ask how we will try these people overseas. The Constitution holds the answer. They should be tried for treason. If they refuse to return home, they should be tried in absentia and provided a legal defense. If they are found guilty, the method of punishment is not the issue. The issue is, and always has been, the right to a trial, the presumption of innocence, and the guarantee of due process to everyone no matter how heinous the crime.

For these reasons I cannot support the nomination of David Barron. I cannot and will not support a lifetime appointment for someone who believes it is OK to kill American citizens not involved in combat without a trial.

I yield back my time.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mazie Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, Al Franken, Amy Klobuchar, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer, Richard Blumenthal, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Edward J. Markey, Richard J. Durbin, Carl Levin, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Court Judge for the First Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Levin	Udall (CO)
Casey	Markey	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Walsh
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hagan	Nelson	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blunt	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heller	Portman
Chambliss	Hoeven	Risch
Coburn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Landrieu	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	Manchin	Wicker
Fischer	McCain	
Flake	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—5

Ayotte	Coats	Shaheen
Boozman	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 43. The motion to invoke cloture is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF DAVID JEREMIAH BARRON TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

NOMINATION OF ELISEBETH COLLINS COOK TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

NOMINATION OF JAMES WALTER FRAZER GREEN TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

NOMINATION OF DEIRDRE M. DALY TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

NOMINATION OF DAMON PAUL MARTINEZ TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2020; James Walter Frazer Green, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years; Deirdre M. Daly, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years; and Damon Paul Martinez, of New Mexico, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico for the term of four years.

VOTE ON COOK NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Cook nomination.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wish to express my support for the confirmation of my former staffer, Elisebeth Collins Cook, to serve on the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board. Ms. Cook loves her country. She is a true patriot, and a person of character, courage, and integrity.

Ms. Cook has had a distinguished legal career. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of Chicago in 1997 and her law degree from Harvard Law School in 2000. She graduated from both prestigious schools with honors. Following law school, Ms. Cook served as law clerk to Judge Lee Rosenthal of the Southern District of

Texas, and Judge Laurence Silberman of the D.C. Circuit.

In 2002, she joined the prominent law firm Cooper & Kirk here in Washington, DC. After working for the firm for 3 years, Ms. Cook was appointed Special Counsel to the Office of Legal Policy at the Department of Justice. In 2008, she was confirmed by the Senate without opposition to be assistant attorney general for OLP.

In 2009, Ms. Cook joined my staff as chief counsel for the Supreme Court nomination of now-Associate Justice Sonia Sotomayor. Her work was superb. She helped me to examine the important issues raised by that nomination on a high level without resorting to personal attacks on the nominee.

In 2010, she returned to private practice as a partner with Freeborn & Peters in Chicago, before returning to Washington, where she is currently counsel at the well-regarded law firm Wilmer Hale.

Ms. Cook has had a wide-ranging law practice, including general civil litigation, policy initiatives, and Federal criminal investigations. The quality of her work has not gone unnoticed. Among her more recent accolades are the Intelligence Community Legal Award, multiple attorney general awards, and recognition as one of *Legal Times*' "40 Under 40." In 2008, she received the Edmund J. Randolph Award for Service to the Department of Justice, the Department's highest award for public service and leadership.

Ms. Cook combines a powerful legal mind, broad experience, good judgment, and a strong interest in serving her country. She has excellent people skills and works well with others, even when she disagrees with them. Her tenure on the board thus far proves as much.

I have nothing but praise for Ms. Cook's abilities, and am confident she will continue to acquit herself as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board. I am pleased to recommend Ms. Cook to my colleagues and I hope they will support her confirmation to this important position.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, we yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON GREEN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Green nomination.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James Walter Frazer Green, of Lou-

isiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DALY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Daly nomination.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Deirdre M. Daly, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MARTINEZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Martinez nomination.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Damon Paul Martinez, of New Mexico, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

NOMINATION OF DAVID JEREMIAH BARRON TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, a year ago the Senate Judiciary Committee reported out a piece of legislation that would do more than increase the gross domestic product, do more than reduce the deficit, do more than promote prosperity, and do more than create jobs. It passed legislation that would take 11 million people out of the shadows in America, prevent anyone from becoming a second-class citizen in this country, and finally establish comprehensive, commonsense immigration reform.

Today, 1 year later, it sits languishing in the House of Representatives and 11 million people wait and wait and wait. While they wait, while they hope that we come to our senses and govern as we should, the toll from inaction compounds: families suffer, children suffer, deportations continue, and injustice prevails.

There is a cost to our inaction, a cost those in the House of Representatives are forcing upon us, as we wait for them to act, that accrues every day. They claim they are for fiscal responsibility. Yet their inaction is costing us each year, on average, \$80 billion of

real GDP, \$40 billion in higher deficits, 40,000 STEM grads who earn a Master's or a Ph.D. in STEM fields from U.S. universities, 50 million in the Social Security trust fund, over 50,000 fewer jobs, and \$13.5 billion in lost revenue.

I hope our Republican colleagues in the House understand exactly what the cost of inaction is. I hope they understand that every minute we waste passing commonsense immigration reform is costing American taxpayers more and more, and the cost is on them, and the losses I view as Republican losses.

The fact is Republicans are acting as if nothing is at stake, as if there is no cost, as if the lives of people and families are not in the balance, and they could not be more wrong. Besides the economic cost of inaction, there is a very real human cost. Franklin Roosevelt once said, citing Dante, that, "Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Let us not be frozen in the ice of our own indifference. Let us act, govern. I call on my Republican colleagues to warm their hearts and think about the costs of inaction not only in dollars and cents but in the lives of families and the future of this Nation. The legislation we are waiting for is a comprehensive way to tackle our immigration problem.

We are on the verge of historic change. I am proud to have been part of the Gang of 8 that hammered out a strong bipartisan effort that passed this institution with 67 votes. That is not usual these days for questions of great controversy.

I say to my friends in the other body: Do the right thing for America and, by the way, for your own party. Find common ground, lean away from the extreme, opt for reason, and govern with us.

In my view, the leadership in the other body has a chance to be American heroes, a chance to bring both sides together in an alliance that will ensure passage of this bill. I believe, based on poll after poll, that a vast majority of Americans want immigration reform to pass, and will thank them for doing the right thing. I hope they have the political will. I hope they have the political courage to unite the Nation and send this bill to the President's desk. I hope they will pass a bill that will increase the gross domestic product, reduce the deficit, promote prosperity, and create jobs.

As I have pointed out on this floor many times, this chart shows cumulative economic gains of the legalization process over 10 years after passage of this legislation. Fixing the broken immigration system would increase America's gross domestic product by over \$800 billion over the next 10 years; it would increase the wages of all Americans by \$470 billion over 10 years, and increase jobs by 121,000 per year for 10 years. That is over 1.2 million jobs.

What do we ever get to do here that increases the gross domestic product, reduces the deficit, raises the wages of all Americans, and creates 120,000-plus jobs per year? Very little. This legislation does that, not just simply because I say it but because the Congressional Budget Office said many of these figures were, in fact, a reality. Immigrants will start small businesses, they will create jobs for American workers, and it is time to harness that economic power.

The CBO report also tells us we reduce direct spending and the deficit by \$158 billion over the next decade, and by another \$685 billion more from 2024 through 2033. Let's remember, we are talking about almost \$1 trillion in deficit spending that we can lift off the backs of the next generation, exactly what our Republican friends demand. Yet they are balking in the face of achieving one of their very fundamental principles. What other single piece of legislation increases GDP growth, increases wages, increases jobs, and lowers the deficit?

The Center for American Progress found that fixing the broken immigration system would increase wages of all Americans by \$470 billion over 10 years and increase jobs by 121,000 per year. What we realize now and what the numbers tell us is that giving 11 million people a clear and defined earned pathway to citizenship is, in effect, an economic growth strategy that lowers the deficit and creates jobs. That is exactly what we are looking to do to move this economy forward.

New Americans who follow this pathway we lay out will have to play by rules. They will have to pass criminal background checks, they will have to pay a fine, they will have to pay their taxes. But if they do, there will be no obstacle they cannot overcome to the day when they raise their right hand and pledge allegiance to the United States and become a naturalized citizen.

Too many families have waited too long for that day. Too many have waited too long to say those words that will change their lives forever. They changed my mother's life, and, in turn, gave me a chance to stand here today and vote for a pathway to citizenship that can change the lives of millions of others.

But it is not just the economics of the legislation that creates the urgency of now, it is the human toll, the toll on millions living in the shadows. That can be pretty dark and frightening. Last year over 150,000 people were deported just for paperwork violations. Hundreds of thousands have been deported despite having U.S. citizen children. They are not criminals; they are hard-working families trying to make ends meet.

For many years I have asked the administration to stop deporting fathers and mothers, stop separating families, stop taking away parents from their U.S. citizen resident children. Let me

tell you about one of these cases, the case of Carlos Oliva-Guillen who was about to be deported away from his three U.S. citizen children, including his 7-month-old infant son who is suffering from a life-threatening disorder. The baby was on the verge of a coma and facing potential brain damage while his dad was in detention about to be deported.

The doctors needed to do a blood test on Carlos, the baby's dad, to see if the baby's illness is genetic. Thank God that Carlos was released and brought back to New Jersey so doctors could pursue these lifesaving tests and treatment.

Those tragedies continue as long as we do not have comprehensive immigration reform. With all of these economic benefits and the tremendous human suffering at stake, what are we waiting for? We are waiting for the House leadership to stand up to a minority—to a minority. We are waiting for Speaker BOEHNER to schedule a vote. We are waiting for reason to prevail, for our Republican friends in the other body to once and for all do what is right and think about the cost of inaction, not only in dollars and cents but in the lives of the families and the future of this Nation.

We are waiting for the Speaker to stop letting the most radical voices, such as STEPHEN KING, dictate the future of immigration reform. Speaker BOEHNER himself has publicly denounced Congressman KING for his "hateful language." Yet the only—the only—immigration-related vote the Speaker of the House of Representatives has allowed in the past year was for radical proposals to end DACA and deport our Nation's DREAMers. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to stand for the majority of the Republican Party and of the Congress in the House of Representatives and remove STEPHEN KING's undeserved carte blanche on immigration policy.

If we had a vote in the House, the Senate bill as passed would pass. It would pass today. It would pass with both Democratic and Republican votes. We have the votes in the House to pass the Senate bill. We just need the will of a Republican leadership behind a bill that reduces the deficit, increases the GDP, creates jobs. I cannot understand, for the life of me, why they cannot break the stranglehold by a few against the will of the many.

Considering that there are enough votes in the House to pass the Senate bill and send it to the President, we deserve action. Eleven million people deserve, at the very least, the political courage to face down the extreme minority and do what is right and govern from the commonsense center.

Time is not on our side. There is a limited window of opportunity. We only have about another 2 months at most for the Speaker to act. So it is in the Speaker's hands. Does he want reform or doesn't he? I know I hear him say he does. I want to believe that. I will be the first to applaud him.

Speaker BOEHNER, however, on the one side said he wants to get immigration reform. The next thing I hear is that he questions the President's commitment to enforce the law as the reason why they are not moving forward on immigration reform, even as this President is deporting more people than the Bush administration. This administration has deported almost 2 million people. I do not understand. When the Speaker says, "We can't trust the President to enforce the law," it seems to me what he is calling for is even greater deportations than the greatest deportations that have taken place over the last Republican administration.

So saying the President isn't enforcing enough, the Speaker is really arguing for more deportations and has done nothing to stop those deportations.

The only conclusion we can draw is that my friends on the other side support the current dysfunctional system, and they do so at a cost to the country. They do so at a cost to families, and I also believe that beyond all the policy arguments that I have talked about—the GDP, the reduction in the deficit, the creation of jobs, the raising of wages, helping our agricultural industry through the ag jobs provision, helping our high-tech industries through the provisions of the legislation, and so many others—not only do they risk all of that and risk the families, but I believe they risk their political futures.

The road to the White House goes through the barrio, as my friend in the House of Representatives, Congressman GUTIÉRREZ, says. If we look at States across the country in which there are large immigrant populations who vote, who are U.S. citizens, and who look at this as the civil rights issue of their time, you cannot win the electoral votes of those States if you cannot find a way to a commonsense immigration reform. So their own futures, politically speaking, are at risk.

But even more than that political risk, our country is at risk—a risk that will hinder our own economic growth and leave millions in the shadows as second-class citizens, a risk that deportations will continue to tear parents away from their infants, despite the parents desperately seeking to register, get right with the law, and pay their taxes.

I thought that so many of my colleagues talk about the family values. Well, family values isn't about ripping families asunder. Family values isn't about ultimately saying that someone has a paperwork violation, so you rip them apart from their three American children—a risk that we will address as one of the greatest civil rights issues of our time.

I have cases in my office of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents of the United States unlawfully detained in immigration raids because of the happenstance of where they live or what they look like or how they speak.

Who among us, who have the privilege of serving in this institution, is

ready to become a second-class citizen because of the happenstance of where you live, what you look like or how you speak, when you are a U.S. citizen or a legal permanent resident? This includes among others, in one case, an Iraq war veteran who was detained while his status was determined.

My first and foremost focus is on getting the House Republican leadership, after 1 year of this body's having passed an immigration bill, to either consider the Senate legislation or their own comprehensive version. That is the ultimate solution. Everything else is a bandaid. But let me be clear. There is a limited window of opportunity we have open to us until the end of July.

If Republicans do not act, they will have forced the President to ultimately use his executive powers on enforcement questions and on deportation relief.

Either they are tone deaf to the priorities of the Nation's largest-growing and fastest-growing minority or they are ignoring the will and interests of their own party and acting against their own stated goal of reducing the deficit.

They can keep finding excuses for inaction, but there are no more excuses. Enough is enough.

The community across the country is riveted in their attention as to what is going to happen in the House of Representatives. I hope that attention will ultimately be a joyful one if the House acts. But if it does not, it will reap the wrath of a community who sees this as the critical civil rights issue of their time and the consequences will be longstanding. I hope they meet the better angels that are within them and ultimately produce the comprehensive immigration reform the Nation needs for its security, for its economy, for doing the right thing as a nation of immigrants, by doing the right thing for those families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

KOCH BROTHERS

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, as the ranking member of the Rules Committee, I take no pleasure in making these remarks, but the circumstances have given me absolutely no choice.

Our distinguished majority leader recently came to this floor and declared that his minority colleagues—that would be us on this side of the aisle, Republicans—were "addicted to Koch."

To those who regularly watch our proceedings, however, it is clear who is suffering from this addiction.

Practically every morning our leader starts our session by giving a speech personally attacking David and Charles Koch and their families. The only thing he seems to do more often than block Republican amendments is attack the Kochs.

As distasteful as that is, it is apparently no longer sufficient. The problem with addiction, of course, is that as a tolerance develops, more and more of

the drug is needed to satisfy the craving.

So now we have learned that not only does the majority leader spend his mornings attacking the Kochs, but he spends his evenings doing so as well.

Last night, the majority leader attended an event in the Capitol Visitor Center—the CVC in the Capitol building—to promote a movie attacking the Kochs. Never mind that the regulations prohibit—prohibit—the use of the CVC space for any "campaign, commercial, promotional or profit-making purpose."

As House Administration Committee Chairman CANDICE MILLER said:

We cannot hold partisan political rallies or fundraisers on the grounds of the Capitol, or within its walls. Our work in this hallowed building must solely be in the interests of the American people and not in the interest of any political cause.

This event is just the latest demonstration of an apparent belief that the rules do not apply to the Democratic leadership. We now have another new precedent: a majority leader appearing in and then promoting a movie in the Capitol.

It also further demonstrates the hypocrisy of the majority's quest to stifle dissent. They celebrate and promote films that attack their opponents but want to outlaw films that criticize the majority Members and their agenda.

The irony of promoting a film to advance their campaign to restrict speech is apparently lost on the majority. So it is worth reminding them what the Citizens United case was really all about. It was about a movie—"Hillary: The Movie," to be precise. "Hillary: The Movie" was made in the wake of "Fahrenheit 9/11." Anyone who saw "Fahrenheit 9/11" knows that the purpose of the film was to convince people that George W. Bush was not worthy of the Presidency and should not be given a second term.

Anyone who saw "Hillary: The Movie" knows the purpose was to convince people that Hillary Clinton should not be elected President of the United States. I suspect that many of the people who went to see the movie in the CVC last night thought that "Fahrenheit 9/11" was great and "Hillary: The Movie" was terrible.

The point of the Citizens United case was that it really doesn't matter. It doesn't matter which film a majority in Congress might prefer. The producers have the right to make and distribute either one, and they can raise the money necessary to do so as they see fit, not subject to any restrictions or limitations imposed by the Congress. They are guaranteed that right by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This Congress cannot take that away.

Is that too difficult a concept to grasp? Isn't it obvious? Of course it is.

Yet the majority has spent the last 4 years misrepresenting it, and now it even wants to amend the Constitution to reverse it. That is just incredible.

In a press release announcing an upcoming hearing on the majority's amendment to the First Amendment, it was declared that it was necessary to "build support for amending the Constitution to ensure that all Americans can exercise their First Amendment rights."

It is not necessary to amend the First Amendment to ensure that all Americans can exercise their First Amendment rights. Those rights are already guaranteed by the First Amendment as written. The amendment the majority wants to impose would allow them to once again curtail those rights. Why can't we just be honest about this. Because of the Citizens United decision, people of all points of view now have the opportunity to make their views widely known. Even people who disagree with the majority in the Senate have that right, and we should all be very grateful.

I know the majority preferred a system where those who wished to criticize them were restrained in their ability to do so. They want to reimpose those restraints. I do not think they will succeed, but we should make clear what they want to do.

In their view, a corporation that happens to own a network, such as NBC or CNN, should be able to broadcast the movie they promoted last night as much as they want. If the networks wanted to show the movie every night of the week for 2 hours, that would be just fine with the majority.

But if somebody wanted to buy a 30-second ad during the airing of the movie to present an alternative point of view, that would be unacceptable. A 2-hour movie? No problem. A 30-second ad? Terrible. It can't be allowed.

That is simply absurd, but that was the reality before the Citizens United decision. Media corporations could do or say whatever they wanted. Other corporations, however, could not. Citizens United ended that ridiculous distinction and the majority has been trying to reinstate it ever since.

The majority claims they are concerned about wealthy donors. No, they are not. They are concerned about wealthy conservative donors.

According to the Los Angeles Times, the very film they promoted last night received financing from foundations and large individual donations. But those donations were OK, I suppose, because they went to promote a cause the majority supports—attacking the Koch family.

Likewise, billionaires who support the causes of the majority are not targeted. Billionaire former hedge fund manager Tom Steyer has indicated he intends to spend over \$100 million to influence the midterm elections.

Does the majority have any problem with that? Of course not.

Spending huge amounts of money in politics only concerns them if it is spent against them or on behalf of their opponents, but if it is spent to promote the majority and their agenda—no problem.

The majority leader has convinced himself, however, and seeks to convince the rest of us, that the Kochs are somehow unique, that the Koch brothers present some kind of evil threat, if you will, that other billionaires with different points of view do not pose. He seems to think that for everything bad that happens the Kochs are to blame.

Recently he claimed that they were one of the main causes of climate change. He said: "Not a cause, one of the main causes."

What do we make of such a statement? Could anything be more absurd? There are over 7 billion people on Earth, but our majority leader believes two men, Charles and David Koch, are a main cause of climate change.

What is that all about?

Just yesterday, the majority leader blamed the Kochs for the wildfires in California. What is next? Maybe the Kochs are to blame for the planes lost in the Bermuda Triangle? How about the volcanic eruption at Pompeii years ago or even the futility of the Chicago Cubs? That has to be the Koch family.

The majority leader convinces himself that his Koch obsession is justified because he believes their political involvement is motivated only by their own financial interest.

It is inconceivable to him that people might exist who simply disagree with him and his agenda and want to see the country take a different path. The reality is that there are millions of Americans who want to see this country take a different path, and the Koch family proudly supports that goal and has made donations to help achieve just that.

You will never hear it from the majority leader, but it is time someone presented the rest of the story about the Koch family. This family has pledged or contributed more than \$1 billion to cancer research, medical centers, education, the arts, and to assist public policy organizations—\$1 billion. Is that the act of a family motivated solely by financial interests? I don't think so. Of course not.

Consider a few of these gifts: \$100 million as a prime contributor for cancer research at MIT; \$100 million to the New York-Presbyterian Hospital to build a new ambulatory care center, plus \$28 million to other research causes; \$20 million to Johns Hopkins University for a cancer research center; \$30 million to the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in New York; \$26 million to the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston; \$26 million to the Hospital for Special Surgery in New York City for the Building on Success campaign and other causes; and \$35 million to the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History to renovate what is called dinosaur hall, which will include one of the largest and most complete *T. rex* specimens in the world; \$20 million to the Museum of Natural History; and \$65 million to the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Likewise, the David H. Koch Charitable Founda-

tion gave \$100 million for the preservation and renovation of Lincoln Center, home to the New York City Ballet and the New York City Opera.

All these acts of extraordinary generosity are completely ignored by the majority leader. They are ignored because the Koch family has committed one unforgivable sin: They have opposed him and the Democratic majority and President Obama. They present a threat to the Democrats' hold on power. That is why they are being demonized. That is why they are being attacked. That is why they are being vilified. That is why they have become his obsession.

They have had the temerity to challenge the agenda of this majority and its leader, and the leader is not happy about it and he wants it to stop. And it looks as if he will do anything he can to make it stop, up to and including amending the Constitution of the United States. I think that is a disgrace. It has demeaned this institution. It should stop. The first amendment doesn't exist to protect those of us in this body. It exists to protect the people. It is there to prevent us from silencing our critics. And thank God for that.

I wish the majority would recognize that they do not have the power to silence their critics. The first amendment denies them that power. I wish the majority leader would stop engaging in character assassination against citizens who choose to exercise their first amendment rights. And I wish he would stop acting as though he is the only person on Earth who can say whatever he wants. He isn't. We all have the right to express ourselves—all of us—from Michael Moore to Citizens United, from Tom Steyer to the Koch family. All of us have that right. All of us. Let's stop trying to deny it. Let's stop trying to change it. It is beneath us. It demeans this body, and it is wrong.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, followed by the Senator from Georgia.

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

WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I came to the floor today to take a few minutes and talk about a piece of legislation I have been working on, along with seven of my colleagues from this Chamber and from the House of Representatives. That legislation is called the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. This is a long-overdue bill

that will reauthorize and improve the Workforce Investment Act—or WIA, as we call it—which includes dozens of critical workforce development programs in all 50 of our States.

This is an issue I have been working on for more than a decade. For several years now I have been very proud to work here in the Senate to reauthorize WIA, so I am very glad we are finally on a strong bipartisan path to get this done for families and businesses in Washington State and across the country who have been telling me how important effective workforce programs are for them and their communities.

The reason we were able to introduce such a strong bill this morning—and a bill that I think has a real chance to become law—is the incredible bipartisan process we have had over the last few months to reach a compromise between both parties and both Chambers. So I would like to thank each of the Members who helped me introduce the legislation this morning by name: in the House of Representatives, Representative JOHN KLINE, Republican from Minnesota; Representative GEORGE MILLER, Democrat from California; Representative VIRGINIA FOXX, Republican from North Carolina; and Representative RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Democrat from Texas; and here in the Senate, Senator TOM HARKIN, Democrat from Iowa and the great chairman of our HELP Committee; Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, Republican from Tennessee; and finally my close partner and cohort in this process, who is here with me today, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia.

None of us got everything we wanted in the bill we introduced this morning, but all of us got legislation we believe in. It is a bill that will help our workers, and it will help our businesses and the economy for years to come.

I am as strong a supporter of our Federal workforce development program as anyone. I have seen firsthand in my home State of Washington workers who were laid off and who were able to get new training and new skills and new jobs. I have seen many of our Washington State businesses, from aerospace companies to video game design firms, that were able to access workers with the new skills they needed to grow and compete.

But the fact is that we have been relying on Federal workforce development programs that were written in the 1990s, and with millions of new jobs that will require postsecondary education and advanced skills in the coming years, we will fall behind in the world if we do not modernize our workforce development now. We have to make sure that when high-tech jobs of the 21st century are created, Americans are ready to fill them. That is what we have done in this bill. We have doubled down on the programs that work, we have improved the programs that have become outdated, and we have created a workforce system that is more nimble and adaptable and bet-

ter aligned with what businesses need and more accountable so we can continue to make it better. That is what we were sent here to do—work with our colleagues across the aisle for the American people. We had a House proposal and we had a Senate proposal and we met in the middle.

I can't count how many times Senator ISAKSON, my Republican colleague, and I have talked about the importance of getting this done. His office happens to be right next door to mine. So whether we were at a committee hearing or on a train to the Capitol, we were always focused on how we could work together and find a path to a deal.

We are not done yet. I am going to be working with my colleagues in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—to get their support for this compromise, and our colleagues will be doing the same in the House of Representatives.

This is an all-too-rare opportunity for all of us to get behind a strong, bipartisan, bicameral bill that will help our workers and get our economy back on track. I am very proud of the work that went into this.

I yield to my colleague, Senator ISAKSON. This would not be on the floor today without his tremendous work and his work ethic and his willingness to work across the aisle to get this done. I sincerely thank him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator from Washington for her overly kind remarks with regard to my participation. To reiterate and underline what is in fact true, we were a team for 8 years when we both chaired and were ranking member of the Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety in the HELP Committee. We time and again had gotten it to a point we thought we could pass it and then everything was falling apart.

We were at a huge divide and chasm at the beginning of this year. The House had passed the SKILLS Act; we had passed an act. They didn't think we did anything; we thought they did too much. It looked like a chasm too far to bridge, but because of the work of Senator MURRAY, my office, and Senator ALEXANDER's office—VIRGINIA FOXX, for whom I cannot say enough. She was the original author of the SKILLS Act. She came to the table with us, and we sat down one floor below this building, this floor right now. We sat down around a long table, and we started talking about the art of the possible, not the art of the impossible.

Here are the high points I wish to focus on: first of all, consolidation of programs that were not working; empowerment programs that were working; flexibility for Governors, both on what they can do with their one-stop shops, as well as their ability to transfer money for unemployed programs and underemployed programs; 100 percent transferability on the behalf of the

Governors; 15 percent total flexibility of the appropriations that come to them through the WIA—Workforce Investment Act—and workforce investment program.

We skinned down the board so you don't have these huge boards. Instead, you have boards that can work. We reduced their size by about 61 percent. We included management as a majority but labor at the table, to make sure all facets of work were there.

Most important, we empowered the States to write the kind of curriculum for the kind of training their State needed. We have 4 million unfilled jobs in America. We sometimes talk about all the unemployment—and we all hate the unemployment—but we have some underqualified people who are underemployed who can take better and bigger jobs available in America right now if we train them for these jobs.

So this new Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is just what it portends. It is an innovation in the WIA Program, and it is an opportunity for millions of Americans to find the training and skills necessary to find a job and keep a job, which is, in turn, good for our economy and good for our country.

But this is something that happened because people of good will on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol got together and said let's figure out what we can do rather than argue about what we can't do.

Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER in the House—whom I served with on that committee years ago—did a tremendous job. VIRGINIA FOXX was very willing to work and TIM SCOTT, the Senator from South Carolina, who was the author of the SKILLS version of Virginia's bill in the Senate. Chairman HARKIN deserves a lot of credit, particularly for his focus on those with disabilities, and we preserve the programs that make sense for people with disabilities, retraining them and giving them the training they need to have meaningful and skillful employment in the future.

But, most important of all, LAMAR ALEXANDER, the ranking member, kind of steered the ship. He was the rudder in the water who helped guide us to the point we got to today.

I am pleased both the Senate and the House Republican conferences have all had presentations. The feedback we have gotten to date is extremely favorable. We hope this is going to be one of those rare occasions in 2014 where Republicans and Democrats come together for the benefit of the American people to address the No. 1 problem we face in America; that is, unemployment and underemployment, and empower people through innovation and opportunity for jobs in the 21st century.

I will end where I began. It would not have happened without Senator MURRAY. I am grateful for her help and assistance and I am proud to be her partner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, would the gentleman yield for 1 second?

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. ISAKSON. To Senator MURRAY, if I could talk about our staff. Tom Nguyen is behind me. I could not have done what I did in this bill without Tom Nguyen, and Senator MURRAY has an outstanding staff who worked for us. I wish to have the RECORD include the tremendous staff work both of us received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to extend a gracious thank you to staff from my office, senior advisor Scott Cheney; my chief of staff Mike Spahn; my Budget Committee staff director Evan Schatz; Stacy Rich and Emma Fulkerson from my floor and leadership staff; my communications team, especially Eli Zupnick and Sean Coit; and everyone else from my team, who have all worked very hard to move this bill forward.

I would like to thank the wonderful staff from Senator ISAKSON's office: Tommy Nguyen, staff director of the HELP Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety; as well as Brett Layson and Michael Black.

I thank Chairman HARKIN's Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee team: senior education policy advisor Crystal Bridgeman; chief education counsel Mildred Otero; disability policy staff director Michael Gamel-McCormick; disability policy advisor Lee Perselay; Derek Miller, staff director of the HELP Committee; deputy staff director of the HELP committee Lauren McFerren; and labor policy advisor Liz Weiss; and many more who have helped.

I also thank the staff for Senator ALEXANDER: senior education policy advisor Patrick Murray; education policy director Peter Oppenheim; Bill Knudsen; and HELP Committee staff director David Cleary.

Finally I would be remiss if I didn't thank the professionals in the Senate Legislative Counsel's office, specially Liz King, Amy Gaynor, Kristin Romero, and Katie Grendon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am honored to represent the 12.5 million people living in the State of Illinois, and it is a special honor to represent 745,000 veterans who live in my State. These men and women have served their country honorably. Many of them are leading great lives and making great contributions to our State. Some are struggling, returning from war with wounds—visible and invisible.

I came to speak to the issue involving the so-called VA scandal at the Arizona Hospital. What I have been told is

troubling. What I have been told is that there were secret waiting lists of veterans who were being unnecessarily delayed when they needed critical medical care. The allegations suggest that some of them may have died while on the waiting list. That is as cruel an allegation as anyone could make about anybody and particularly cruel when it applies to our veterans.

We are trying to investigate this, as we should. The President sent his Deputy Chief Rob Nabors, a person I know, to Arizona today, but we are not going to stop with that. We are going to do everything we can to make sure every veterans facility across America is serving our veterans in a timely and professional way. That includes, of course, those in the State of Illinois.

Tomorrow I will be meeting with General Shinseki in my office. He is the head of the Veterans' Administration. We are going to focus on Illinois, because in Illinois we have five VA medical centers, 30 outpatient clinics, and 11 veterans centers. I want to make certain there are no secret waiting lists at any of those facilities, and I want to make certain we are doing everything in our power to serve our veterans in a timely professional way.

We know the stories—the stories that have come out of these wars we are concluding now. The war in Afghanistan is winding down to a close. Iraq was over just a few months, maybe 1 year ago, but despite the end of these wars, it is not the end of the war for many veterans. They come home with needs—serious needs: post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, amputations, serious problems that will haunt them for some time.

We promised these men and women, if they would volunteer to serve our Nation, if they were willing to serve and even die for our Nation, we would never quit on them; that when they came home, we would stand by them.

We passed a GI bill on the floor of the Senate several years ago. Jim Webb was the Senator from Virginia, a Marine Corps veteran himself of the Vietnam war. He brought in a modern GI bill for those men and women currently serving, and it passed overwhelmingly with both political parties supporting it, as they should. In a place where we don't agree on much, we sure agreed on that. When it comes to veterans and the GI bill, we stood together. We have to do it again on a bipartisan basis.

I read the comments from President Obama this morning. I thought they were unsparing in terms of his personal concern over what has been reported.

I know we all honor the contribution made to America by General Shinseki, a disabled veteran himself from the Vietnam war. He is an extraordinarily good man. The question is whether he can fix this problem if one exists.

I don't know about the Arizona situation. We will wait until those facts come together. But this much I do know: Our Veterans' Administration has been overwhelmed by disability

claims coming in at rates that surpass this country's experience in any previous war. Almost half, almost 50 percent of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are filing for disability benefits when they come home.

The backlog at the VA is 300,000 cases—applications for disability. They have been pending for more than 125 days—4 months. Some have been in the process for more than 1 year. It is an improvement—300,000 from 611,000, which was the case last year—but not good enough.

Illinois has cut its backlog in half as well. But when I read some of the delay times in making a decision at the VA, we will understand why we find this still unacceptable.

Seven years ago the average processing time for an Illinois veteran claim was 1 year, maybe 18 months. Appeals sometimes took 2 years. Today veterans tell us the claim will easily take 2 years to process, maybe longer, and an appeal may take 3 or 4 years. Compared to the numbers of 7 years ago, the numbers are much worse today. I understand there are more veterans who are applying, but it just means we need to put the resources in place to serve this surge of veterans looking for help.

The veterans who call my office are just asking for updates and accurate information about the claims and medical care. They want to know if somebody—anybody—at the VA is taking a look at their application. They get conflicting information from the VA.

Sometimes the VA calls them back and says: You have to send such and such a document.

The veteran says: I have already sent it.

That kind of frustration for someone who is coping with illness or problems is unacceptable, and it is certainly unacceptable when it comes to our veterans.

Even when claims are processed, there are cases of mistaken identity. A bad address leads to canceled benefits and checks, and it takes months to fix it. I am trying to help. As chair of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, I put \$3.6 million in the Defense Department to speed up the program that allows servicemembers' records to be transferred to the VA electronically so we can have at least a quicker response from the VA. I directed the DOD inspector general in my bill to work with the VA inspector general to streamline the transfer of records between the Departments.

Another way we tried to step up support for veterans is by creating the Caregiver Program at the Veterans' Administration. I will be the first to tell you this was not my idea. It was the idea of Senator Hillary Clinton of New York. She used to sit back there, and she came up with an idea: If members of a disabled veteran's family will stay home with them and help them get through, we ought to help those members of the family. She called it

the caregivers act. It didn't pass while she was here, but when she left I liked it enough to call her and say to the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton: Do you mind if I steal your idea and try to pass it? She invited me to be her guest, and I did. With the support of Senator Danny Akaka, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and others, we made the caregivers act the law of the land, and now across America hundreds of spouses and parents who care for disabled veterans are getting a helping hand. We provide them medical training, nurses training so they can take care of their veteran. We give them respite care of up to 2 weeks a year so they can have some time off, a vacation to recharge their batteries. If they have a financial hardship, we provide a modest amount of money to help them get by. It is the right thing to do. These veterans get to stay home with families who love them. That is where they want to be. From our point of view as a government, just to put it down to dollars and cents, it is a lot cheaper when they stay home. So we do well and the veterans do well. That is a great outcome.

We have to expand the reach of caregivers assistance through the VA so at every veterans center there is a source of information to tell that veteran and the veteran's family: The Caregiver Program is there if you want to stay home. We want to help you stay home and be healthy as you do.

I think that is a good thing to offer the veterans. The ones I have met, there are some amazing stories in Chicago that truly warm your heart to know that those veterans, after what they have been through, can stay home with their families and be there with the people they love and who love them too.

There is another area I wish to mention. Our committee has pushed the Veterans' Administration to focus on the sustainability of orthotics and prosthetics. We are worried about the professional workforce that deals with these important parts of restoring a veteran's life.

Twenty percent of the orthotics and prosthetics workforce, about 7,000 clinicians, will retire over the next 5 years. We have never needed these specialists more than we need them today: 1,715 servicemembers lost limbs in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many have lost multiple limbs. The United States has 5 quadruple amputees and 40 triple amputees from these wars. The VA serves 40,000 people with limb loss every year. That is why I am focused on this—to get the professionals in the orthotics and prosthetics fields of medicine to be trained and ready to help these veterans in the years to come while others are retiring.

There are 745,000 veterans in my State, and not a single one of them should be deceived about what they can receive for their service nor delayed when it comes to seeing a doctor or having their claims processed. Not one of them should wait 2 years before they

start getting disability benefits. We have 5 VA Medical Centers, 30 outpatient clinics, and 11 Veterans Centers across Illinois, and we have to be there to serve them in a timely way.

None of these facilities has the right to mislead or lie to the veterans about what doctors they can see or what services they can receive. The Senate just added \$5 million to the budget of the inspector general at the Veterans Administration, and the Inspector General is now investigating 26 facilities.

One of the toughest votes that a Member of Congress is called on to cast is whether we should go to war. It has happened a few times in my career. You don't sleep well the night before, wondering how you are going to vote, and knowing that at the end of the day, even if this is a just and necessary war, innocent people will die, including innocent Americans. What I have come to learn over the years is that it is not just a matter of that simple decision to go to war, but it is the cost of war—the cost in human lives. Over 4,000 died in the war in Iraq, and over 2,000 have died in the war in Afghanistan. There are thousands and thousands who come home with injuries, and, of course, there are the expenses and budget costs that come along with each and every one these conflicts.

It really helps when you make these decisions and reflect on them to also be aware and honest about the real cost of war. The real cost of war in human life and human suffering can't be calculated, but we did make a promise that those who would stand for our country in those wars would have our help when they came home.

The scandal that has been reported in Arizona—the problems at the VA centers—is unacceptable in a Nation as great as America, and we owe it to these veterans and their families to stand by them. I promise I will, not just for veterans facilities in Illinois, which is my first priority, but for those across the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

LEGISLATING

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his comments about a problem—and how extensive it is—we are seeing across the United States. I don't think there is a Senator who is not looking into that and ensuring that something is done. I looked at the resources that have been allocated, and noticed that we increased the resources 60 percent in the last 5 years. I think there is a severe management problem, and after reading some of the emails I have received, I am very concerned about that.

I want to talk about a different subject today. A recent headline from a Capitol Hill newspaper declared that our current Congress could be the "worst ever." Another said negotiating political agreements is a "lost art." The whole country knows something is wrong with our government. The prob-

lem is that Senators are being prevented from doing their job. Common sense is ignored because bills are being made in a political vacuum. This results in more lengthy, complex, incomprehensible laws that defy logic.

Former House Speaker NANCY PELOSI famously said that Congress would first have to pass a bill in order to find out what was in it. That is a problem. Legislation is often hundreds, if not thousands, of pages long. One bill could contain provisions affecting everything from health care to housing and increase the debt by hundreds of billions of dollars.

I recently introduced a bill with Senator JOHN BARRASSO, also from Wyoming, that would take a page from Wyoming's State legislature handbook. In order to stop Congress from passing bills with countless, unrelated measures, S. Res. 351 would require any legislation considered by the Senate to be limited to a single issue. One topic per bill will help get things done. It means more understandable and manageable bills. This is not a flashy concept, but I have found people of both parties are receptive to it. It makes sense to them.

Change is hard and those who control the Senate now like the system we have. Most Members of Congress have no opportunity to weigh in, and neither does the public—directly or indirectly. This is a very tidy arrangement for those who are in power now, especially in the Senate. Nothing is approved unless the majority leader allows it to come out.

Dissenting opinions are rarely considered. The majority leader uses procedural tactics to prohibit amendments to improve bills in order to control the legislation and to prevent his party from taking politically difficult votes. He has done this more than any other majority leader—perhaps more than all the previous leaders. Political motivations and consolidation of power should not be used to deny Senators from either party the right to represent their people.

Last week the majority leader used procedural tactics to prevent us from voting on tax amendments important to Wyoming, such as the permanent State and local sales tax deduction amendment offered by my friend on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Washington. We were also prevented from voting on amendments that would be important to all of us, such as preventing waste of taxpayers' dollars by stopping the IRS from giving bonuses to employees who have not paid their taxes. Amendments were filed by Members from across the country. By my count, more than 60 amendments to the tax package were filed by Senators from the other side of the aisle. Nobody is being represented by amendments. At some point we need to actually vote on the issues that are important to our constituents, and Members on both sides of the aisle who support these amendments need to insist on that.

Last week Politico's Huddle claimed "Senate GOP Filibusters \$85B Tax Extenders," but there is no opportunity to filibuster when the debate is cut off before it ever begins. That is what the majority leader did by filing cloture on the tax extenders package. Cloture is a political tactic designed to bring debate to a close after a supermajority of the Senate is satisfied that a matter has received adequate consideration.

In recent years this majority leader has often filed a cloture motion immediately—before there is an opportunity to debate or introduce amendments, not after adequate consideration. The number of same-day cloture filings has more than doubled compared to when Republicans last controlled the Senate. We are not even being given a chance to debate, much less offer amendments, and that is why I have joined Senator GRASSLEY, a Republican from Iowa, in cosponsoring his Stop Cloture Abuse Resolution. It would amend the Senate rules to prohibit filing cloture until there has been at least 24 hours of debate.

Another telling statistic is the number of amendments the current majority has blocked from being considered in the Senate. As this chart shows, in 2005 and 2006, the Senate voted on almost 700 amendments on the Senate floor. Since the Senate has been controlled by the current majority, the number has dwindled. In 2011 and 2012, there were about 350 amendments, and since July of last year, the majority leader has allowed votes on only 9 Senate Republican amendments. The House—where debate is very limited and controlled by the majority—had 132 votes on Democrat minority amendments.

Let's see. The minority in the Senate—the cooling saucer for the country where there is supposed to be open debate—had nine amendments. The House—always controlled by the majority in a very strict way with a rules committee—had 132 Democratic minority votes on amendments.

The leader has used the tactic of filling the amendment tree to prevent amendments from being introduced, and because of that tactic, the amendment to prevent wasting taxpayers' dollars by stopping the IRS from giving bonuses to employees who have not paid their taxes doesn't get to come up. That is just one example of many that has happened. In the last 8 years, he has used this tactic 86 times, and of course, we are still counting. By contrast, the last six majority leaders combined only filled the tree 40 times.

What is filling the tree? It is a political tactic of setting up a few amendments that cannot be taken down, that have to be voted on before the bill can be done, and filing cloture even prevents those from getting done.

The chart shows that there have been 86, and still counting, and the six previous leaders only filed cloture 40 times.

Filling the amendment tree has become a routine way to prevent any

Senator—majority or minority—from exercising their right to offer an amendment because once the tree is filled, no Senator can offer an amendment.

Almost half of the Senate has been here less than 6 years. Yes, 45 of the 100 Senators are in their first term. They don't realize that there is a better way. They have not seen how it could work, how it did work, and how it should work.

I know how this can hurt. I once had a bill that would have been the first step of 10 for solving health care in this country, and it was a small business health plan. It would have allowed small businesses across the country to join together through their association to get a big enough block to effectively negotiate with the insurance company or even set up their own selfinsurance pool.

The majority leader was willing to bring it up and then filled the tree and filed cloture. I had 2 people that would have made the 60 votes necessary to get that passed, but each had 1 amendment to the bill, and they would have been good amendments. They were not allowed to bring up their amendments, and consequently I wound up being just short to pass a very important bill that would have brought down health care costs for this country and might have encouraged people to do the other nine steps in the plan that Senator Kennedy and I put together and provided more in the way of insurance than what we have now, and it would have been paid for.

Committees should have the first opportunity to shape legislation. It is there that Members are able to iron out unintended consequences and craft better legislation before it goes to the floor. There is a lot of flexibility in the committee process. I used to sit down and go through all the amendments. There might be 200 amendments on a bill we were working on, and we would put them into piles according to what we covered. We would look to see who was involved in that particular pile and send that bipartisan group off to come up with a solution to these multiple solutions that had been presented. They were usually able to craft something out of that and bring it back as another amendment that would make the bill better and eliminate unintended consequences and perform a real service for our country.

Most of the bills now don't go to committee first. After a bill goes to committee, then it comes to the floor. All 100 Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to improve the legislation. The reason we have so many people in Congress—100 here and 435 at the other end of the building—is to bring together 535 different backgrounds that can suggest improvements to bills. Different Members may know something from their background that others may not have noticed, and that is why we do amendments. Rarely is that happening in to-

day's Senate. More often than not, committees are ignored and massive legislation is the result of a few people behind closed doors deal making for the more than 535 Members of Congress. We need to get away from deal making and start legislating again, and that is apparent, especially in our spending. The job of Congress is to decide how much the Federal Government should spend and on what priorities. That is not being done under the Senate's current management. Deals are made.

In fact, last January, the legislation we voted on was a deal between one Member of the House and one Member of the Senate. Do you know how many amendments we got on that? Nobody had an amendment to it. The debate was very limited. There was \$1.1 trillion spent on one vote that was put together by two people. That is deal making, not legislating, and that is what is costing this country so much money and what stifles things.

A couple of weeks ago we had a bill that was allowed to have amendments, and in 2 days we covered the amendments and passed the bill unanimously because it had been improved significantly. That is what we need to get back to. More time is spent on negotiating not to have amendments than it would take to vote on 75 amendments on a bill. Yes, a lot of them would fail, and that is typical, but at least a Senator could feel that his constituents have been heard but he just didn't have the votes for it. At least they have been heard, and that is what we are missing right now.

We are not getting to cover the amendments, and they can be covered relatively quickly. So deals are made and then spending bills are all packaged into one massive "take it or leave it" bill and the deficit has increased.

In 2013, the Senate didn't pass a single appropriations bill. We were supposed to do 12 of them right after April 15. We didn't do any of them. We only considered 1 of the 12 bills on the Senate floor, and that bill was shut down because the first amendment the majority leader didn't like, so he pulled it off of the floor and he never brought it up again, nor did he bring up any other spending bill. Is it any wonder that since January 2009 the total Federal debt stood at \$10.6 trillion and now it is over \$17 trillion? We don't budget; we don't appropriate; we just deal-make. It has never risen so high so fast in our country's history.

Similar to legislation on one topic per bill, we should look at each spending bill individually. The committees should be able to look closely at each branch and each agency. That is how it used to work before the power shift, but we can make some changes now to encourage more spending scrutiny. We could switch to a biennial appropriations process. That means once every 2

years for each agency. I have introduced S. 625, the Biennial Appropriations Act, and I am cosponsoring Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON's version of the legislation.

My bill would require the President to submit a 2-year budget resolution at the beginning of each Congress. Congress would then adopt a budget resolution. Following adoption of a budget resolution, Congress would focus on appropriations bills. Each Congress would debate the Defense appropriations bill; however, the other appropriations bills would be split into two groups. The more controversial bills would be debated in the first year after an election and the easy ones would be done the year before an election. Of course the bill would mandate at least one joint oversight hearing with the authorization committee and the Appropriations Committee in the off-appropriations year for those particular bills.

When you are spending a trillion dollars, it is so much money that nobody can look at the details. I don't even remember the last time we looked at something as small as a billion dollars, let alone a million dollars, and a million is a lot of money out where I live. We have to get back to where we can have some scrutiny on the appropriations, not a one-time deal.

Congress has 535 elected representatives. When each of us looks at every proposal, lots of viewpoints and experience get put into the decisions we make for our country, but if all decisions are made by the majority leader, the vast majority of Americans get shortchanged. Shortcuts are taken, committees are skipped. Legislation is long, cumbersome, and it is not easily read and understood. If you skip all the process to do that, then spending will reach all-time highs and we will get less for our money. That has to change.

These are some ideas on how we can solve those problems. This won't change unless those who are here exercise our rights. That may not happen until those outside Washington demand that these and other ideas get considered. Demand your Senators be allowed to represent you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BEGICH. I wish to speak as if in morning business to talk about one issue, IRS overreach.

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

Mr. BEGICH. Before I do that, I do want to say to my friend who just spoke, I am one of those who loves biennial budgets. I think it is a great idea and one we should continue to work toward. It makes work a little bit better and we also get a little bit longer planning horizon.

IRS OVERREACH

Mr. President, I come to the floor because there has been a lot of talk recently in different areas about the IRS, and virtually none of it is good. Let me

be clear. The IRS going after taxpayers for debts allegedly incurred by their dead relatives is shocking. Tax-delinquent employees with IRS bonuses are offensive. Targeting individuals or groups for their political beliefs is unacceptable. But today I want to talk about a different issue: a vital industry in my State crushed by overbearing IRS enforcement of their own incomprehensible regulations.

Folks who have been to Alaska know we have some of the most beautiful terrain in the world. Most of the best sights, however, are off the road system. What does that mean? That means you cannot drive to them. That means if you want to visit a remote part of the Denali National Park or try to spot some bears or go to a great fishing area, the easiest way to do that is by airplane.

Companies that provide these sightseeing services are overwhelmingly small businesses, mom-and-pop operators. They aren't tax attorneys. They aren't CPAs. They are pilots. They live to fly. As you can see right here, this is an incredible view right outside of a glacier where a small plane has just landed. That is why it is so devastating that at least one of these businesses had to sell its plane to pay the IRS and close up shop forever. Countless others live under the cloud of uncertainty because the IRS goes to extraordinary lengths to find them liable for taxes. In fact, one company received this massive tax bill, including penalties, even after they had negotiated with the IRS and received a favorable resolution. In other words, this bill came after they had agreed with the IRS to get rid of these penalties and these interest charges and everything else. The IRS said there was a little mixup, and maybe for them that is all it was, but for a small business it could mean financial ruin. Also, getting a bill like this would drive you crazy after you just had a conversation with the IRS and resolved this.

Let me give a little history. Air transportation is usually subject to excise taxes, which go to a trust fund for airports, much like the gas tax pays for the highway trust fund. But since 1970 Congress has made it crystal clear that these excise taxes shouldn't apply to small aircraft, the type shown in the first photo.

Here is another example. These types of planes have not been subject to excise taxes since 1970, unless they are flying regularly scheduled routes, such as the route I take going back home to Alaska. I fly from the airport in Washington, DC, to Seattle and then to Anchorage. Those are regularly scheduled flights.

But the IRS brought down the enforcement hammer on some businesses in Nevada and Alaska. Those companies sued the IRS and eventually lost. So Congress came back again in 2005 and said, look, we meant what we said in 1970. Small aircraft used for sightseeing are supposed to be exempt from

excise tax—pretty simple, pretty clear, not complicated.

But the IRS doesn't get it. The IRS still won't listen to Congress. The IRS still thinks it can ignore the plain meaning of the law backed by clear congressional intent. A lot of folks around here talk about Federal overreach. This is a perfect example of Federal overreach. Congress told the IRS not once but twice: Small aircraft offering sightseeing services should not have to collect excise taxes, and still the IRS thumbed its nose at Congress and says, "We'll do whatever we like," in clear contradiction to the plain meaning of the statute that was supposed to be upheld.

That is not the way this country is supposed to work. Agencies such as the IRS don't get to go it alone. They are bound by the Constitution to enforce and follow the laws that Congress writes.

I was pleased about a recent letter that was written to the Alaska Air Carriers Association in which the IRS acknowledged their guidance was unclear and inappropriately enforced. They offered to give refunds to companies flying small aircraft on sightseeing tours. While it is a step in the right direction to recognize they got it wrong, they refused to back down completely. The IRS is still reserving the right to go after these same companies in the future.

That is why I called the IRS Commissioner into my office last week and that is why I am here today, to make it clear to the IRS that I will not stand idly by while they send Alaskan small businesses into bankruptcy. I will keep coming here as long as I have to, until the IRS lets Alaskan small businesses do what they do best: Fly and share all of the beautiful sights my great State of Alaska has to offer to all Alaskans and all Americans.

It is happening in Alaska. It is starting to happen in other States. My guess is this will go anywhere there are sightseeing planes to be determined from the IRS perspective that they know what is best. The law is clear. The IRS in their letter made it clear that their interpretation of the law may be unclear and inappropriately enforced. Well, if it is wrong, don't enforce it, or enforce it the way it was set out in 1970 and 2005. If you put someone in a plane and take them out for sightseeing, they are exempt. There is no rate or schedule.

Here is what is also amazing about this. I will go to this first photo again, the one with the glacier. They are restricted as to where they can go. So when the IRS says they flew from point A to point B on a regular basis, that is because they are regulated by the Federal Government to go to that location. I think this visitor would love to fly all around the glaciers, but they are not allowed to by Federal law. So they are sightseeing, and the law is clear about this. But, once again, the IRS has determined what they think the

law is. The FAA, which regulates the air industry, makes it clear who is sightseeing and who is regularly scheduled. So I would plead with the IRS to do the right thing here, settle this issue once and for all and make it crystal clear. The law has been passed by Congress—not once but twice. It is time to get off the backs of these small businesses, small business people, not only in my State but across this country. Ensure they can do their business, and make sure the great sights of Alaska can be seen by anybody anytime through these great tour operators who operate in my State and the operators all around the country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

WRRDA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the 2013 Water Resources Reform and Development Act conference report. I agree with my colleagues who have spoken about this and who believe that passing this conference report is important for our communities. As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure and as one of the members of the conference committee that came out with this report, I believe the agreement we have today addresses the issues facing the Army Corps of Engineers and facing our country.

We have problems in this country with aging infrastructure, we have problems with a lack of transparency, and we have problems with fiscal accountability—all of which impact public health, public safety, as well as the environmental welfare of our communities. As a conferee, I and my staff have worked with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the building, House and Senate, to create a bipartisan product to address these real concerns. We may have our differences on some key issues, but the bulk of what we have accomplished is about protecting our States. It is about protecting our constituents. It is not about partisan politics.

For example, issues such as flood mitigation are very important to my home State of Wyoming. Predicting floods and being able and better prepared for them is a major component in keeping Wyoming and other western communities safe. That is why we have successfully included language in this

bill for the authorization of the Upper Missouri Basin flood and drought monitoring. This program will restore the stream gauges and the snowpack monitors through the Upper Missouri Basin at all elevations. These gauges are used to monitor snow depth and soil moisture to help inform agencies such as the Corps of Engineers as to potential flooding as well as drought in the future. This type of monitoring will help protect communities and will save lives.

We also included language in this bill for technical assistance to help rural communities comply with environmental regulations. Rural communities often don't have the expertise or the funding to make important upgrades to their water systems. Dedicated professionals, such as the folks at the Wyoming Rural Water Association, use this funding to go into those communities and provide the critical assistance these people need.

We also secured an agreement that establishes a 5-year pilot program known as the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act. This program will allow the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency to provide loans and loan guarantees for flood control, for community water systems, for aging water distribution facilities, and for wastewater infrastructure projects. It also includes language that makes tribes eligible for the loans.

As I mentioned, transparency and fiscal responsibility are also important components to tackling the issues that need to be addressed with the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why we have included language in the conference report to create an Army Corps project deauthorization process. Under this process, the Army Corps would identify projects for deauthorization based on established criteria. Then, after taking public input, they would submit those projects as a single package for an up-or-down vote in the Congress.

Many of these projects are on the books and have been on the books for extended periods of time, and they authorize the expenditure of millions of taxpayer dollars. Yet these are projects that are going nowhere. Under this conference report, the Corps would have to propose a list of the projects to cut. The list would total \$18 billion and would be sent to Congress for this up-or-down vote. And \$18 billion is more than enough to offset the entire total authorization of this piece of legislation.

It truly is time for the Corps of Engineers and for Congress to clean the books, cut the waste, and bring fiscal responsibility to this WRDA process.

I wish to thank my colleagues, including Chairman BOXER, Ranking Member VITTER, and former Senator Max Baucus for the bipartisan process under which this bill was considered.

The conference report is not perfect, but I believe we have achieved a prod-

uct that is substantive, effective, and in the public interests. It is a product that will save lives, maintain the flow of commerce, and protect communities for years to come. Therefore, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this conference report.

Once again, I thank the Presiding Officer and my committee colleagues for their willingness to work together on this bill.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to give this speech in full.

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

TAX EXTENDERS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments this afternoon to correct the record on something very important.

In his opening remarks this morning, the distinguished Senate majority leader made a number of claims and accusations relating to the tax extenders legislation.

As you will recall, last week the Senate voted not to invoke cloture on the substitute amendment to the tax extenders bill. Since that time, the Senate majority leader has been accusing Republicans of voting against tax relief. He said we are obstructionists and that we "work so hard to do nothing." This is, as we know, par for the course.

When the majority leader is not calling out American citizens by name and attacking them for getting involved in the political process, he is usually accusing Senate Republicans of one thing or another, and doing it so unjustifiably.

Today, he attacked me personally for my vote against cloture on the tax extenders substitute, saying: "The primary Republican who negotiated this, the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, voted against his own bill."

It is true that I negotiated. It is true that I helped to get it through the committee. It is true that I got our side to agree to a voice vote.

Needless to say, I cannot let this go unanswered. I am here now to set the record straight.

First and foremost, I want to make clear that I support the tax extenders legislation, and everybody in this body knows it, and if they do not, then they better go take an IQ test. I want to see that bill passed, and I believe we should pass it sooner rather than later.

I do not want speak for anyone else, but I suspect that the majority of Senate Republicans feel the same way. But there are serious and legitimate process issues at stake here.

At the time of last week's cloture vote, the substitute amendment had been available to the full Senate for little more than a day. Although there were 167 amendments filed—including about 70 Democratic Party amendments—the distinguished majority leader blocked the consideration of any and all amendments.

This, unfortunately, has become the norm here in the Senate, where we have voted for a grand total of 9 Republican amendments in the past 10 months—9. By contrast, in the House of Representatives, where the Republicans are in complete control, where the Rules Committee is 9 to 4 in favor of Republicans—the committee that decides what comes to the floor—the Democrats, who are in the minority, have had votes on 242 of their amendments in that same timeframe.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for instance, a single Democratic House Member, has received votes on 22 separate amendments in the same timeframe that all Republican Senators have, combined, received votes on only 9.

So, yes, I, along with almost all of my Republican colleagues, voted against cloture—in fact, all but one voted against cloture—on the tax extenders substitute. But I made it clear before and after the vote that my vote against cloture was a vote to allow Senators—both Republicans and Democrats, especially those who do not serve on the Senate Finance Committee—an opportunity to amend the tax extenders legislation, something you would think every Senator in this body would want to justify and would want to support.

As I said, at the time of the cloture vote, there were a total of 167 amendments filed. Yet the Senate majority attempted to close off debate on the bill without considering or voting on a single amendment—on a bill costing \$85 billion so far. That is no way to operate the Senate, particularly on a bill as broad and as consequential as the tax extenders bill.

There are a lot of interests at stake with the expired or expiring tax provisions, a number of voices that deserve to be heard. Why, then, would we want to rush through the debate without considering a single solitary amendment? It does not make sense.

My vote against cloture was never intended to kill this legislation, as the majority leader claimed this morning. As I made clear last week, my vote was for a fair, open, and cooperative process—a bipartisan process, if you will, something we have not had much of around here lately. I would have thought the majority leader would have been listening last week when Republicans, including myself, made it very clear why we were voting against cloture. But either he was not listening or he forgot everything we said because this morning he came to the floor to attack us, once again, claiming that somehow our votes against cloture on the tax extenders legislation were related to President Obama.

So let me make it clear for our distinguished majority leader and anyone else who may be misunderstanding what is going on with the tax extenders bill. This has nothing to do with President Obama. There is only one person who is stopping the tax extenders bill from moving forward. It is not me. It is not the minority leader. It is not anyone on the Republican side or caucus.

The distinguished majority leader could solve this impasse today if he would simply allow the Senate to operate in a way it always has. He knows—and he knew then when he made these comments because we chatted the day before—he knew that my job is to try and winnow down the total number of amendments on this bill, approaching almost 100 for each side, and get it to where we basically could pass this bill.

He can come to the floor as often as he wants to attack Republican Senators or anyone else, but that does not change the fact that he is the one in control here. He is the one who will decide if the Senate will live up to its legacy of being the greatest deliberative body in the world or if it will continue to be what it has become—a graveyard of ideas.

Once again, I stand willing and able to work with the Democrats to get this bill across the finish line. I do want this legislation to pass. It is important legislation. But I do think we ought to have the Senate operate as it always has in the past, where each side has at least a reasonable opportunity to bring up amendments that they consider to be important. It is important that the Senate operate in that way, and not in the way it is currently being operated. As I said, it is not up to me.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT RELIEF

I would like to take a moment to address the California drought relief bill Senator FEINSTEIN has been working so hard on for the past several months. There is no question that we are facing some very serious conditions across the West. We need to be doing all we can to provide relief to the farmers in California and elsewhere. But it does not make any sense that this drought has gotten to the point that it has when it could have been avoided. This is a man-made crisis. The water that should have been and could have been stored behind the dams in California's Central Valley during the past several years has instead been flushed downstream to create fish habitat for the endangered delta smelt. Now, do not get me wrong, protecting our natural resources is important. But there is a problem with our system when we put the needs of fish—and especially this fish—ahead of the needs of people.

This is happening in other States too. We are seeing the needs of people made secondary to the regulatory requirements that may or may not even be benefiting the species they are designed to help.

I think we have some of the stupidest people in the environmental movement that you can possibly imagine. They

consistently place these trumped-up situations against human beings and humankind. It is getting real old to me.

Senator BARRASSO has an amendment to Senator FEINSTEIN's bill that would bring some common sense into this situation by allowing for some flexibility for communities that are facing dire situations as the result of Federal regulatory requirements.

I support the Barrasso amendment and would have liked to have seen it included in the California drought relief bill. I also recognize that the farmers and farm workers in California cannot afford to have Congress playing games with their livelihood. For that reason, I am not going to object to this bill.

To have California, where some of the greatest, most productive farmlands in the world are, basically shut down for really what are stupid approaches when there could be an accommodation to help both sides on those issues is hard for me to understand.

When the members of the California delegation sit down with the committees of jurisdiction to work out the differences between the Feinstein bill and the bill that has already passed the House, I would urge them to implement Senator BARRASSO's proposal into the final bill. This will help rural communities across America avoid getting into potentially disastrous situations that are caused by out-of-date, out-of-touch regulations.

The economy and job creation do not have to be at odds with conservation. This is the perfect opportunity to create some badly needed flexibility to make sure they are not. I, for one, would like to see that for a change in the Senate.

I sure would like to see us depoliticize this place so we can work together again. I have been here only 38 years, but I have to tell you, there were many times in that 38 years where we worked together, we solved the problems of America together, and we had the country running well. Frankly, we all walked out of here feeling pretty good.

Most people in the Senate right now do not feel all that good—first of all, because of the way it is being run; secondly, because there is a partisan divide that exists—on both sides, by the way; thirdly, because we have a rough time getting people together in a bipartisan way; and last but not least, because we do not spend much time together anymore. It used to be that Senators got together and cared more for each other and cared less about attacking each other and cared less about some of the ridiculous, stupid things that have been going on over the last few years.

I would suggest to my Democratic friends that they start thinking this over because the Senate has really gone downhill. We have to stop it and start working together for the best interests of our country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2366 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Mississippi.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. WICKER. I rise this afternoon to express my strong support for a new Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which we can send to the President this very week, and it will be a great bipartisan accomplishment. It will be a major win for economic development also.

I am proud to have worked on this legislation as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, and I am excited about the potential the WRRDA bill has to make a difference in States such as my home State of Mississippi.

Like many States, we routinely depend on water infrastructure. In Mississippi, our ports and waterways are crucial to commerce, and our system of levees protects us from natural disasters. These modernized ports and commercial waterways are critical to maintaining competitiveness in a global economy. They are essential to boosting trade and job growth across the Nation.

The House-Senate agreement on this new water resources bill—the first in 7 years, I might add—would accomplish a number of goals, from restructuring the inland waterway system to completing storm protection projects. It would help ensure that U.S. industries have a reliable, navigable, and cost-effective transportation network to do business.

In particular, I am encouraged by reforms to the harbor maintenance trust fund which promise to help our ports with much needed dredging. The fund, which was established for port improvements, is currently underutilized. Using this money for its intended purpose would help facilitate critical port

upgrades—an especially important investment in preparation for the upcoming completion of the Panama Canal expansion.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has estimated that America's busiest ports, including the Port of Pascagoula in Mississippi, are operating at their full capacity only 35 percent of the time or less. This is unacceptable. As a matter of fact, for other ports around the country, the situation is worse than that.

A lapse in maintenance can become a vicious cycle, impairing a port's ability to secure future maintenance dredging. Coastal ports, such as Mississippi's Port of Gulfport, have been disadvantaged as a result. We haven't received the maintenance. We have less traffic. Therefore, we are entitled to less future maintenance dredging.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that thanks to an amendment by Senator THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi on crediting authority for navigation projects, ports such as the Port of Gulfport would have greater flexibility in making dredging upgrades.

Other provisions in the new water resources bill seek to ensure fiscal responsibility by streamlining project requirements and timelines. This means allowing greater private contributions to infrastructure repairs and deauthorizing projects no longer in the national interest.

Mississippians understand why water resource infrastructure matters. In recent years we have faced very different challenges because of extreme conditions on the Mississippi River. First, historic flooding put flood control mechanisms such as the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project to the test. Then the very next year severe drought turned large stretches of the river into nothing more than sandy beaches. These situations can have a big impact. Any disruption in the movement of goods along the Mississippi River has the potential to affect staple products such as corn, grain, and petroleum. When that happens, consumers are often left with higher costs. The Mississippi River alone is responsible for more than \$100 billion of America's gross domestic product.

For our coastal communities, this Water Resources Reform and Development Act would also advance beneficial storm protection projects. Many of these projects, developed after Hurricane Katrina under the Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, have been left unfinished. Their completion would help create more resilient coastal communities and lower the risk of future hurricane and storm damage.

Of course, our work is not finished. Implementing this legislation will require oversight, and more can be done to improve our inland waterway trust fund and to protect medium-use ports. I hope in a couple of years we will be considering another Water Resources Development Act. In other words, I

hope we don't wait another 7 years for a WRDA. But today and tomorrow we have an opportunity for a great step forward, demonstrating the strong bipartisan cooperation that exists in the House and Senate for America's future vitality and competitiveness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Ohio.

CHINA

Mr. BROWN. I rise to discuss the growing problem with U.S.-China relations.

Earlier this week we saw another example of how the Chinese Communist government will do everything it can—anything—to get ahead. The United States of America, in something that rarely happens, charged five Chinese military officers and accused them of hacking into American nuclear, metal, and solar companies to steal trade secrets.

This is not only a national security concern, it is an economic concern. Two who were allegedly hacked are U.S. Steel and the United Steelworkers union—organizations with which I have helped to file unfair trade practice cases against Chinese state-owned companies. It is not only a cause-and-effect, but these two entities, a steel company and a steelworkers union, filed unfair trade practices against China, and now the U.S. Government is filing legal charges against them for going after these two companies—against the Chinese.

We won these trade cases because we held China's feet to the fire and used our trade laws to level the playing field for our steel companies and our steelworkers. Jobs were saved and factories stayed open because of these trade cases, and that is precisely why China is targeting these companies.

We know the Chinese will do just about anything to get ahead economically. Fair enough. We also know that China will cheat and spy. The best example is currency manipulation, which makes Chinese exports more competitive.

When you manipulate the currency—when China sells products into the United States, the price is less, basically subsidizing Chinese exports into the United States, putting American workers out of jobs. When U.S. companies export to China, because China has manipulated the currency, it means that the prices are higher for these American goods, making them significantly less than competitive, if you will, in China. So when China cheats on currency, our workers at U.S. Steel in Lorain, Wheatland Tube in Warren, Vallourec Star in Youngstown, and TMK IPSCO in Brookfield lose out, and when our workers suffer, our economy suffers.

A December 2012 report by the Peterson Institute—a conservative think tank—found that currency manipulation by foreign governments costs the government between—quite a range—1 million and 5 million jobs, increasing

the U.S. trade deficit by \$200 to \$500 billion a year. These are manufacturing jobs that are about export or competing with imports. They are almost always pretty good-paying jobs.

In 2012 our trade deficit with China broke \$300 billion for the first time, and then in 2013 for the second time it broke \$300 billion.

An Economic Policy Institute report notes that “addressing currency manipulation is the single most important policy change for U.S. workers.” EPI argues that up to 5.8 million American jobs—40 percent of them in manufacturing—would be created if currency manipulation were eliminated by next year. It would reduce the goods deficit by at least \$200 billion. For my home State of Ohio, EPI found that eliminating global currency manipulation by next year would create 254,000 jobs—up to 75,900 in manufacturing; reduce Ohio’s unemployment rate by nearly 3 percentage points; increase Ohio’s GDP by up to \$17.4 billion; and improve the fiscal position of Ohio’s State and local governments altogether by up to \$3.7 billion. That is only Ohio. It doesn’t count Connecticut; it doesn’t count Arizona; it doesn’t count the other 47 States. That is why we are urging the administration to be more aggressive and level the playing field for American workers and businesses.

We should pass my bipartisan legislation with Senators SESSIONS, GRAHAM, STABENOW, HAGAN, and others, which would treat currency manipulation as an unfair trade subsidy and require the Commerce Department to investigate currency manipulation.

It is also why we must urge China to comply with the World Trade Organization commitments and fully and faithfully implement all the WTO rulings against it.

The U.S. Trade Representative’s report paints a sobering picture of the Chinese state’s efforts to intervene in the economy and unfairly help China’s businesses despite its WTO commitments that it wouldn’t do that. China still has not agreed to the procurement agreement from WTO. By not doing so, our businesses miss out on the opportunity to compete for potentially \$100 billion a year in contracts. In other words, China won’t let us sell into their country in many cases because they don’t follow the WTO procurement agreement.

Another issue noted by the USTR is China’s imposition of retaliatory duties against countries bringing WTO cases against it. One case involving grain-oriented electrical steel—and I was speaking to an executive at AK Steel, David Horn, an executive at AK Steel in southwest Ohio—China not only lost in a WTO challenge but now appears to not comply with the ruling. The continued imposition of these duties even after WTO ruled against it has caused significant harm to companies such as AK Steel, as I mentioned, which is based in West Chester, OH.

The issue of retaliation figured prominently in the latest cyber espio-

nage cases brought by the Department of Justice. Several American companies and the steelworkers union that were targeted were taking part in trade cases to challenge China’s unfair trade practices.

China tries to intimidate our companies and they try to intimidate the U.S. Government from holding them accountable to international and U.S. laws. Living up to their trade obligations and promoting the rule of law in China not only benefits American companies, American workers, and American local communities, it also benefits the Chinese people.

There are already examples of Chinese companies willing to play by the rules. I applaud the announcement that Fuyao Glass Industry Group, a Chinese producer of auto safety items, has finalized its agreement to buy the former General Motors plant in Moraine, OH, a Dayton suburb. It is an example of how fair trade and foreign direct investment going both ways can benefit the Chinese, a Chinese company, and create 800 new jobs in Ohio. But to truly have a fair trading relationship, there must be a level playing field. That means playing by international rules.

This brings me to my final point. If China continues to manipulate its currency, cheating American workers, cheating American businesses, refuses to abide by WTO rules, is now accused of stealing trade secrets from American companies and unions, why in the world would this Senate even consider and why would the President consider entering into a bilateral investment treaty with China? Have we not learned?

In 1999, the year 2000, we passed permanent normal trade relations with China. Many of these issues were aired then. China said they would follow the rule of law. China said they would do it right. China hasn’t followed the rule of law. China hasn’t done it right. China hasn’t played fair. So we are considering entering into a bilateral investment treaty with China? I don’t think so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 394

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 88, S. 394, the Metal Theft Prevention Act; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the theft of valuable metal is a serious crime, one that can damage valuable infrastructure—sometimes government infrastructure—and it can cause serious harm to businesses and to the owners of the infrastructure at issue. For this reason,

many States, including my own State of Utah, have enacted measures that deter such criminal activity and punish harshly those who engage in this type of criminal activity. These measures are generally appropriate, but where the Federal Government enacts legislation creating criminal penalties, we as lawmakers must be careful to respect the Constitution’s enumerated powers and the constitutionally ordained structure of federalism.

I have heard concerns expressed regarding people who steal valuable metal and cross State lines to sell stolen metal. While I would support Federal legislation addressed to such truly interstate, unavoidably national circumstances, I cannot support legislation that more broadly regulates intrastate conduct.

Because this bill exceeds Congress’s power under the commerce clause and imposes a Federal regulatory scheme in an area of the law the Constitution properly reserves to the States, I must object to the Senate passing it by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I appreciate hearing Senator LEE’s objection. I do believe this is an issue that has been delayed for too long. The bill passed the Judiciary Committee by voice vote last June. Yet businesses, communities, and individuals continue to be victimized.

This is a bipartisan bill. This is legislation that has been introduced with Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina, with Senator HOEVEN of North Dakota—two Republicans—as well as Senator SCHUMER and Senator COONS. As I noted, it passed the Judiciary Committee. Yet we still have objections from the other side—people who are holding up this bill. At the same time, metal theft continues to rise across the country.

This bill does not create the kind of burdens my friend mentioned. This bill is very narrow. The only crime it creates for a Federal crime is a crime of theft of critical infrastructure—critical infrastructure, something that could threaten the national security—and this is not a far reach, given we have seen people stealing copper pipes, given we have seen houses blow up. So it is not a far reach at all.

Secondly, what does this bill do? It leaves it to States to decide what metal theft laws they want. In the end, it does not preempt those laws. If States have laws that are on point, if they have laws relating to metal theft that create some kind of a requirement that not everything can be paid for by cash so law enforcement can actually track this, then we have a situation where that State law would govern.

It is not an overly burdensome law. In fact, many States are adopting these kinds of laws. Our problem is there are some States that refuse to adopt these kinds of laws. So people are stealing

metal from places such as Minnesota and bringing it to those States—to scrap metal dealerships that are accepting that metal and that don't have to report any kind of information to the police and don't have to have any recordkeeping.

We have a national problem. If you don't believe me, listen to this story. Just last week, in my home State, metal thieves robbed dozens of veterans' graves—veterans' graves as we are approaching Memorial Day. What did they do? They took the brass rods that hold their symbol of service.

People want to tell me this isn't a problem? People are stealing stars on veterans' graves and they are stealing the brass rods that hold their symbols of service. Just when families are gathered for Memorial Day, we have metal thieves wreaking havoc because they can go to some scrap metal dealer that isn't following the law and sell it and no one is going to keep track of who they are.

This is a crime. This is a crime, and it is not the first time. On Memorial Day in 2012, thieves stole more than 200 Bronze Star markers from veterans' graves in Isanti County, MN.

So I ask my colleagues who are holding up the bill how they explain defending this kind of practice and allowing it to continue, when this metal is being taken because it is valuable and it can be brought to scrap metal dealers that aren't following the law.

Metal thieves have become infamous for shameless acts such as this. These thieves will stop at nothing to get this high-priced metal and make a quick buck. Last month thieves stole the aluminum wheelchair ramp from the front steps of a man's house in Washington, stranding the man inside.

Enough is enough. Are our friends going to be listening to some scrap metal dealers when most of them follow the law, but clearly some don't want to follow the law; is that what we are listening to in this Chamber? Are we going to listen to the veterans of this country? Are we going to listen to the police groups?

By the way, this bill has been endorsed by the Major Cities Chiefs of Police, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the Major County Sheriffs' Association. So I ask, are we going to listen to those groups or are we going to listen to the scrap metal lobby?

In Minneapolis, thieves have targeted the city's oldest continuously used church. First, they stole the copper downspouts. Then they came back to steal two air-conditioners and gut the copper supply lines to the kitchen freezers. Before the church even had time to replace the stolen air-conditioners, the thieves came back a third time to steal a third air-conditioner and gut the newly replaced copper lines. Replacing the stolen items and installing security fixtures has cost the parish thousands of dollars that could have otherwise been spent on the good work of the church.

These thefts have cost the parish more than money, it has also cost a tradition. This church has been serving French meat pies since the late 1800s, but this year they had to cancel it because of the thieves.

Last winter at a recreation center in St. Paul, MN, thieves stole \$20,000 worth of pipe from the outdoor ice rink, causing the center to close until local businesses donated labor and materials to make the repairs—\$20,000 worth of pipe. The problem is the replacement is much more than \$20,000. It was hundreds of thousands of dollars because they have to repair the whole ice rink.

In Rochester, MN, I met with local businesses that have been robbed by metal thieves—one local business 12 times in just the past 2 years and has suffered more than \$150,000 in losses, similar to the story Senator HOEVEN and I heard when we met with electric companies in Fargo and in Moorhead. During one of the robberies in Rochester, thieves even stole a truck with the company logo on it and then used the truck to rob other construction sites without raising suspicion.

Across the country, copper thieves have targeted construction sites, power and phone lines, retail stores and vacant houses. They have caused explosions in vacant buildings by stealing metal from gas lines, and they have caused blackouts by stealing copper wiring from street lights and electrical substations. Do you know why? Because they have a willing buyer. They have people who are willing to buy their stuff and will not even take the care of keeping records and taking checks so law enforcement can later investigate who they are.

These next examples show how dangerous metal thefts can be. Last October four people were injured in an explosion at a University of California-Berkeley electrical station. Officials blamed it on copper theft that occurred 2 hours before the explosion. The copper is stolen, the pipes don't work, the workers turn it on, and there is an explosion and four people injured.

Georgia Power was having a huge problem with thieves targeting a substation that feeds the entire Atlanta airport—one of the busiest airports in the world, the Delta hub. The airport was getting hit two to three times a week and surveillance didn't lead to any arrests.

This is a crime that knows no borders, no boundaries. It happens in cities, it happens in suburbs, and it happens certainly in rural areas. Depending on the case, it threatens public safety, weakens our infrastructure, and undermines our businesses.

The impact is staggering. In one study, the U.S. Department of Energy found the total cost to industries affected by copper theft would exceed over \$900 million every single year—\$900 million every single year. Between 2010 and 2012 the National Insurance Crime Bureau identified nearly 34,000

insurance claims related to metal theft. To put that number in perspective, it marked a 36-percent increase from the 25,000 claims reported between 2009 to 2011. That 25,000 number was more than an 80-percent increase from the previous reporting period.

Listen to who is supporting this bill, and then I ask my colleague: Are you going to listen to these businesses or are you going to listen to the scrap metal dealers?

Air Conditioning Contractors of America, supporting the bill, American Public Power Association, supporting the bill, American Supply Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, CenturyLink, Edison Electric Institute, Heating, Air-Conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors, the Home Depot, International Council of Shopping Centers, Independent Electrical Contractors, Independent Telephone and Telecommunications Alliance, Lowe's Companies, Inc., National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders, National Electrical Contractors Association, National Retail Federation, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association, Inc., United States Telecom Association, Windstream Corporation, XO Communications.

I could go on and on. These are mainstream businesses on Main Street that support this bill because they are getting ripped off.

So what can we do about it? We know why it is happening; that is, because there is a global demand for copper, especially from China and India, and higher prices encourage thieves to steal copper and other metals. We all know the vast majority of scrap metal dealers are legitimate and law-abiding. They do not want to buy stolen property. I have worked extensively with the scrap metal industry in my legislation. We have made some changes they suggested in order to improve the effectiveness of the bill and lessen the burden on scrap metal dealers wherever possible.

Given the scale of the problem, I believe we have to take strong steps to fight these crimes and give law enforcement the tools they need. I worry that at some point we are going to have a major break in our Federal infrastructure and everyone will look back and wonder why they listened to some lobbyist representing the scrap metal dealers instead of all these businesses I mentioned and instead of the police. They will look back to this moment.

Maybe they could at least listen to the beer dealers. They support this bill because their kegs are getting stolen all over the country.

What does our bill do? First of all, it puts modest recordkeeping requirements on the recyclers that buy scrap metal, limiting the value of cash transactions, and requiring sellers in certain

States to prove they actually own the metal.

The bill also makes it a Federal crime to steal metals from critical infrastructure and directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to review relevant penalties.

Our intention is not to preempt State laws, so if a State already has laws on the books regarding metal theft, they would still apply and the Federal law would not.

These criminals work across State lines—we know that—and they take advantage of States without this type of law. This bill is intended to fill the gap in States that don't have these protections. My people are getting ripped off in Minnesota because some States don't have laws. This is a Federal crime, and it is a Federal problem.

The shameless—shameless—robberies of veterans' graves make clear we can't just let this go anymore. It is time to pass this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

EARMARKS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk lately about earmarks. Some Members are even talking about bringing them back.

I grew up earmarking. I grew up on a ranch, where we earmarked cattle. That is where earmarking gets its name. I didn't think much of the practice then. We already had a brand on the critter. An earmark seemed to be redundant. After a while, we didn't do it any more.

Then I came to Congress—first in the House and now in the Senate—and I had hoped not to be earmarking any more. But when I got to the House I found out the practice was not just prolific but rampant, so I come here today, after hearing some people want to bring the practice back—after we had the moratorium placed a couple years ago—and urge caution. Let me explain a few reasons why.

One reason we lamented the absence of earmarks was the saying: Earmarks are the glue that helps legislation get passed.

I would say it is a little more accurate to say: Earmarks usually represent the lard that allows earmarks to squeeze through the door and get through to the President's desk.

Senator TOM COBURN has spoken often about earmarks. I think he at one point said the best statement ever made about earmarks: They are the gateway drug to spending addiction.

Earmarks are usually small items, but they lead to massive spending overall. They leverage greater spending. Once you get an earmark in a bill, you usually vote for that bill no matter how big it becomes. We had years and years of that, and we shouldn't return to it.

But now earmark fans have a new argument—spending oversight. They say we can provide better oversight when we earmark; we will keep better track of that spending.

They argue that Congress is derelict in its article 1 constitutional responsibilities, the power-of-the-purse argument: By not allowing earmarks, we are somehow derelict in our duty. That is an interesting argument which we ought to explore for a minute.

The same people who will defend earmarking as a constitutional right and responsibility will also note: Don't worry, it is only 1 percent or less than 1 percent of all Federal spending.

But think about that for a minute. If it is our constitutional responsibility, why would we stop at 1 percent? That is not a valid argument at all. If it is constitutional, for our constitutional responsibility, shouldn't more than 1 percent be earmarked?

When we look at when earmarks were here, they were never evenly spaced. Every Member of Congress in the House and the Senate has the same constitutional right, I would assume. But with earmarks, committee chairs or those on the appropriate committees get the lion's share of the earmarks when rank-and-file members get far fewer. So the constitutional argument is specious at best.

I do share a concern that Congress has ceded to agency bureaucrats and administration officials much of our discretion over spending decisions. The culprit is not a lack of earmarks but the lack of oversight opportunities. The problem is we haven't gone through regular order for a long time.

Right here in the Senate is the perfect example. We have only had nine votes on Republican amendments in this Senate Chamber since July. Nine votes. This is the most deliberative body in the world. The hallmark of this body is an open amendment process, open debate—unlimited debate. Yet we have only had nine Republican amendments rollcalled in the Senate Chamber since last July. That is no way to provide oversight. We have to get back to regular order if we want to have oversight.

We have a pretty dismal record lately on appropriations bills. We have become addicted to continuing resolutions, so-called CRs.

According to the Congressional Research Service, between fiscal year 1977 and fiscal year 2014, in all that 30-year period there were only 4 years where all appropriations bills were enacted on time, and in only one other year were more than half of them completed on time. The last year Congress actually moved through all the appropriations bills and did it on time was 1997. That is the problem we are having with oversight: When we don't authorize and pass appropriations bills one by one, we lose the ability to conduct oversight over the Federal agencies and over Federal spending in general. Since then, there has been an average of six CRs per year. This year will be no different.

I will consider some of the arguments.

We are often told this is a way we can have a check on the agencies. But

what we have seen in the past is that when we earmark, the bulk of the time spent by the Appropriations Committee is not spent in doing oversight but is spent in doling out earmarks.

The last year we had earmarks, 2009, there were 9,000 earmarks in 1 Omnibus appropriations bill. What was the Appropriations Committee doing for months prior to that? Most of their time and staff's time—time that should have been spent on the other 99 percent of Federal spending—was spent securing that 1 percent of Federal spending that constituted earmarks for the Members. So we are not exercising oversight with earmarks. We are abdicating our responsibility and spending far too much time on these earmarks.

There are 43 Members of the Senate who are in their first 6 years in this body, myself included. I happened to have spent some time in the House, so I have some perspective there. For those who haven't seen the appropriations process with earmarks, I think it is useful to take a little walk down memory lane and see what it was like in years past.

Jack Abramoff, who spent some time in prison for working the appropriations process pretty well, called the Appropriations Committee the earmark favor factory. That I don't think has been seriously refuted by anyone. That is what the Appropriations Committees became during that time—earmark favor factories.

It is worth remembering some of the earmarks that finally galvanized the country against them: the Bridge to Nowhere; the indoor rainforest in Iowa. We could go on and on. I went to the House floor myself several hundred times over the period of a couple of years to challenge these individual spending projects.

In 2008, there was a lobbying firm founded by a former Appropriations Committee staffer that specialized in getting particularly defense earmarks from the Appropriations Committee. The FBI finally got wind of some of this and started to investigate. Politico reported that sources within the FBI indicated they were "conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions." While they did so, this investigation commenced and within weeks the firm imploded.

According to analysis by Taxpayers for Common Sense, clients of the firm received at least \$299 million in earmarks. The firm or individuals from the firm made campaign contributions of more than \$3 million to nearly 300 elected officials.

ABC News said at the time of the firm's operation: Millions out to lawmakers, hundreds of millions back in the form of earmarks for clients, have made it for many observers the poster child for tacit pay-to-play politics.

I don't think we want to go back to that time. News reports every day were looking at the link between earmarks and campaign contributions. There was a smack of corruption there.

As I said, as soon as the FBI turned its attention to this firm doing a lot of this earmarking, it imploded almost overnight and went away. There was great public distrust in the process, and well there should have been.

At that time I remember going to the House floor and offering over a series of weeks nine separate privileged resolutions asking for the Ethics Committee to look at that relationship between campaign contributions and earmarks.

Let me take this time to say this is not a partisan issue. Republicans as well as Democrats over years past participated in this process of earmarking with equal abandon. I am not pointing the finger at either party. There are Members of both parties who seek to return to the practice. But we ought to remember that it wasn't good for this institution. For those who say we ought to go back to it, I don't understand. I would argue it doesn't give us any better oversight because we spend all of our time actually earmarking projects rather than providing oversight over the other 99 percent of government funding.

There is no constitutional requirement. And, frankly, if it is just 1 percent of all spending, how can we argue it is our constitutional responsibility? Why wouldn't we be earmarking more of it? I don't know how the corruption that comes with it is avoided.

Members may say it will be better now than it was before—names will be attached to earmarks. We will have total transparency. The investigation of this firm and others happened when there was transparency, when names were attached to earmarks. That didn't help. The corruption continued. There is no way to police this process adequately when we earmark in that way.

I encourage my colleagues, when we hear Members pining for the old days when we earmarked, remember that Congress went for decades and decades with maybe one here or one there on the margins. It was only in those last couple of decades, the 1990s through about 2010, where we had a rampant corrupt process which I would argue we wouldn't want to return to. So let's think twice before doing that.

WRRDA

Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Water Resources Reform and Development Act before the Senate for a vote tomorrow. To call WRRDA, as it is called, an expansive bill is an understatement.

This single piece of legislation would impact the Nation's harbors, waterways, shorelines, infrastructure, and of course it will impact the budget for many years to come. Yet all the talk around the bill before us today seems to focus on what has thankfully been left out of its pages—the very topic I have just been discussing—earmarks.

No doubt this reform-minded WRRDA is a step in the right direction, and I applaud my colleagues in the House and in the Senate who have been able to move a bill without earmarks.

It is a real accomplishment, as it should be done.

That said, I do have many concerns about the bill. My chief concern is the process by which infrastructure projects will be authorized. Simply put, just because it doesn't have earmarks doesn't mean it will be a good process for the taxpayers.

Under this legislation, non-Federal interests will have authority to propose projects that meet broadly defined goals to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Once the Corps confirms that these projects have met these broadly defined goals, they will be included in a report to Congress that will serve as a de facto authorization bill for feasibility studies, and then on the conveyor belt to the chief's report and ultimately to construction.

It seems to me that, in order to be effective, this process relies on things that are either entirely unlikely or things we haven't seen before. It relies on State and local governments, for example, on being judicious on what they request from the Corps. Instead, I suspect we will see a virtual tsunami of requests flooding in.

It requires the Corps to be selective in what it ultimately embraces as worthy projects.

This again is an agency that has a reputation of never meeting a project that it didn't want to build.

It will require Members of Congress to ultimately be willing to cross projects off a list to prevent taxpayer dollars from going to them. I think we can all be realistic about the chances of that happening.

During the process of this bill moving forward, I suggested Congress ought to give the process some statutory sidebars to ensure that only worthy projects make it through the stringent cost-benefit ratio requirement and tight criteria for what will and will not be reviewed. In addition to making sure the projects themselves are actually worth constructing, a limited budget means that some prioritization will be necessary. I believe it would be prudent to include statutory priorities. Unfortunately, these were not included.

So my concern remains that this process will put us in the same position we have been in recently: Faced with sizable backlogs of authorized Corps projects for varying worthiness, appropriators will be in the position to pick and choose which of those get funded. Again, just because something isn't earmarked doesn't mean it benefits taxpayers. My hope is that once we see how it plays out, Congress will be willing to adjust this process. As it stands now, while I sincerely congratulate those involved for working diligently to move forward in a manner consistent with the earmark moratorium we have, I will not be supporting the WRRDA conference report.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have come directly to the Senate floor from a terrific event in the Dirksen building where hundreds of people who are concerned about what the carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans gathered to wake up Congress. At 5 o'clock a whole bunch of alarms went off down there, and it was a very exciting, very enthusiastic moment with more than 40 members of Congress showing up to reflect our commitment to getting this done.

One of the things I told people at the rally was that we are close to turning this issue around. The barricade of special interest propaganda that has surrounded Congress is eroding. The denial castle is built on sand and the sand is eroding the foundations for that propaganda, washing out from underneath it, and it will collapse soon. Why do I say that? I say that for several reasons.

The first reason that I believe we are close to a win is that for a long time the big polluters have had a free shot at the atmosphere and oceans. Pollution costs them nothing, and that has created a mindset of entitlement and it created a mindset in which pollution was viewed as of no consequence. Thankfully, the President of the United States has required the EPA to promulgate regulations that will for the first time put a price on the carbon pollution that is emitted from our biggest power plants, and the 50 biggest power plants in America put out more carbon than Korea. They put out more carbon than Canada. So this is a very serious situation. When they are faced with the regulation, I think that is not just going to reduce their emissions, but it is going to change the way they see the problem, and they will be motivated in a new way to think: "Wait a minute; what is the best way to solve this problem?" Once they are no longer free to pollute, once the advantage is taken away, the whole equation changes for them, and I suspect that it will not take long between a polluter change in point of view and a change in point of view on the other side of the aisle in the Senate.

The second reason is the politics on this. We have seen a recent poll that I have talked about on the floor before that points out that Republican voters—self-identified Republican voters—if they are under the age of 35 think that climate denial is—not my words, but in the words in the poll—ignorant, out of touch or crazy.

So if you are a modern political party and you have built your climate change policy on a theory of denial that your own youth cohort, your own young voters under 35 think is ignorant, out of touch, or crazy, that is what I mean by a castle that is built on sand and that is doomed to fall.

The third reason I want to mention here is there is a very significant role for America's corporations because what you get in this body from the so-

called self-appointed corporate mouthpieces—the Wall Street Journal editorial page, the so-called U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers—what you get from all of them is flat out climate denial, the absolute hard stuff—just complete denial, absolute ignorance and ignoring of the science, totally in the tank with the polluters and the oil and coal industry. What is interesting is that actually doesn't represent the views of America's corporate community, and it doesn't represent them by a lot.

If you look at big brand name American corporations, if you look at Coke and Pepsi, if you look at Apple and Google, if you look at WalMart and Target, if you look at Mars and Nestle, UPS and Federal Express, GM and Ford, look at the entire casualty property insurance industry, look at the bulk of the electric utility industry, look at the entire green energy sector, all of them know that climate change is a real problem, understand the undeniable science of what carbon pollution does to the Earth's atmosphere and to our oceans, and they are doing things about it.

They have sustainability policies. They have climate policies. WalMart has probably done more to get rid of the incandescent bulb than any other force on the planet. They are very strong on this issue. But within those great corporations, it tends to be cabined into their corporate business and sustainability divisions. It hasn't really influenced yet the way they communicate with the public, and it certainly hasn't influenced much their government relations. So there is a huge mismatch between the so-called voice of the corporate community, which is really a polluter-paid propaganda effort coming through the Wall Street Journal, coming through the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and coming through the National Association of Manufacturers—a huge difference between that and what the underlying leaders of what regular Americans think of as the American corporate community believe. That difference is eventually—like these other forces—going to tear apart the foundation of the denial castle.

We have the chance to make this happen and to make this happen soon, and we need to. We absolutely need to. The Presiding Officer is the senior Senator from Connecticut, a State which borders mine. Connecticut and Rhode Island share a critical factor, which is coastline. If you follow the logic, such logic as exists in the denial machinery, they will take you off into distant and complex computer models of what the temperature is going to be and what the atmosphere is going to be like 30 or 40 years from now. And yes, that is complicated. In that area there is room to sow confusion.

Come to the coast. At the coastline you see sea levels rising because of an immutable law of nature called the law of thermal expansion. The ocean is

warming because it has caught more than 90 percent of the excess heat that the carbon has trapped, and when it warms, it expands.

It is as simple as that. That means when you go to my State to the Newport tide gauge off the Naval Station Newport, you see it is 10 inches higher than it was in the 1930s. That is a big deal because in the 1930s we had the hurricane of 1938. And if you look back at the devastation that hurricane caused to our coastline and you adjust for what 10 additional inches of sea would do and adjust again for stacking up that 10 inches in what a storm surge would do, you end up with a truly apocalyptic vision of the Rhode Island shore, and it is not deniable.

You cannot quarrel about a tide gauge. It is in effect a yardstick nailed to a dock, and the water has gone up 10 inches. To deny that is not just to deny science; it is to deny measurement. I think it is a bit of a stretch for even the most ardent of my denier colleagues to deny measurement. With a thermometer you measure that Narragansett Bay is nearly 4 degrees warmer in mean winter water temperature, and that means a lot for fishermen who used to fish for winter flounder. It doesn't take a very complicated test to determine what the acidity of the ocean is and to measure just the way you would measure the acidity in an aquarium. Our oceans are acidifying at the fastest rate that has been measured in 50 million years.

Remember we are a species that has been on this planet as *Homo sapiens* for a little over 200,000 years. So when you are talking about the steepest rate of acidification in millions of years, that is a dramatic shift in the habitability of our planet. If you want to know who that matters to, go to the west coast, go to the oyster fisheries and look at the wipe-out of young oyster species that took place when acidified ocean water got into the growing oysters and killed them all off. It was simply too acidic for their little shells to survive.

These are the harbingers of things to come. These are the undeniable facts. These are the truths the oceans tell us and our coastlines tell us. For all those reasons, I am confident that we will be at serious business to address climate change a lot sooner than the deniers think. The American public simply is not going to put up with a Congress that has become the prisoner to a barricade of special interest propaganda when they know better. Now the American people do, indeed, know better.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

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

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

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, there has been a lot of conversation among many of us here in the Senate and last week in the Veterans' Affairs Committee about the circumstances we find ourselves in at the Department of Veterans Affairs and its ability to provide the necessary care and benefits for our military men and women who have become and are becoming veterans.

What we heard last week at the Veterans' Affairs Committee was very disturbing to me because it still appears that the Department of Veterans Affairs has no plan to solve circumstances our veterans find themselves in. Who in this country would we expect to have access in the most timely fashion to the highest quality of care other than those who served our country and who were promised that? A commitment was made to them to make certain that those benefits would be made available. They were told that would be the case.

I went home this weekend. Part of our job is to help people. Every week at the end of the week I get what is called a weekly State report. I and other members of the Senate have staff who spend significant amounts of time trying to solve people's problems with government. We call it case work.

Every week I get a report of people who called my office to tell me something they want me to know, people who contacted me asking for help with a variety of federal agencies. But it struck me as so evident in reading my report from my State staff about the circumstances that our veterans find themselves in. So every week there is a report that I read generally at the end of the week, on the weekend. It is really page after page of things that have happened involving me and my staff and our relationship with Kansans who have a story to tell, who have a concern to raise, who have a request for how I vote. This week's staff report I thought I would highlight for my colleagues. My guess is that the circumstances that Kansan veterans find themselves in is probably no different for me than it is for my other colleagues here in the Senate.

These are just reports from Kansans who called or stopped by my office or wrote to us this week at home looking for help, asking me to help them solve their problem and telling a story about their relationship with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

A veteran from Hutchinson, KS, called to tell us that he filed a claim with the VA. It has been filed for 6 months, and he is still awaiting a decision. Unfortunately, that is all too common. A veteran from Norton, KS, filed a claim for service due to Agent Orange. He has been diagnosed with cancer and is seeking treatment through the VA. He has been informed that it could take 7 to 8 months before the VA will examine his claim, and while his cancer is not curable, it is treatable. And yet he has a 7- to 8-

month waiting period before he can receive benefits.

A veteran from Salina, KS, in the central part of our State indicates that he received double vaccinations before he was deployed to Desert Storm due to the fact that his predeployment package had been lost. He indicates he now suffers from several health conditions as a result and has been informed that the VA denies his benefits.

A veteran from Hutchinson, north of Wichita, indicated he has been fighting with the VA for 7 years on appeal. He has something pending with VA. They provided him an answer that was unsatisfactory, and he is appealing that decision. He claims the VA has continued dragging out his appeal process, and he has difficulty finding updates on his appeal when he contacts the VA. That is an example of someone who called the office and asked for help.

A veteran from Wichita said his doctors discovered a mass on his brain, and it will require an MRI to determine what the mass is. The earliest appointment available for him is on June 30. He, of course, as all of us would be, is concerned over that long wait. This is a veteran who has been diagnosed with a mass on his brain, doesn't know what it is, needs an MRI—exactly what a doctor would order to get additional diagnostic information—and cannot get the MRI until June 30.

A veteran from Junction City—which is a community that is adjacent to Fort Riley where a significant number of veterans and military retirees reside—indicates that he is living in a nursing home. He is 100-percent service connected with a disability and the VA is currently paying for his nursing home services. He has recently been informed that his physical therapy will no longer be covered by the VA and they are discontinuing payment but offer no explanation as to why. He filed an appeal late last year and has not received a response or status update from the VA since that request.

A veteran from Lawrence has had an appeal pending with the VA for over 1½ years and wants our help because he has received no communication from the VA in more than a year.

A veteran from Overland Park, KS—a suburb of Kansas City—is the primary caregiver for his wife who suffers from Alzheimer's. He has had tremendous difficulty in working with the VA to schedule appointments when he can be away from her to receive his treatments from the VA.

A daughter of a veteran from Wichita who passed away in the Wichita VA is concerned about the events that took place while he was in the care of the VA.

A veteran who lives north of Bird City, KS, is a category 1 disabled marine veteran due to a service-connected disability. He indicates that he has had two heart attacks and is now paying for stress tests and his own medical bills out of pocket because the VA has denied him fee basis. What that means

is if you are a veteran in Bird City, KS, which is the very northwest corner of our State, access to a VA hospital is a long way away, and that fee basis allows the veteran to receive care and treatment from a doctor and hospital closer to their hometown or neighborhood.

My point is that the people who are most deserving of care and attention are not receiving the care and attention they need. The Department of Veterans Affairs is supposed to provide the services and benefits earned and promised to those veterans. This is not anything that is out of the ordinary.

This report is something I read every week, and the reports that I convey to my colleagues here on the floor of the Senate are not unusual. I suppose what is unusual is that the number is increasing. What used to be a shorter list of problems with the VA has grown over time to be a longer and longer list.

I have been asking for a plan by the Department of Veterans Affairs from its top leadership, Secretary Shinseki, to explain to me, the Senate, the American people, and veterans what the Department of Veterans Affairs is going to do to meet the needs of these and other veterans across our country.

As I have indicated on the Senate floor before on this topic, if we are incapable of caring for our veterans today, how are we going to be capable of taking care of veterans in the future as more and more military men and women return from our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan? The physical and mental circumstances those veterans will find themselves in will be even more difficult and challenging.

We have an aging veteran population from World War II and now Vietnam veterans will most likely be needing more care and treatment from the Department of Veterans Affairs. What we need is the leadership that is necessary to meet the needs of these veterans and a commitment that the status quo is unacceptable and that the bureaucratic culture at the Department of Veterans Affairs is not something that is going to remain. There is going to be a concerted effort to make certain that the Department meets the needs of those who served and sacrificed for our country.

Again, who, other than those who served our country, would we expect to be at the top of the list to receive the most timely and highest quality of care than those who served our Nation? It seems to me that as these issues are raised, we have a Department of Veterans Affairs that is doing damage control. What we need is a Department of Veterans Affairs that reduces the damage being done to the veterans—the men and women who served our country—in Kansas and across our Nation.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last Saturday we celebrated the 60th Anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education. In that unanimous opinion, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the State-sanctioned segregation of public schools was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment and therefore unconstitutional. The Court "concluded that," in the field of public education, the doctrine of separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." This landmark decision is rightly celebrated every year.

The case of Hernandez v. State of Texas, however, decided by the Supreme Court just 2 weeks before the Brown decision, is an often overlooked and yet momentous advancement of civil rights in our country. In that case, the Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment protects those beyond the racial classes of white or black, and extends to all racial groups in the United States. Fortunately, we are only left to imagine a world without the Hernandez decision, a world that would have blocked Hispanics and other racial groups from the promise of equality made in the Constitution.

Taken together, the Brown and Hernandez decisions stand as landmarks of progress in our country. We have come far in the march towards equality; yet, we must recognize that we can and must achieve more. Six decades after the Brown and Hernandez decisions, our country must continue to confront social, economic, and racial inequalities throughout this country.

Racial inequality is not an issue that our society can just wish away in the 21st century. It still exists in our criminal justice system, educational, and voting systems, and in our housing and lending markets. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and as a member of the Senate for nearly 40 years, I have fought to uphold the promise of equality in our fundamental charter.

The anniversary of these civil rights cases is a moment to reflect on our past, and to evaluate and commit to the next steps that we need to take as we strive to build a more perfect Union. As many families across the Nation celebrate the graduation of hard-

working students who have earned their degrees, it is important to also celebrate all who helped in the journey traveled. As former Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall once said:

None of us got where we are solely by pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps. We got here because somebody—a parent, a teacher, an Ivy League crony or a few nuns—bent down and helped us pick up our boots.

Let us rejoice as a nation that in 60 years we have made great strides. We must not forget that the promise of our founding charter is aspirational, and we are all made better by the fight to bring greater liberty and equality to the Nation.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the Senate earlier today. Along with Senator AYOTTE, I was in New Hampshire this morning and afternoon attending memorial services for Officer Steve Arkell of the Brentwood Police Department, who was tragically killed in the line of duty on May 14, 2014.

I missed rollcall votes in relation to the confirmation of Stanley Fischer to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of David Barron to be U.S. circuit judge for the First Circuit.

I support both the Fischer and Barron nominations, and would have voted yes if I were present during these votes.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JERRY BEHRENS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, on June 6, 2014, the Wyoming Medical Center in Casper will dedicate its new Orthopedic, Spine and Surgery Center to an American patriot, Jerry Behrens, M.D.

For years, patients in Wyoming have known Jerry to be a compassionate, thorough, and trusted surgeon. He has cared for thousands of patients in Casper and around the State. What they may not know is that his character was shaped by the courage and determination he displayed half a world away in Vietnam.

Dr. Behrens always knew he wanted to help others. For that reason, he completed his medical degree and internship at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Although he was excited about beginning a family and a new career, he felt a calling to serve a higher cause. It was this desire which pushed him to volunteer as a medical doctor in the U.S. Navy during the Vietnam Conflict.

Attached to the 3rd Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment, Dr. Behrens performed surgery in very dangerous and difficult conditions. Jerry was assigned to Delta Med, a forward casualty receiving facility in Dong Ha. Soldiers with fragment wounds, lost limbs, and severe blood loss were triaged, treated, and transported to hospital ships for

additional care. It was not unusual for incoming rounds of fire to interrupt surgeries. Yet amidst the chaos and confusion, Jerry kept a level head and performed his duties with precision and professionalism.

Jerry later became the battalion surgeon for the Rockpile, Ca Lu and Khe Sanh Combat Bases. During this time, his courage was tested when his convoy was ambushed as they were making their way to Ca Lu. Of the 200 men in his unit, 70 were wounded, and 18 were killed. Jerry stabilized the injured while waiting for reinforcements. It was a harrowing experience, but it would not be the last time he risked his life to serve his battalion. Just a month later, his bunker at the Rockpile took a direct hit. Though he was uninjured, ten of his corpsmen were lost. Jerry was ultimately awarded the Bronze Star Medal with a V for Valor for his bravery and devotion to duty.

Upon the completion of his distinguished service to our Nation, Jerry returned home and completed his orthopedic residency at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. It was Wyoming's great fortune that Jerry decided to move his family to Casper to begin his orthopedic practice. I was lucky enough to be invited to join Jerry in his growing practice in Casper, WY, where his family and career thrived.

In 1991, Jerry's son Michael deployed with the U.S. Marine Corps as part of Operation Desert Storm. Jerry once again showed his patriotism and desire to serve. He contacted Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and asked to be re-activated so he could provide medical attention to Americans serving overseas. Jerry was commissioned as a lieutenant commander in January 1991, after a 4-day whirlwind of paperwork, physicals, and phone calls. He put his practice aside to once again wear the uniform. He was deployed within 3 weeks to Saudi Arabia and went through the breach with the Marines into Kuwait.

Certainly his experiences, both in Vietnam and Desert Storm, shaped his character—and his career. As a fellow in the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons and a board certified physician, he has devoted his life to providing high quality care and service to his patients. With every surgery he performs, he demonstrates integrity and precision. In addition to his contributions to the medical community, Jerry also volunteers his free time to serve as a teacher, mentor, and friend to our servicemen and women. He is actively involved with veterans' organizations around the country and continues to stay in touch with the Marines who served with him in Desert Storm.

Jerry is particularly proud of his work with Semper Fi Odyssey. This is a week-long transition assistance program which helps prepare individuals for life after military service. Participants work in teams and learn valuable skills that help them achieve their per-

sonal and professional goals. Jerry has served as a team leader for Semper Fi Odyssey on eight separate occasions and continues to mentor the former servicemembers he met through this work. Needless to say, Jerry is a positive force within the community and we are fortunate for his remarkable contributions.

After practicing in Casper for 41 years, the community is honoring this patriot by unveiling the Jerry Behrens, M.D. Orthopedic, Spine, and Surgery Center at the Wyoming Medical Center. Hundreds will gather to pay their respects to this accomplished surgeon. At his side will be his wife Mary, his children Kelly, Mike, and Ingrid, and his two grandchildren Erik and Jasper. Bobbi and I will be honored to stand with him on this special occasion. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Jerry Behrens and thanking him for a life and career devoted to service and the care of others.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISITS

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I am incredibly honored to recognize a group of 30 heroic military veterans who have traveled from southern West Virginia to visit our Nation's capital as part of the fourth Always Free Honor Flight. On the occasion of their visit, in which they will see for the first time the monuments built in their honor, I want to express my utmost gratitude to these special men and women for their extraordinary bravery and patriotism, and for their noble sacrifice to help keep our country free.

I have said this time and time again—West Virginia is one of the most patriotic States in this great Nation. With one of the country's highest per capita rates of military servicemembers and veterans, we are so proud of the many citizens who have served and who are actively serving in the military. The 30 veterans participating in today's Always Free Honor Flight truly embody the Mountain State's history and contributions to the safeguard of our American freedoms.

Our special West Virginians visiting today represent three generations of warriors—5 served in World War II, 9 served in the Korean War, and 16 served in the Vietnam War. They range from 63-90 years of age, and have traveled from all parts of our great State—from New Martinsville to Bluefield, Huntington to Princeton to Beckley, and many places in between. In addition to our Mountain State vets, two veterans from bordering Bland and Tazewell Counties in Virginia have accompanied their West Virginia neighbors on the day-long adventure.

I especially want to recognize our two women veterans who joined today's honor flight, both of whom are the first women to make the Always Free Honor Flight trip. Helen "J" Wheby served in the Korean war as an office worker in the Navy. Vanda Jane Butcher served in the Vietnam war

with the rank of a seaman as a part of an air flight crew in the Navy. Despite the challenges, sacrifices, and hardships they faced while defending this Nation, these women voluntarily stepped forward and put service above self to preserve our freedoms. We cannot thank them enough for their tremendous courage and their sacrifices.

Showing our appreciation to those who have served is something that we should do each and every day, but today is a special day to pay tribute and thank those who have volunteered to put their lives on the line for our freedoms. The memorials our Honor Flight participants will visit today serve as an important reminder to us all that our freedoms and liberties come at a steep cost. However, I know our veterans will find special meaning and potentially long-lost emotions when they tour such touching sites.

The brave West Virginia heroes today have all served this country in a variety of ways, working both at home and abroad. They have engaged in combat all over the world, traveling to the Panama Canal, working on the docks of Saigon, and serving in historic events such as the Cuban Missile Crisis. One of our visiting Vietnam veterans, Stephen Douglas Phillips of New Martinsville, earned not just one, but two Purple Hearts. Another, Gary Curtis Harold of Shady Spring has received both a Purple Heart and a Bronze Star.

But regardless of their rank or duty, each and every one of these veterans answered our Nation's call and has served with incredible pride and valor.

Additionally, I would like to recognize the nine volunteers, or so-called "guardians," who have accompanied the veterans during their trip today. These guardians have selflessly given their time to travel alongside our veterans all the way from Princeton, WV to Washington, DC to share this very special journey with them.

I am also tremendously grateful for all those involved in the Always Free Honor Flight Network, especially the president of the Denver Foundation and owner of Little Buddy Radio in Princeton—Dreama Denver. Along with coordinator and executive assistant, Dreama launched the Always Free Honor Flight and has planned four trips within a 2-year span for our West Virginia veterans. I commend Dreama, Pam, and all the Denver Foundation staff for their dedication and commitment to West Virginia's large veteran population. They have offered the people in West Virginia just one more way to say thank you' to our veterans for their service and sacrifice.

I am filled with pride every time I meet the patriots who have served our country, and I am so pleased to welcome West Virginia's most courageous veterans, who are all heroes, to Washington, DC. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in saluting them. They truly inspire us all as we are reminded of their selfless service. It is because of their bravery that all Amer-

icans enjoy the greatest liberties and freedoms in the world.

God bless all our servicemembers and veterans, God bless the great State of West Virginia, and God bless the United States of America.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES MONELL

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Charles Monell as he retires from the Rancho Mirage Library Advisory Commission after two decades of service and dedication to the library and the community it serves.

Throughout a long and distinguished career in medicine, including as the chief of surgery at the Beverly Glen Hospital in Los Angeles, Dr. Monell also gave generously of his time to a variety of charitable causes, especially those supporting music and education. Being particularly devoted to supporting public libraries, Dr. Monell served on the California State Library Commission for 14 years prior to retiring from medicine in 1992 and becoming a full-time resident of Rancho Mirage, which was working to establish its first public library.

In 1993, Dr. Monell was appointed to the Rancho Mirage Public Library Planning Committee, and led the effort to convert a former bank building into the first library. On January 6, 1996, as chairman of the new Rancho Mirage Public Library Commission, he introduced President Gerald Ford for the ribbon-cutting ceremony and formal opening of the Rancho Mirage Public Library.

The library was up and running, but Dr. Monell did not stop there. In 2003, he secured a gift of \$2 million from the Annenberg Foundation to purchase land for a new and larger Rancho Mirage Public Library, which opened on January 6, 2006—10 years to the day after the first library opening.

Dr. Monell has shared his lifelong love of music with the library and the community. With his personal contributions and fundraising efforts, he helped the library purchase a Steinway concert grand piano and sponsored concert performances by the acclaimed musicians of the Idyllwild Arts Academy. He has also donated his personal Civil War library to the Rancho Mirage Library, and generously made possible a private study room in the library for the community to use.

On May 12, the Library Advisory Commission honored Dr. Monell for his extraordinary devotion to the library and his 18 years of service on the commission. On June 5, Mayor Iris Smotrich will present Dr. Monell with a proclamation from the City of Rancho Mirage in appreciation of his distinguished service.

I am pleased to join them in saluting Dr. Charles Monell for his dedicated

and inspiring service to the community of Rancho Mirage.●

JOHNSTOWN FLOOD ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 125th Anniversary of the Johnstown Flood, one of the most unforgettable tragedies in our Nation's history. This anniversary reminds us of the delicacy of human life, the great importance of caring for others, and the true resilience that was demonstrated by those who endured the catastrophe.

At approximately 3:00 p.m. on Friday, May 31, 1889, the South Fork Dam, built to hold back a portion of the Conemaugh River, gave way, releasing 20 million tons of water into the valley below. The wall of water rushed towards the City of Johnstown, 15 miles to the southwest, picking up large quantities of debris and sweeping away whole towns. It finally hit Johnstown just after 4:00 p.m.

The flood event and ensuing typhoid outbreak claimed 10 percent of Johnstown's citizens; 2,209 people lost their lives, including 396 children and 99 whole families, resulting in the largest loss of civilian life in a single day until the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.

The tragedy left our Nation and larger global family in shock. The Johnstown Flood was the largest news story of its day and resulted in the single largest international humanitarian fundraising effort to date, with donations contributed from 13 countries. Clara Barton and five Red Cross workers arrived from Washington, DC, on June 5, 1889, making the Johnstown Flood the first major peacetime relief effort for the American Red Cross. Barton stayed until October 24, 1889, supervising the distribution of supplies and helping more than 25,000 people.

The Governor of Pennsylvania called on his constituents to rebuild and reopen the rail lines that had been wiped away. Within 14 days, 20 miles of railway reopened ensuring access to the lifesaving supplies arriving from the surrounding region.

During this anniversary we can recall these examples as just a few of countless stories of heroism. The survivors lived on to rebuild Johnstown. More importantly, they established a spirit of endurance that would live on in future generations.

The flood is a part of the history of Johnstown that will not be forgotten. The people of Johnstown and the Conemaugh Valley exhibit an indescribable human strength that rises above devastation and exhibits a true example of hope and determination during difficult times.●

CONGRATULATING CREEKVIEW HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I congratulate the Creekview High School rocketry team from Canton, GA who outperformed hundreds of

their peers from across the country on Saturday, May 10, 2014, to earn 1st place at the 12th annual Team America Rocketry Challenge. Champions Amanda Semler, 18; Andrew White, 16; Nick Dimos, 16; Austin Bralick, 16; and Bailey Robertson, 15, bested more than 700 other teams representing 48 states, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands to earn the national title. These students will now go on to represent the United States in London at the Farnborough International Airshow.

Team America Rocketry Challenge, TARC, is the world's largest student rocket contest and the aerospace and defense industry's flagship program designed to encourage students to pursue study and careers in science, technology, engineering and math, STEM. Sponsored by the Aerospace Industries Association, the National Association of Rocketry and more than 20 industry partners, TARC provides middle and high school students the opportunity to design, build and launch model rockets in a competition among more than 5,000 students nationwide.

I cannot express how proud I am of these students whose achievement represents tremendous dedication and unwavering commitment. It is equally encouraging to see young people with such a strong commitment to STEM education and fields of study. I wish these Creekview High School students and teachers the best as they go on to represent our Nation in London.●

POWESHIEK COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Poweshiek County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has

worked with me to secure funding in Poweshiek County worth over \$1.2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$11.1 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include the community's tremendous success with using farm bill funds for important local projects such as remodeling and expanding St. Francis Manor, which received a direct loan of \$1 million from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Community Facilities Program.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Poweshiek County has received \$556,624 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Poweshiek County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$151,108.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Poweshiek County has received more than \$3.2 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Poweshiek County's fire departments have received over \$628,329 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Ameri-

cans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Poweshiek County has recognized this important issue by securing more than \$360,000 for community wellness activities.

Disability Rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Poweshiek County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Poweshiek County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Poweshiek County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

WAPELLO COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its

vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Wapello County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Wapello County worth over \$10.5 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$43.5 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include the establishment and funding of both a Job Corps center and a community health center, working with the Ottumwa Regional Health Center on renovations and equipment, working with Indian Hills Community College on biotechnology and other programs, expanding the Des Moines to Burlington highway, and working with local law enforcement to combat methamphetamine and other dangerous drugs in the community.

Among the highlights:

Investing in Iowa's economic development through targeted community projects: In Southeast Iowa, we have worked together to grow the economy by making targeted investments in important economic development projects including improved roads and bridges, modernized sewer and water systems, and better housing options for residents of Wapello County. In many cases, I have secured Federal funding that has leveraged local investments and served as a catalyst for a whole ripple effect of positive, creative changes. For example, working with mayors, city council members, and local economic development officials in Wapello County, I have fought for funding to separate the combined sewers which would overflow during rain events. Over the years, I have appro-

riated over \$4.3 million to this project, which reduces the cost of these improvements to residents and businesses, helping to create jobs and expand economic opportunities. I also worked with leaders throughout the region to build a four lane highway from Des Moines to Burlington. I was pleased to have been able to acquire nearly \$52 million worth of Congressionally directed funding for various segments of this project. Thanks to our years of partnership, this highway will result in a more jobs and a better economy for the entire area.

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This is not just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Ottumwa to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Wapello County has earned \$120,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Wapello County has received \$3,301,391 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Wapello County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$57,315.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it

means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Wapello County has received over \$12.2 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Wapello County has received more than \$9.9 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Wapello County's fire departments have received over \$1.4 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Wapello County has recognized this important issue by securing over \$2 million for the community health center and for community wellness programs.

Disability Rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with

disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Wapello County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Wapello County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Wapello County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

MILITARY ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this fall, seven remarkable Utahns will enter three of our prestigious military academies, and I would like to take this opportunity to officially congratulate them and to recognize their individual achievements.

Dexter Chayton Clark will be attending the U.S. Naval Academy. A graduate of Brighton High School, Dexter has maintained a 4.0 GPA, he is an AP Scholar with Honor, a member of the National Honor Society, a National Academic League Champion, a gifted swimmer, and an Eagle Scout.

Jillian Lemay Combs will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy. She graduated from the Waterford School with academic high honors; she is an accomplished violist and a member of the National Charities League with over 400 hours of service. She was the captain of Waterford's debate team as well as the swimming, diving, and water polo teams, and she is a Girl Scout Gold Award recipient.

Amy Noelle Johnston will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. A graduate from Brighton High School and a member of the National Honor Society, Amy was captain of the Brighton lacrosse and tennis teams. She served her community with the Red Cross and also performed volunteer

service on the Northern Cheyenne and Coeur d'Alene Reservations.

Carson Eugene Nuttall will be returning to study at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Carson displayed commitment to his faith by resigning from West Point to serve a full-time mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for 2 years in Chile. He has been recognized consistently as a natural leader and one who is committed to honor and service.

Zerek Douglas Olson will be attending the U.S. Naval Academy. A graduate from Layton High School and a JROTC Captain, Zerek was captain of his football, wrestling, and track & field teams. He is a member of the National Honor Society, attended Boy's State, and served our veterans at the VA hospital and VA homes in Utah.

Seth Lawrence White will be attending the U.S. Naval Academy. A graduate of Sky View High School, Seth served as one of its student body officers, the captain of both the debate team and the football team, and a Dwight D. Eisenhower People to People European Representative. Seth also helped in organizing the Don't Drive Stupid program to discourage drunk and distracted driving.

Keven Shin Yeh will be attending the U.S. Naval Academy. Keven graduated from Brighton High School with a 4.0 GPA. He is a member of the Governor's Honors Academy and the captain of both Brighton's cross country and track & field teams. He has given over 100 hours of dedicated service to our veterans at the VA hospital in Salt Lake City.

It appears that the future of our military is in good hands. I challenge these praiseworthy appointees to continue the tradition of honor, sacrifice, and courage that has been so exceptionally demonstrated by so many throughout the great history of our military. I should like to close with a quote from Lincoln, which I hope we will all remember as we strive to do what is right for our country. Of the brave soldiers who were then fighting to preserve the Union, he wrote:

Honor to the Soldier, and Sailor everywhere, who bravely bears his country's cause. Honor also to the citizen who cares for his brother in the field, and serves, as he best can, the same cause—honor to him, only less than to him, who braves, for the common good, the storms of heaven and the storms of battle.●

REMEMBERING SAMUEL SMITH, SR.

● Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, on April 14, 2014, our Nation lost a great hero, Mr. Samuel "Jesse" Smith, Sr. Mr. Smith was one of the few remaining Navajo Code Talkers, who defended our country with such ingenuity and valor during World War II.

As the number of these legendary warriors decreases year by year, our respect and gratitude for their remarkable service only increases with time.

My State of New Mexico is proud to be the home of many of these extraordinary men, and we mourn their passing.

Samuel Smith was a student at the Albuquerque Indian School on December 7, 1941, when news arrived of the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor. He and two of his fellow students knew, very quickly, what they must do. They resolved, without hesitation, and despite their youth, to defend their country. All three joined the U.S. Marine Corps, determined to go wherever they were needed. Samuel Smith dreamed of being a pilot, but fate would have other plans. He would never fly a plane, but he would serve with particular distinction as a Navajo Code Talker.

Mr. Smith possessed the determination, intelligence, and language proficiency that was essential to the Code Talkers. He was assigned to the 4th Marine Division and was responsible for transmitting messages for Gen. Clifton Cates, the commander of the Marine landings in Saipan and Tinian.

In the course of his military service, Samuel Smith fought at the battle of Roi-Namur, the battles of Saipan and Tinian to retake the Marianas Islands, and the battle of Iwo Jima. He and his fellow Code Talkers turned their language into an unbreakable code. They used the language of the Navajo people as a weapon to defend our freedoms. In battle after battle, in ferocious combat, that code helped secure Allied victory. Their courage and patriotism is all the more remarkable in that they fought so bravely for freedom in a world that did not always accord freedom to them.

It would be many years after World War II before the story of the Navajo Code Talkers, and the pivotal role they played, could be told. The true purpose of their service was not revealed until over 20 years later. In 2001, Congress honored Samuel Smith and his fellow Code Talkers with Congressional Gold Medals. This recognition and honor was richly deserved. The simple words on their medals told the heroic story: "The Navajo language was used to defeat the enemy."

After the war, Mr. Smith returned home. He married Rena Smith, and together they started a family. They moved to the Pueblo of Acoma, where they raised ten children. Later, at Fort Defiance Navajo Nation, Mr. Smith served as a law enforcement officer and was appointed chief ranger of the Navajo Nation Rangers. He also served as director of Transportation and Water Resources for the Navajo Nation.

Samuel Smith lived a long and eventful life, until the age of 89. He leaves behind more than 150 direct descendants. His life is a testament of service to others, in war and in peacetime. For his family, his community, and his Nation, he set an example of courage and commitment. Those who knew him will long recall his steady presence. As his son Michael said:

We were very fortunate to have one of the wisest and gentlest men in our lives. He

could warm your heart with his smile, let you know you had to straighten up with his gaze, and always had something clever to say. He is our hero. He is our dad.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mr. Smith's family. He will be deeply missed, and he will be forever remembered by a grateful nation.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:34 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3530. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

H.R. 3610. An act to stop exploitation through trafficking.

H.R. 4058. An act to prevent and address sex trafficking of youth in foster care.

H.R. 4225. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts.

H.R. 4573. An act to protect children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 309. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

H.R. 685. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1209. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2363. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 309. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5841. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Commercial Groundfish Fishery Management Measures; Rockfish Conservation Area Boundaries for Vessels Using Bottom Trawl Gear" (RIN0648-BD37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5842. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Fishing Year 2014; Recreational Management Measures" (RIN0648-BE00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5843. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD261) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5844. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Depart-

ment of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Control of Spacecraft Systems and Related Items the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)" (RIN0694-AF87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5845. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, a report relative to the deployment of certain U.S. forces to Chad; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1036. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office".

H.R. 1228. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building".

H.R. 1451. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

H.R. 2391. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office".

H.R. 3060. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Col. William P. Robertson, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Anthony G. Crutchfield, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. James C. McConville, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Gregory A. Biscone, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Kathleen A. Cook, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Jeffrey A. Rockwell, to be Major General.

Navy nominations beginning with Captain Brian J. Brakke and ending with Captain Jesse A. Wilson, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 31, 2014.

Navy nomination of Capt. Timothy C. Galaudet, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Steven L. Parode, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Johnny R. Wolfe, Jr., to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Samuel A. Greaves, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Warren D. Berry, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Jon A. Norman, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Roosevelt Allen, Jr., to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Richard W. Kelly, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Carlton D. Everhart II, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Darryl L. Roberson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Ellen M. Pawlikowski, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Karen E. Dyson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Christopher F. Burne, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Marshall B. Webb, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Thomas III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen G. Fogarty, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Thomas S. Rowden, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) John F. Kirby, to be Rear Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Jon M. Davis, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. McKenzie, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert B. Neller, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. John A. Toolan, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Patrick J. Hermesmann and ending with Col. Helen G. Pratt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. James M. Holmes, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Scott A. Raber, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Mark D. Levin, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jeremy P. Garlick and ending with Derick A. Sager, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Tonya Y. White, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Daniel L. Rosera, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jason E. O'Brien and ending with Erik D. Rudiger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Robert J. Trainer, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kenneth G. Crooks and ending with James D. Tims, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kim L. Bowen and ending with Daniel K. Waterman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Victoria M. Aglewilson and ending with Deborah L. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Heather A. Bodwell and ending with Christian L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Erich M. Gauger and ending with Timothy J. Zielicke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Anthony F. Fontenos and ending with Vu T. Nguyen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Peter G. Bailey and ending with Kevin R. Windsor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2014. (minus 2 nominees: Taft Owen Aujero; Jeffery Lynn Richard).

Army nomination of Randolph S. Wardle, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Stanley F. Zezotarski, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Eric S. Comette, to be Major.

Army nomination of William D. Swenson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Gregory R. Shepard, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with David F. Caporicci and ending with Eric G. Wishart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Army nomination of Philander Pinckney, to be Major.

Army nomination of Elizabeth Joyce, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jasmine T. Daniels, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jan S. Sunde and ending with Himanshu Pathak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2014.

Army nomination of Joseph L. Craver, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Maribeth A. Affeldt and ending with R10045, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Miguel Aguilar and ending with Mark A. Zinser, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Kimberely Derouenslaven)

Army nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Abel and ending with Deborah A. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Bobby L. Christine and ending with James K. Massengill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Ronald W. Burkett II and ending with Brian J. Melton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2014.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with William B. Allen IV and ending with James L. Zepko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2014.

Marine Corps nomination of Richard P. Owens, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Robert M. Manning, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with James P. Edmunds III and ending with Paul B. Webb, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Leonard F. Anderson IV and ending with Konstantin E. Zoganas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nomination of William A. Garren, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Leander J. Sackey, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher M. Davis, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Charles E. Varsogea, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Louis J. Lazzara, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Tara M. McArthur-Milton, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Todd W. Boehm, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with John I. Actkinson and ending with Justin R. Wolfe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of Robert J. Polvino, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Victor Sorrentino, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Jeffrey P. Martin, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Richard D. McCormick, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with David W. Atwood and ending with Anna H. Woodard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nomination of William S. Switzer, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Joshua L. Kever, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Rustin J. Dozeman, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Lori L. Cody, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Finance.

*Stefan M. Selig, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

*Darci L. Vetter, of Nebraska, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

*Sylvia Mathews Burwell, of West Virginia, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Steven M. Wellner, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Tony Hammond, of Missouri, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission for a term expiring October 14, 2018.

*Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission for a term expiring November 22, 2018.

*Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2366. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2367. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out programs and activities that connect the people of the United States, especially children, youth, and families, with the outdoors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2368. A bill to establish an online significant event tracker (SET) system for tracking, reporting, and summarizing exposures of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components thereof, to traumatic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 2369. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consider Brunswick County, North Carolina to be part of the same metropolitan statistical area as Wilmington, North Carolina; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 2370. A bill to rescind unused earmarks provided for the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. LEE, Mr. BURR, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2371. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of major revenue legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2372. A bill to provide additional oversight and guidance to the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2373. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2374. A bill to improve college affordability; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2375. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to facilitate paid television service in certain counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2376. A bill to designate the buildings occupied by the Department of Transportation

located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, Southeast, and 1201 4th Street, Southeast, in the District of Columbia as the "James L. Oberstar United States Department of Transportation Building Complex"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2378. A bill to establish a regulatory framework for the comprehensive protection of personal data for individuals under the aegis of the Federal Trade Commission, to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to improve provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2379. A bill to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2380. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve the national freight policy of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BURR, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. COBURN):

S. Res. 453. A resolution condemning the death sentence against Meriam Yahia Ibrahim Ishag, a Sudanese Christian woman accused of apostasy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 454. A resolution recognizing that cardiovascular disease continues to be an overwhelming threat to women's health and the importance of providing basic, preventive heart screenings to women wherever they seek primary care; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to hire veterans, to require States to recognize the military experience of veterans when issuing licenses and credentials to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1066

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to allow certain student loan borrowers to refinance Federal student loans.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1184

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1184, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include information on the coverage of intensive behavioral therapy for obesity in the Medicare and You Handbook and to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1577

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1577, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction.

S. 1700

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1700, a bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to extend, enhance, and revise the provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, to establish certain other protections for personal information of children and minors, and for other purposes.

S. 1708

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1708, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the establishment of performance measures for the highway safety improvement program, and for other purposes.

S. 1733

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1733, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 1968

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1968, a bill to allow States to let Federal funds for the education of disadvantaged children follow low-income

children to the accredited or otherwise State-approved public school, private school, or supplemental educational services program they attend.

S. 2004

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2004, a bill to ensure the safety of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, as they travel on and across federally funded streets and highways.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2013, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

S. 2125

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2125, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2152

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2152, a bill to direct Federal investment in carbon capture and storage and other clean coal technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

S. 2162

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a deduction for married couples who are both employed and have young chil-

dren and to increase the earned income tax credit for childless workers, and to provide for budget offsets.

S. 2270

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2270, a bill to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 2295

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2295, a bill to establish the National Commission on the Future of the Army, and for other purposes.

S. 2302

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2302, a bill to provide for a 1-year extension of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2304

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2304, a bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 2316

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2316, a bill to require the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs to submit a report on wait times for veterans seeking medical appointments and treatment from the Department of Veterans Affairs, to prohibit closure of medical facilities of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 2335

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2335, a bill to exempt certain 16 and 17 year-old children employed in logging or mechanized operations from child labor laws.

S. 2349

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2349, a bill to establish a grant program to enable States to promote participation in dual enrollment programs, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 348

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 348, a resolution expressing support for the internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within

Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace.

S. RES. 412

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 412, a resolution reaffirming the strong support of the United States Government for freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region, and for the peaceful diplomatic resolution of outstanding territorial and maritime claims and disputes.

S. RES. 421

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 421, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

S. RES. 451

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 451, a resolution recalling the Government of China's forcible dispersion of those peaceably assembled in Tiananmen Square 25 years ago, in light of China's continued abysmal human rights record.

AMENDMENT NO. 3161

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3161 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3474, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3167

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3167 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3474, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3174

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3174 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3474, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage

under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2366. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I know that many students across the country are waiting on the edge of their seats and looking forward to school letting out shortly for their summer break. But for many of those kids who participate in school meal programs, the summer can be a pretty uncertain time—not knowing when or where they are going to get their next meal. It can be a stressful time for those kids' parents as well, who have to stretch every dollar they have to feed their family today.

That is a struggle Nicole, a single mom from my home State of Washington, knows all too well. She has been unemployed now for about a year. She has two kids. She has a daughter who is finishing kindergarten and a son who is just finishing fifth grade. They have relied on SNAP benefits to help pay for their groceries and school meals to get help during the school year. But Nicole says that last summer, without school-provided meals, it was particularly difficult to put enough food on the table to feed her kids.

Today I am here introducing a bill that will help families like Nicole's and many across the country. It is a bill to make sure more children can get the nutrition they need during the summer break. When school is in session, millions of kids from low-income families can get free or reduced-price meals through our National School Lunch Program. But during the summer, hunger goes up in this country about 34 percent for families with school-aged kids, according to a study.

Right now we do have a Federal congregate summer meals program, of which I have long been supportive. It is called the Summer Food Service Program. It is very successful in some areas of our country. I always look forward to working with my colleagues to strengthen and expand that program to make sure it is reaching as many children as possible.

But in a study from 2012, summer congregate meals programs only reached about 14 percent of the students who qualified for free or reduced-priced meals during the school year. That adds up to tens of millions of kids across our country who do not have access to meal programs in the summer.

In my home State of Washington, just 9.8 percent of those kids partici-

pated in 2012. That means those kids are more likely to deal with hunger or food insecurity. That is unacceptable to me. When it comes to ensuring that our kids grow up with the nutrition they need to learn and to thrive, there are no excuses.

We have to do more to fight summer hunger. That is why I am here today introducing legislation called the Stop Child Summer Hunger Act. The bill is pretty simple. It provides families with an EBT card that will help them afford groceries during the summer months to replace the meals those kids would otherwise have gotten at school. It is based on a very successful pilot program that has proven now to decrease hunger by 33 percent. Some of the demonstration projects had participation rates as high as 90 percent. Scaling up that program with the Stop Child Summer Hunger Act will help more children get the nutrition they need in the summer months.

The bill is fully paid for. We do that by closing a tax loophole that actually encourages U.S. companies to shift our jobs and profits offshore. From my perspective, that is a pretty fair trade. It will encourage companies to keep jobs and profits here in America. At the same time, it will help kids get the nutrition they need during the summer.

Fighting hunger, especially among kids, is an issue that is extremely important to me. I have told this body before that when I was just a teenager—15 years old—my dad, who fought in World War II, was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. Within a few years he could not work any longer. My mom had to go to work and find a job. It did not pay anywhere near enough to support seven kids and a husband who had a growing stack of medical bills. So for several months when I was young, we had to rely on food stamps. It was not much, but I remember it helping to get my family by during a very tough time. So I know how hard it is for families who are struggling to put food on the table.

As adults, I believe it is our moral responsibility to take care of our children, to make sure they can grow up healthy and to make sure they have every opportunity to thrive and learn. I hope we can live up to this responsibility by tackling this problem and helping more kids get the nutrition they need to live healthy lives. I hope this body can work with me to make sure that kids who are now looking forward to their summer break can enjoy it free from hunger.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2379. A bill to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill that would authorize the implementation of the landmark agreements that settle some of our country's most complex and contentious water allocation and species preservation issues. Water management crises this century have made the Klamath Basin nationally known, with all interests having experienced devastating water years. Overcoming that adversity, the parties in the basin have spent years coming together to hammer out solutions—essentially giving up their right to obstruct in the name of the greater good. With this bill the basin should now be known for the dedicated and enduring collaborative efforts that have honed in on a sustainable and more economically certain future for the basin—an example that other regions can emulate for their watershed challenges. It is time for Congress to place its seal of approval and set about implementing these agreements to restore the basin by passing the Klamath Water Recovery and Economic Restoration Act of 2014.

I am pleased to be joined by three colleagues on this bill. Senator MERKLEY has tirelessly worked to support the collaborative approach undertaken by two states, four Tribes, multiple Federal agencies, and countless stakeholders. Senators FEINSTEIN and Boxer have answered the call for communities reeling from unprecedented drought, and the Klamath Basin—spanning Oregon and California—is yet another illustration of their efforts to assist communities in need while supporting fish and wildlife. Together, we are committed to working with our colleagues in the Senate and House to advance this bill and get it signed by the President.

The story of the Klamath Basin revolves around water. Congress authorized a federal irrigation project for the basin in 1905. Now the Klamath Project provides water service to roughly 210,000 acres of productive farmland—producing such crops as potatoes, cereal grains, sugar beets, alfalfa and other hay, and irrigated pastures for beef cattle. The Klamath Hydroelectric Project supports power needs in the basin with seven dams, the last of which was built more than 50 years ago. Water needs for irrigation have increasingly come into conflict with the needs of fish and wildlife. In 1908, President Teddy Roosevelt established the nation's first waterfowl refuge, Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge. The importance of the basin for migratory birds along the Pacific Flyway saw the later creation of the Clear Lake, Tule Lake, Upper Klamath, Bear Valley, and Klamath Marsh National Wildlife Refuges. The basin is also home to 13 species of anadromous fish. Three of these species are listed under the Endangered Species Act, including the endangered listing of the Lost River and shortnose suckers in 1988, the threatened listing

of coho salmon in 1997, and the threatened listing of bull trout in 1999. These fisheries—particularly salmon and suckers—are important to the six federally recognized tribes in the basin. Water demand often far exceeds the amount of water in a given year, setting up a situation ripe for conflict.

That conflict grew to a head in the early 2000s. In 2001, biological opinions about the water necessary for endangered fish resulted in the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior withholding much of the water that would have normally gone to Klamath Project irrigators. Researchers for Oregon State estimated that the water curtailment would have, in the absence of public and private emergency mitigation efforts, reduced agricultural output in the Upper Basin by \$82 million, about 20 percent, and regional employment by almost 2,000 jobs. Then in 2002, low water flows and poor water health caused the death of as many as 70,000 fall chinook before they could navigate up the Klamath and spawn, in an event known as the “2002 fish kill.” The rancor and legal conflicts only intensified with these events, creating uncertainty in the basin that has impeded overall growth and prosperity.

Instead of accepting a future determined by acrimonious and costly legal battles over the water, stakeholders in the basin came together to chart a different path. They recognized that their respective interests could be better met through cooperative efforts designed to enhance species recovery, the certainty of agricultural operations, and stability in the basin for economic growth and civic relations. Years of complex and challenging work culminated in two historic agreements in 2010—the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement, KBRA, and the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement, KHSA. The KBRA settles water disputes in exchange for greater water certainty for farmers and ranchers, water for fish and wildlife needs, reduced power costs for irrigators, and restoration efforts for fisheries. The KHSA sets out a process whereby four hydroelectric dams may be removed, at no federal cost, should removal be in interest of fish restoration and the public interest considering local community impacts. Together these cooperative efforts can achieve more for the basin than asserting individual interests could. The collective efforts will promote economic stability and growth, while ensure a full suite of restoration efforts are in place for the recovery of listed fish species.

The latest agreement in the basin became final just this year, the Upper Basin Comprehensive Agreement, UBA. I am especially proud of the work that produced the UBA, having helped convene the special task force that worked mightily to find agreement on the key remaining issues in the basin. The task force came about after a June 2013 Senate Energy and Natural Resources

Committee hearing on water issues in the basin that I chaired. The Committee heard from 17 diverse witnesses and received roughly 4,000 comments via email prior to the hearing. Most acknowledged the clear impetus for a comprehensive solution given that the Oregon Water Resources Department found in March 2013 that the Klamath Tribes held a time immemorial water right, making them the most senior water right holder in the basin. And after months of arduous work on the task force, members including irrigators, environmentalists, and tribes found common ground on habitat protection and restoration and swallowed hard to reduce the federal expenditures needed as I had called for in the Senate. The UBA lays out specific water management and restoration measures for the Upper Basin, including 30,000 acre feet of increased stream flows into Upper Klamath Lake. The agreement provides crucial economic certainty to small business in the basin who sell equipment to farmers growing the crops, certainty for the cattle ranchers who manage their herds, certainty for the tribes who want to pursue promising opportunities in forestry, like biomass and other economic development.

The Klamath Basin Water Recovery and Economic Restoration Act of 2014 authorizes these historic agreements and paves the way for the restoration work needed to achieve their goals. In so doing, it sets out a new cooperative management plan that the Bureau of Reclamation will administer. For the first time, the Klamath Reclamation Project will include fish, wildlife, and National Wildlife Refuges as authorized purposes for the project. This will allow water managers to increase in-stream flows and lake levels. Private landowners and others will undertake permanent protections for riparian areas and other enhancements that will help restore hundreds of miles of fish habitat. Fish biologists estimate that these efforts will boost annual production of adult Chinook salmon by 80 percent. Additional water and flexible releases for the National Wildlife refuges means greater numbers of migratory waterfowl, non-game water birds, wintering bald eagles, and other sensitive species.

Achieving these benefits for fish and wildlife correspond to economic benefits to the basin. The restoration efforts will also produce jobs. The Department of the Interior calculates that more than 4,000 farming, ranching, commercial and recreational fishing, construction, and other jobs will be created or preserved. The water management plan provides for more predictable water for farmers and ranchers to ensure irrigated agriculture continues in the basin. A drought management plan assists in navigating the challenges created by drought and climate change in the basin. To deal with the escalating electric costs faced by irrigators, the bill lays out a path to

affordable power including renewable energy development. There are also economic benefits to tribes, beyond what a water right alone can achieve. The legislation sets up an economic development fund for the Klamath Tribes so they can create tribal jobs while sustainably managing their natural resources. By modifying some parties' interests for the greater good, the basin can move beyond years of polarizing debate and create a stable future from which to plan and prosper.

These historic agreements didn't happen by osmosis. They represent years of hard work among parties who have stood up to incredible pressures and made very real sacrifices to better their communities and the associations they represent. I have thanked many parties for their dedication over the course of these agreements and want to again express my deepest thanks to the members of the task force and those who went before them to tee up the work for Congress. With this bill, it is now time for Congress to step up and deliver on this package of agreements. The spirit of compromise on these thorny water issues has a message for not just Congress, but provides an example of how other vexing water situations across the Nation can sit down to work out their differences.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2380. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve the national freight policy of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Freight Priorities Act, which takes an all-of-the-above approach to addressing our Nation's freight needs. We must improve the movement of freight and strengthen our economic competitiveness by examining a comprehensive, multimodal, national network that includes not just our major highways, but our rail, seaports, local roads and intermodal facilities. This bill would authorize the Department of Transportation to broaden our approach to freight policy, set goals for reducing air pollution, and creates a pilot program to study the disproportionate impacts on urban communities that can be caused by the movement of freight.

In 2011, 17.6 billion tons of goods were transported throughout the United States, valued at more than \$16.8 trillion. The Federal Highway Administration estimates there will be a 60 percent increase of freight being moved over the next 30 years.

In New Jersey, hundreds of millions of tons of freight are annually shipped through our ports, by rail, and highways. The port of New York and New Jersey, as of 2012, supported over 296,000 jobs and 28.9 billion in business income. This major economic engine drives New Jersey's economy and boosts U.S. economic competitiveness. However, too often, our lack of invest-

ment and our limited focus on the highway network causes our freight to get stuck in congested, heavily trafficked urban areas. Extended truck, rail and ship idling negatively impacts the health and air quality of local urban communities. With a slight adjustment of our priorities and a strong national commitment to investing in our infrastructure, we can dramatically reduce congestion, improve the health of American communities, make sure goods get where they need to go faster and cheaper, strengthen our economy and create jobs.

The Freight Priorities Act sets goals for increasing efficiencies. It outlines goals to reduce air pollution and congestion, and requires the inclusion of port authorities in freight infrastructure investment decisions. The bill requires DOT to meet performance measures for all modes of freight movement, and establishes a pilot program that will help find ways to reduce the impact on local communities and help create access to jobs at ports and other multimodal facilities.

By refocusing our priorities, we will ensure that the smartest, most-cost effective projects secure funding. In New Jersey this could mean investing in the Raritan intermodal hub project in Essex, Union and Middlesex counties, which would create a direct connection for freight cars to access the port of New York and New Jersey. The project would relieve congestion on the roads and shift freight off of Amtrak's passenger lines. This bill would also prioritize investments that reduce air pollution, such as shore power technology at the port of Newark, which would help reduce emissions by allowing major cargo vessels to plug into the electric grid while at port.

Rather than finding ways to merely skate by on the limited infrastructure funds we have each year, the conversation we should be having in Congress is how we can dramatically increase investments in our infrastructure and improve the safety and functionality of our entire network that transports both people and goods. This bill is a strong step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and look forward to working with my colleagues on the Senate Commerce Committee to carry these priorities as we draft our portion of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 453—CON-DEMNING THE DEATH SENTENCE AGAINST MERIAM YAHIA IBRAHIM ISHAG, A SUDANESE CHRISTIAN WOMAN ACCUSED OF APOSTASY

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOZ-

MAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BURR, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. COBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 453

Whereas, on May 15, 2014, a Sudanese court affirmed a sentence of death by hanging for 27-year old Meriam Yahia Ibrahim Ishag, a Christian woman accused of apostasy for refusing to recant her Christian faith, and ordered her to receive 100 lashes for adultery because under Sudan's Shari'ah law such inter-religious marriages are illegal;

Whereas Ibrahim is eight months pregnant and being held in the Omdurman Federal Women's Prison with her 20-month old son;

Whereas the Department of State has designated Sudan as a "Country of Particular Concern" under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-292) based on the government's systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom since 1999;

Whereas the Sudanese 1991 Criminal Code allows for death sentences for apostasy, stoning for adultery, cross-amputations for theft, prison sentences for blasphemy, and floggings for undefined acts of "indecentcy";

Whereas, according to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), the Government of Sudan, led by President Omar Hassan al-Bashir, continues to engage in systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom or belief, imposes a restrictive interpretation of Shari'ah law on Muslims and non-Muslims alike and, along with other National Congress Party leaders, President al-Bashir has stated that Sudan's new constitution, when drafted, will be based on its interpretation of Shari'ah;

Whereas, according to USCIRF, since South Sudan's independence from Sudan in 2011, the number and severity of harsh Shari'ah-based judicial decisions in Sudan has increased, including sentences of amputation for theft and sentences of stoning for adultery;

Whereas the United States Government has designated Sudan as a State Sponsor of Terrorism since August 12, 1993, for repeatedly providing support for acts of international terrorism;

Whereas the Sudanese 2005 Interim Constitution states that "[t]he State shall respect the religious rights to (a) worship or assemble in connection with any religion or belief";

Whereas the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the Government of Sudan has acceded, provides that "everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others, and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice, and teaching."

Whereas the Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life found that, as of 2011, 10 percent of the 198 countries surveyed had apostasy laws which can, and have been, used to punish both Muslims and non-Muslims in countries such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Morocco, and Sudan; and

Whereas people have the right to practice their faith without fear of death or persecution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the charge of apostasy and death sentence of Meriam Yahia Ibrahim Ishag and calls for immediate and unconditional release of her and her son;

(2) encourages efforts by the United States Government to support religious freedom within Sudan, including by requiring, before normalizing relations or lifting sanctions under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-292) and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), that the Government of Sudan abide by international standards of freedom of religion or belief;

(3) urges the Government of Sudan to ensure that, when drafting the country's new constitution, the process is transparent and inclusive of civil society leaders and representatives of all major political parties, to ensure that the new constitution includes protections for freedom of religion or belief, respect for international human rights commitments, and recognition of Sudan as a multireligious, multiethnic, and multicultural nation;

(4) recognizes that every individual regardless of religion should have the opportunity to practice his or her religion without fear of discrimination;

(5) reaffirms the commitment of the United States Government to end religious discrimination and to pursue policies that guarantee the basic human rights of all individuals worldwide; and

(6) encourages the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to continue their support for initiatives worldwide that support religious freedom.

SENATE RESOLUTION 454—RECOGNIZING THAT CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE CONTINUES TO BE AN OVERWHELMING THREAT TO WOMEN'S HEALTH AND THE IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING BASIC, PREVENTIVE HEART SCREENINGS TO WOMEN WHEREVER THEY SEEK PRIMARY CARE

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 454

Whereas heart disease remains the leading cause of death for women in the United States, causing 1 in 4 female deaths and more female deaths than all forms of cancer combined;

Whereas since 1984, the number of women who have died from heart disease exceeds the number of men who have died from heart disease;

Whereas the rate of cardiovascular death is increasing by 1 percent each year among women ages 35 to 44;

Whereas heart disease claims the lives of nearly 422,000 women each year;

Whereas almost half of African American women have some form of cardiovascular disease, and African American women are more likely to die from heart disease than white women;

Whereas heart disease and stroke account for \$312,600,000,000 in health care expenditures and lost productivity annually;

Whereas only 54 percent of women recognize that heart disease is the leading cause of death for women, and almost 3/4 of women who unexpectedly die of heart disease have no previous symptoms of disease;

Whereas many women, especially younger women, may not be aware of their risk for heart disease because they have never gotten a basic, preventive heart screening and have no symptoms;

Whereas studies show that nearly 1 in 5 women rely solely on their obstetrician and

gynecologist ("OB/GYN") for primary care, yet only 35 percent of women recall having even discussed heart disease with their OB/GYN;

Whereas early identification of cardiovascular disease risk factors such as high blood pressure, smoking, excessive weight and obesity, high cholesterol, and diabetes allows for more effective intervention and treatment, and can dramatically lower a woman's overall risk of heart disease and heart attack;

Whereas the burden of women's heart disease can be reduced in the United States by encouraging primary care providers to offer women basic, preventative heart disease screenings;

Whereas experts recommend and encourage that a basic, preventive heart screening be a routine part of a woman's visit to a primary care practitioner; and

Whereas once women understand their risk, they still need follow-up information, support, and incentives to maintain cardiovascular health and make the most informed decisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that, despite improved education and awareness, heart disease remains the number 1 killer of women in the United States;

(2) recognizes the importance of making basic, preventive cardiovascular screening available for women as recommended, so that all women can know the risks they face and what can be done to reduce them;

(3) recognizes that basic, preventive heart disease screenings are recommended to be a routine part of women's health care; and

(4) commits to improving the heart health of all women, tearing down the barriers that prevent women from getting screened for heart disease, ensuring women are provided with personalized lifestyle modification recommendations and support, and ensuring every woman has a healthy heart.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Delivering Better Health Care Value to Customers: the First Three Years of the Medical Loss Ratio".

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 2 p.m. in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Authorization For Use of Military Force After Iraq And Afghanistan."

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Indian Education Series: Ensuring the Bureau of Indian Education has the Tools Necessary to Improve."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 21, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 2:15 p.m., to hold an African Affairs and East Asian and Pacific Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, "The Escalating International Wildlife Trafficking Crisis: Ecological, Economic and National Security Issues."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 10 a.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY, PENSIONS, AND FAMILY POLICY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy of the Committee on Finance be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Strengthening Social Security to Meet the Needs of Tomorrow's Retirees."

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

RELIABLE HOME HEATING ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2086) to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science & Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reliable Home Heating Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO EXTEND EMERGENCY DECLARATIONS FOR PURPOSES OF TEMPORARILY EXEMPTING MOTOR CARRIERS PROVIDING EMERGENCY RELIEF FROM CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATIONS.

(a) *DEFINED TERM.*—*In this Act, the term "residential heating fuel" includes—*

- (1) heating oil;
- (2) natural gas; and
- (3) propane.

(b) *AUTHORIZATION.*—*If the Governor of a State declares a state of emergency caused by a shortage of residential heating fuel and, at the conclusion of the initial 30-day emergency period (or a second 30-day emergency period authorized under this subsection), the Governor determines that the emergency shortage has not ended, any extension of such state of emergency by the Governor, up to 2 additional 30-day periods, shall be recognized by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration as a period during which parts 390 through 399 of chapter III of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply to any motor carrier or driver operating a commercial motor vehicle to provide residential heating fuel in the geographic area so designated as under a state of emergency.*

(c) *RULEMAKING.*—*The Secretary of Transportation shall amend section 390.23(a)(1)(ii) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to conform to the provision set forth in subsection (b).*

(d) *SAVINGS PROVISION.*—*Nothing in this section may be construed to modify the authority granted to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's Field Administrator under section 390.23(a) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to offer temporary exemptions from parts 390 through 399 of such title.*

SEC. 3. ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, using data compiled from the Administration's Weekly Petroleum Status Reports, shall notify the Governor of each State in a Petroleum Administration for Defense District if the inventory of residential heating fuel within such district has been below the most recent 5-year average for more than 3 consecutive weeks.

SEC. 4. REVIEW.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study of, and transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, a report on the impacts of safety from the extensions issued by Governors according to this Act. In conducting the study, the Secretary shall review, at a minimum—

- (1) *the safety implications of extending exemptions; and*
- (2) *a review of the exemption process to ensure clarity and efficiency during emergencies.*

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and there be no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following items, which are post office-naming bills: Calendar Nos. 385, 386, 387, 388, and 389, and that we do those en bloc.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bills be read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate on any one of the five.

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

NATIONAL PARK RANGER MARGARET ANDERSON POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1036) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CORPORAL JUSTIN D. ROSS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 1228) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 1451) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LANCE CORPORAL PHILLIP VINNEDGE POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2391) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SERGEANT WILLIAM MOODY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3060) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE AND APPRECIATION TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AT NORMANDY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 381, S. Res. 421.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 421) expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 421) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to. (The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 10, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 445 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 445) recognizing the importance of cancer research and the contributions of scientists, clinicians, and patient advocates across the United States who are dedicated to finding a cure for cancer, and designating May 2014 as "National Cancer Research Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 445) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 14, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE THREAT OF CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE TO WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 454.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 454) recognizing that cardiovascular disease continues to be an overwhelming threat to women's health and the importance of providing basic preventive heart screenings to women wherever they seek primary care.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 454) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 22, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 22, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 1:45 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes, the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes, and the final 10 minutes equally divided and controlled between Senators LEAHY and PAUL or their designees, with Senator LEAHY controlling the final 5 minutes; and that at 1:45 p.m. the Senate vote on confirmation of the Barron nomination, with all other provisions of previous order remaining in effect; further, that upon disposition of the Barron nomination, the Senate resume legislative session, and pursuant to the previous order, the Chair lay before the Senate the message with respect to the conference report to accompany H.R. 3080; that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the adoption of the conference report, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be two rollcall votes at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:28 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 22, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ARMANDO ORMAR BONILLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE EDWARD J. DAMICH, TERM EXPIRED.

PATRICIA M. MCCARTHY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE EMILY CLARK HEWITT, RETIRED.

JERI KAYLENE SOMERS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE GEORGE W. MILLER, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL DANIEL R. AMMERMAN
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTTIE D. CARPENTER
BRIGADIER GENERAL PHILLIP M. CHURN, SR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL ALLAN W. ELLIOTT
BRIGADIER GENERAL A.CJR. ROPER
BRIGADIER GENERAL TRACY A. THOMPSON

To be brigadier general

COLONEL SANDRA L. ALVEY
COLONEL JAMES A. BLANKENHORN
COLONEL DAVID E. ELWELL
COLONEL STEVEN T. EVEKER
COLONEL CARLTON FISHER, JR.
COLONEL LEBELA J. GRAY
COLONEL DARRELL J. GUTHRIE
COLONEL MARY-KATE LEAHY
COLONEL FREDERICK R. MAIOCCO, JR.
COLONEL JONATHAN J. MCCOLUMN
COLONEL GREGORY J. MOSSER
COLONEL BARBARA L. OWENS
COLONEL JOE D. ROBINSON
COLONEL ALBERTO C. ROSENDE
COLONEL RICHARD C. STAATS
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER W. STOCKEL
COLONEL KELLY E. WAKEFIELD
COLONEL JASON L. WALRATH
COLONEL DONNA R. WILLIAMS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAMON PAUL MARTINEZ, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

STANLEY FISCHER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2006.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

ELISEBETH COLLINS COOK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2020.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DEIRDRE M. DALY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JAMES WALTER FRAZER GREEN, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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:

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4435, the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. I especially want to thank Chairman MCKEON for working with my staff and I to include section 1072 in his Manager Amendment.

As we draw down our presence in Iraq and Afghanistan, military equipment used in theater can be used to enhance border security at home, and in the process, save taxpayer dollars.

Section 1072 modifies current law, last updated in 1996 before the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, which guides the transfer of excess military equipment to provide preference for "border security activities."

This change puts border security, and the Department of Homeland Security, on equal footing with the Department of Justice and the Office of National Drug Control Policy so the Department's border security components can readily tap into excess military equipment on a preferential basis.

In the past, United States Customs and Border Protection has missed out on thousands of articles of DoD excess gear because the equipment is distributed on a first-come first-serve basis, notwithstanding statutory preference in under current law.

Section 1072 will bring the law up to date and will allow the operators on the ground protecting our border to more effectively complete their mission.

Again, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and the staff of the Armed Services Committee for working with me to include this important provision in this year's NDAA.

TRIBUTE TO KUDER, INC.

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Kuder, Inc. of Adel, Iowa for being named a 2014 recipient of the President's "E" Award by the United States Department of Commerce.

On December 5, 1961, the prestigious "E" Award program was created by President

Kennedy through Executive Order to properly recognize American citizens and organizations who significantly contribute to increasing United States exports. United States exports are a crucial part of our economy and support nearly 10 million jobs across the country.

Kuder, Inc. is a growing career and education planning company with an increasing focus on evidence-based career guidance overseas. From Adel, Iowa, Kuder has acquired multiple government contracts in the Middle East and Asia as well as fostering collaboration with private organizations and government agencies in Europe, South America, Asia, and Africa. In total, Kuder has helped more than 150 million people discover their career aspirations. In addition to Kuder, Inc.'s national recognition for its outstanding efforts, Kuder was also recently selected as the Iowa Small Business Exporter of the Year for 2014 by the U.S. Small Business Administration for their outstanding leadership in our state's business community. It is clear that Iowa's own Kuder, Inc. truly represents the spirit of American business and the renowned Iowa work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, the great work done every day by the men and women of the Kuder, Inc. provides a crucial service to their community and our nation as a whole. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Kuder, Inc. for receiving this coveted award and thanking them for their invaluable efforts. It is an honor to represent the people who comprise this leading organization in the United States Congress, and I look forward to many more years of Kuder's innovative and positive impact in Iowa.

HONORING MATTHEW HARTMANN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Matthew Hartmann. Matt is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 175, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Matt has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Matt has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Matt has earned the rank of Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and led his troop as the Assistant Senior Patrol Leader. Matt has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Matt led a team in designing and constructing 30 new signs and replacing 28 burlap targets at the James A. Reed Conservation Area archery range in Lee's Summit, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Matthew Hartmann for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CAPTAIN KYNNIE MARTIN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Captain Kynnie Martin for her service to our country.

Captain Martin served in the United States Army from December 2002 to December 2010. She was assigned to the 3rd Infantry Division Artillery at Ft. Stewart, Georgia, as the Assistant Intelligence Officer. She was subsequently deployed in support of Iraqi Freedom as the 3rd Infantry Division's first Shadow Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Company Executive Officer and Platoon Leader, Camp Taji, Iraq, and as Battalion Intelligence Officer for 703rd Forward Support Battalion, 4th Brigade.

Captain Martin continues her work on behalf of veterans in her civilian career as Senior Recruiter for Veterans and Diversity for Xcel Energy and as Treasurer on the Board of Directors for Women Veterans of Colorado.

Through her courageous service, Captain Martin charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Captain Kynnie Martin for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

Today is a monumental occasion for our nation's economy, for the creation of good-paying jobs, and for the health of our natural environment.

Thanks to the leadership of Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL, we present this Chamber with a thoughtful, reasonable, and optimistic bill that renews this Congress' commitment to our Nation's water-related infrastructure.

In that light, I would like to personally thank our Chairman, our Ranking Member, and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Mr. GIBBS, for the open and inclusive process with which our Committee conducted negotiations with the other body on WRRDA,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and for their leadership in returning our Committee to its long-standing traditions of bipartisanship and collaboration—as exemplified in the Chairmanships of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's father, the former Chairman Shuster, as well as the late-Chairman of this Committee, Chairman Oberstar.

These former Committee leaders knew that a successful outcome can only come from the valuable input from Members on both sides of the aisle, from constructive negotiation, and from mutual respect. That is what we have seen return to this Committee under our current Chairman, and if the final vote tally for this Conference report is as I expect, then this bill ought to serve as a model for how this Congress conducts the American people's business.

Today is also a monumental day, because while this bill is about many things, most importantly, it is about job creation—not only those good construction jobs that will come with the authorization of 34 Chiefs Reports contained in the bill, but also the jobs that rely on a robust network of large and small ports and inland waterways to move goods throughout the United States.

I am especially pleased that this Conference report provides a reasonable path forward to the challenges facing the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

This legislation provides that, within 10 years, 100 percent of the fund proceeds are used for their intended purposes—harbor maintenance—while ensuring that any increase in harbor maintenance does not come at the expense of other critical Corps' programs. I am also thankful that this conference report recognizes the critical importance of our Nation's small ports to our regional and local economies in establishing future funding priorities.

Unfortunately, we could not solve all of the financial challenges facing the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, or the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. That will have to come from continued Congressional attention and future legislative efforts. However, today is a good first step in addressing the most pressing challenges facing each of these funds, and should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, today is also a monumental day because this new WRRDA creates a reasonable and workable process, developed by this chamber, to address the ongoing navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration challenges facing each of our Congressional districts. For the past few years, this Congress has, unfortunately, ceded our constitutional and representative duties to the Executive branch in deciding what is in the best interests of our Congressional districts. This Conference report rightly restores our Congressional discretion in establishing these priorities, as well as the balance between the Congress and the Executive branch in meeting the local challenges of our districts.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, today is a monumental day because, at long last, this WRRDA restores the Federal commitment to our other remaining water infrastructure challenges—our failing sewage and drinking water infrastructure.

First, this Conference Report includes legislation that has eluded this Congress for almost three decades—the reauthorization of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. For decades, this critical, and widely-popular program

has been the leading source of Federal funding to States and communities to address their ongoing water quality challenges. Today, we recommit to this program, and provide additional tools to our States and to our communities to address local water quality challenges in a flexible, cost-effective, and environmentally sustainable manner. I am pleased that much of this language is modeled after legislation (H.R. 1877) that I have introduced over the last few Congresses, and thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their willingness to include this language in the Conference Report.

Finally, this Conference report adopts a modified version of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (or WIFIA) that was approved by the other body. Many of the modifications made to this authority were to address a concern that I had raised about the potential impact of this new authority on the existing Clean Water SRF program. I am confident that these modifications send a clear message of Congressional support for both the existing SRF program, as well as for testing this new WIFIA pilot program, and commit that our Committee will need to revisit this issue in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at the progress we have made together on improving water infrastructure in the United States. Again, I thank the leadership of our Chairman and our Ranking Member for getting us to this point today.

I urge my colleagues to support the Conference Report to H.R. 3080.

HONORING THETA PHI SIGMA
CHRISTIAN SORORITY, INC.

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, since 2009, Theta Phi Sigma Christian Sorority, Inc., has been and continues to be a worthy instrument for good; and

Whereas, the 2014 "Theta Phi Sigma Christian Sorority, Inc., Proverbs Alpha Kingdom Celebration Weekend," is being held this year in Lithuania, Georgia; and

Whereas, Theta Phi Sigma Christian Sorority, Inc., was founded by Dr. Jessica Martin, in Montgomery, Alabama, to promote Christian standards, values and the creative and artistic ideals of the modern woman; and

Whereas, its members give of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to serve our community through projects such as voter registration, health walks, mentorships and scholarships; and

Whereas, the lives of many in our district are touched by the leadership and service given by the ladies of Theta Phi Sigma Christian Sorority, Inc., our nation and the world is a better place due to their commitment to excellence in all of their endeavors; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize their outstanding service to our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim January 18, 2014 as Theta Phi Sigma Christian Sorority, Inc., Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 18th day of January, 2014.

HONORING REVEREND CLAUDE E.
WILSON

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Reverend Claude E. Wilson. Known as a prominent leader in our community and as a devoted husband, father and friend, Reverend Wilson has left an indelible mark on our community. With his passing on May 9, 2014, we look to Reverend Wilson's personal legacy of spiritual service, the joy he inspired and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born on June 11, 1932 in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Reverend Wilson moved to Seattle, Washington with his family at the age of eight. After graduating from Simpson College in San Francisco in 1956, Reverend Wilson went to pursue his Master's degree at the Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary in Mill Valley. He obtained a Masters of Religious Education and a Masters of Divinity. In 1980, Reverend Wilson completed his Doctor of Ministry at the Jesuit School of Theology in Berkeley.

Throughout the 1960s, Reverend Claude Wilson served as a minister of Christian education and assistant to the pastor at McGee Avenue Baptist Church. In 1969, he became the pastor at Havenscourt Community Church, where he served his community for over 44 years. In addition, Reverend Wilson instructed at different institutes and universities, including the Bible Fellowship Institute, Fuller Seminary, and he was a Professor of Pastoral Care for Patten University.

Among Reverend Wilson's many accomplishments, he was also an active community leader and organizer. He served as the President of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance of the East Bay, one of the oldest Black ministerial alliances in Northern California. Reverend Wilson also served as the President of the Northern California Council of Churches. In addition, he was a member of Pastors of Oakland and Love Fellowship of Churches, and was the Intern Chaplain at San Quentin Prison.

Reverend Claude Wilson has left a lasting imprint on our society and communities of faith. Reverend Wilson dedicated more than half of his life to ministry and will be remembered for his wisdom and compassion. In recognition for all of his achievements, a groundbreaking ceremony was held in Monrovia, Liberia naming a building after him: The Doctor Claude E. Wilson Academy.

On a personal note, I will always remember the confidence Reverend Wilson had in me when he endorsed me during my first campaign in 1989 for the California Assembly. He encouraged me and helped me win election after election. I was so proud to list him on my literature as a supporter. More importantly, however, I was proud to call him my friend. Reverend Wilson's smile, his kind words and his prayers reassured me to keep fighting the good fight. He was always there for me and for that, I am forever grateful.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding community leader and individual, Reverend Claude

E. Wilson. His dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the Bay Area. I join all of Claude's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT
DOROTHY HOLMES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Chief Master Sergeant Dorothy Holmes for her service to our country.

Chief Holmes served in the United States Air Force from May 1949 to May 1979. During her distinguished career, she was assigned to numerous locations worldwide, including Europe, Puerto Rico, two tours in Asia and several posts throughout the United States. Chief Holmes was assigned to the United States Air Force Academy in 1976, specifically to serve as a role model and mentor for the first class of female cadets. She distinguished herself by being the first female Chief Master Sergeant assigned to the Air Force Academy.

Chief Holmes was the first African American woman in the United States Air Force to achieve the rank of Chief Master Sergeant, and she was the first woman to retire with 30 years continuous service.

Through her courageous service, Chief Holmes charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Chief Master Sergeant Dorothy Holmes for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 220 on H.R. 3080—"To provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes." I am not recorded because I was absent due to a district issue. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 221 on H.R. 3530—"Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act," I am not recorded because I was absent due to a district issue. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 222 on H.R. 4225—"Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation (SAVE) Act of 2014," I am not recorded because I was absent due to a district issue. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HONORING THE NEW CRJ900 BOMBARDIER/AMERICAN AIRLINES PARTNERSHIP

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a new plane debuted in the skies above Dallas/Ft. Worth International Airport. From the outside it may have resembled other aircraft you've seen, on the inside this state-of-the-art bird offers passengers a better travel experience, with more leg room, bigger overhead bins, and a brighter cabin.

This plane is the CRJ900 NextGen aircraft, a new regional jet built by Bombardier, the world's only manufacturer of both planes and trains. American Airlines will be the first carrier to fly these aircraft, and will begin adding them to their fleet next month.

American Airlines has been an operator of Bombardier's CRJ family of aircraft for a long time. And though we are all familiar with American, our DFW-based airline, you may not be as familiar with Bombardier who also has strong presence in our hometown.

Bombardier employs more than 8,500 people in the U.S., whether at their manufacturing facilities that build aircraft and rail equipment for both domestic and export markets, at their network of service centers that maintain the products they build, or at their flight test, engineering and training centers that are an extension of their core manufacturing operations.

Bombardier has four facilities in the North Texas area alone, including two in the 24th district: Bombardier built and currently operates the Skylink automated people mover at DFW, the free system that swiftly connects passengers to all five airport terminals. Bombardier also has a pilot and technician training facility at DFW, which I had the pleasure to visit last year, where six full-sized, state-of-the-art aircraft simulators train pilots and maintenance technicians on Bombardier aircraft. Pilots and technicians from around the world come to this training facility in my district.

Bombardier is a key employer in the 24th district, and I am excited for American to be the first to take delivery of this sophisticated new regional jet. I congratulate them both on this partnership and look forward to flying on the new CRJ900 in the near future.

HONORING THE GENESIS PHILANTHROPY GROUP

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Genesis Philanthropy Group (GPG) and their mission to develop programs focused on ensuring that Jewish culture, heritage, and values are preserved in Jewish communities throughout the world.

This year, this organization is honoring Michael Bloomberg on his selection as the inaugural Genesis Prize Laureate. The goal of the Genesis Prize, awarded by the Genesis Philanthropy Group, is to instill in the younger generations of the Jewish Diaspora a sense of

belonging—both to a collective future and to a collective past. This \$1 million award is endowed by the Genesis Philanthropy group and is annually presented by the Prime Minister of Israel to an individual who has attained excellence and international renown in their chosen professional field, and whose actions and achievements embody the character of the Jewish people. This award is the result of a unique partnership between the Israeli Prime Minister's office, the Genesis Philanthropy Group, and the Office of the Chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Israel.

The Jewish people have celebrated and relied on the strength of their shared identity throughout history. In today's society there is an increasing emphasis on finding a "global identity", and technology has allowed people to be interconnected in new and fascinating ways. However, it is important to remember the past, and for younger generations to reaffirm their Jewish identity and assert pride in their Jewish heritage by highlighting the inherent Jewish values that inspire the laureates' achievements.

Mr. Speaker, let us stand by the Genesis Philanthropy Group and its important mission of advancing and celebrating Jewish peoplehood.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT: GUN VIOLENCE RESEARCH LEGISLATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce legislation to end the misguided freeze on public health research about firearm safety and gun violence.

For too long, this Congress has put political talking points ahead of real solutions, and our country is a more dangerous place because of it. Every day, 32 Americans are murdered with guns, and a recent study conducted by researchers at New York University's Langone Medical Center and St. Luke's Medical Center found the U.S. has the highest rate of gun-related deaths among a group of 27 developed countries, including four times higher than Canada.

Because of past riders on Appropriations legislation, federal funding for gun violence research came to a halt in the mid-1990s. As a result policymakers and community leaders lack the authoritative public health research they need to address the horrifying persistence of gun violence.

The bill I introduce today, with companion legislation introduced by Senator MARKEY, would right this wrong and authorize \$10 million in annual funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) through Fiscal Year 2020. This funding will allow the CDC to begin the research agenda outlined in a report issued last year by the Institutes of Medicine to identify areas in need of study to better understand the underlying causes of gun violence and best implement strategies for prevention.

We know that public health research can save lives and prevent tragedies. For example, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration funds research to make our roads

and cars safer—and car fatalities have decreased 36 percent in the last 20 years. Other public health crises cannot be left ignored, and I'm proud to introduce this legislation that addresses the epidemic of gun violence and develops best strategies to prevent future incidents.

COLONEL MARY MILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Colonel Mary Miller for her service to our country.

Colonel Miller served in the United States Army from June 1981–June 2011, for a total of 30 years—10 of which were on active duty and 20 years in the Army Reserve. She retired at the rank of colonel. During her distinguished career, Colonel Miller served in a variety of military intelligence assignments worldwide. She was deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom at the Multi National Forces Headquarters in Baghdad where she served as the commander of the 208th Army Liaison Team, 96th Regional Readiness Command.

Colonel Miller continues to serve our nation as a civilian employee at the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Battle Lab in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the Chief of Operations Division.

Through her courageous service, Colonel Miller charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Colonel Mary Miller for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

INTRODUCTION OF A HOUSE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS IN UKRAINE

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a House Resolution Calling for Free and Fair Elections in Ukraine. Ukraine will hold a presidential election this Sunday, May 25, 2014, with the goal of once again reinforcing a democratic legitimacy within the country.

On February 22, 2014, the Ukrainian Parliament voted to remove Victor Yanukovich from the post of President of Ukraine. This election to replace the former president is planned amidst political upheaval that has included violent street protests, Russia's invasion and illegitimate annexation of Crimea, and Russian instigated separatist rebellions throughout the eastern portions of the country.

The prospects this presidential election hold cannot be overstated. It is a decisive marker for a fresh start for Ukraine. Free and fair elections are fundamental for regaining economic and political stability throughout the nation.

The importance of free and fair elections is not lost on the American people. With this resolution we are reaffirming the commitment of

the United States' support of the expression of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law in Ukraine, embodied through elections that are free and fair. Further, we condemn the interference of foreign agitators in pre-election activities and behavior that could adversely impact voter participation during polling.

In the remaining days prior to the election, the focus of the international community will remain on supporting the preparations and ensuring the Ukrainian people understand they are supported in these democratic efforts. Promoting access and participation in free and fair democratic processes must be a priority for America. I encourage my colleagues to support these ideals through this resolution.

No nation across our world suffered more or endured more in the last century's bloody European wars than did Ukraine. Freedom loving people hold a moral obligation to right the wrongs of the past in the present for Ukraine through these historic elections.

May they occur peaceably as thousands of election monitors from across our globe travel to Ukraine to assure that nation a better future.

This weekend in our own Nation, as Memorial Day commemorations ensue, including the 10th Anniversary ceremony here in Washington, D.C. of the dedication of the World War II Memorial, in which I will gratefully participate, let us remember those whose sacrifices made our freedoms possible. And let us pray for those who dream of opportunities America is blessed to enjoy, like the people of Ukraine who have yet known full freedom and whose moment is now.

HONORING DYLAN N. STRAUGHN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dylan N. Straughn. Dylan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 251, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Dylan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Dylan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Dylan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Dylan N. Straughn for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I missed rollcall vote 217, on H.R. 10, Success

and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PASTOR JOE CATANI

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Pastor Joe Catani of Dubois, Pennsylvania for 50 years of service to his community.

Pastor Catani has served as the pastor for three different churches over the span of his fifty year career. From 1971–1997, he served at the Jonestown Bible Church, followed by The Grace Fellowship Church in Wilkes Barre (1997–1999), and finally, the Bressler Bible Church (1999–2014). In addition to his work with the church, he has volunteered as a chaplain for rest homes and has served on mission agency boards. Pastor Catani's efforts have enriched his community, and his selfless service has touched thousands of people, in the states and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years of exemplary pastoral service, I commend Pastor Catani and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

COMMANDER KATHLEEN NOLL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Commander Kathleen Noll for her service to our country.

Commander Kathleen Noll served in the United States Navy Nurse Corps and Navy Reserve from 1972 to 1993 for a total of 21 years. Commander Noll served at Subic Bay, Philippines, when South Vietnam surrendered to North Vietnam, effectively ending the Vietnam War. During her tour in the Philippines, she was part of the Grand Island clinic caring for the civilian Vietnamese refugees and active duty military personnel.

Commander Noll later activated and deployed to the Persian Gulf in Bahrain in support of Operation Desert Storm where they built a fully functioning, fully staffed field hospital in three days. Commander Noll continues her nursing career as a Pediatric Nurse Practitioner for Kaiser Permanente.

Through her courageous service, Commander Noll charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Commander Kathleen Noll for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

HONORING DR. MONTE DEAN BUTLER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Monte Dean Butler for

his 18 years of service to Pacific Union College's Department of Psychology and Social Work. Mr. Butler has dedicated his career to preparing students for a career in social work and to providing social services to the Napa County community, which is both admirable and deserving of recognition.

Mr. Butler was born and raised in Dinuba, California. He attended Pacific Union College, where he received a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies. Mr. Butler then continued his studies at the University of Utah, where he received a Graduate Certificate of Gerontology, a Master of Social Work, and a Ph.D. in Social Work. He returned to Pacific Union College, where he has taught social work courses for 18 years, including 10 years as the Bachelor of Social Work Field Coordinator, 8 years as the Program Director, and 7 years as the chair of the Psychology and Social Work Department.

As Program Director, Dr. Butler managed the Bachelor of Social Work Program's reaffirmation process, which resulted in the program receiving the highest level of affirmation from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Outside of Pacific Union College, Dr. Butler continues to serve the Napa community through his work with numerous organizations. He developed the Angwin Food Pantry in 2006 and he started the Christmas Tree Family Project to help families in need in the Napa community. Dr. Butler has also served as the Volunteer Coordinator for ALDEA Treat Foster Care Program's "Foster Parent University" and he has served as a volunteer for the Get Out the Vote: General Election and Shuttle Service Project and as a home visitor for the COPE Family Resource Center.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Mr. Butler not only for his commitment to social work, but for his commitment to our community. Dr. Butler's unyielding dedication to educating students and providing social services is greatly appreciated by the Napa County community and we wish him further success in an already distinguished career.

THE NECESSITY OF TESTIMONY
FROM SECRETARY OF STATE
JOHN KERRY TO EXPLAIN HIS
DEPARTMENT'S FAILURE TO
COMPLY WITH A CONGRES-
SIONAL SUBPOENA

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, as the House's Select Committee on Benghazi stands up and takes ownership of an investigation that has been conducted jointly by standing committees since the fall of 2012, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has, with your support, one final bit of business scheduled for May 29: subpoenaed testimony from Secretary of State John Kerry about his Department's failure to produce critical documents subject to a lawful subpoena.

On April 17, 2014, the State Department sent a letter informing the Committee that it was producing previously unreleased e-mails subject to prior requests and subpoenas. In this letter the State Department acknowledged

that these documents were responsive to a September 20, 2012, request and an August 1, 2013, subpoena. These subpoenaed documents had been willfully withheld from the Committee and were only turned over after a federal judge ruled against the administration's efforts to block a Freedom of Information Act request from the organization Judicial Watch.

One e-mail in this production showed that White House official Ben Rhodes coordinated talking points for then Ambassador Susan Rice, encouraging an emphasis that the attack was "rooted in an Internet video, and not a failure of policy." This exposed false White House claims that inaccurate statements made by then Ambassador Susan Rice on national television were solely the product of bad information from the intelligence community even though the intelligence community talkers made no reference to an Internet video.

Undaunted, earlier this month, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney argued at a White House press briefing that the Internet video reference in the Ben Rhodes' e-mail was the result of a, "connection between the protests in Cairo and what happened in Benghazi, that's drawn directly from talking points produced by the intelligence community, as testified to by the deputy director of the CIA on multiple occasions."

New evidence obtained by the Oversight Committee, however, contradicts this explanation. An e-mail sent at 9:11 pm eastern time on September 11, 2012, (3:11 am September 12 in Libya) to the Diplomatic Security Command Center under the subject line "Update on response actions—Libya" recounts items discussed in a Secure Video Teleconference attended by senior Administration officials. Among the items noted in this e-mail, one states: "White House is reaching out to YouTube to advise ramifications of the posting of the Pastor Jon Video." Among descriptions of actions from different agencies, the e-mail says nothing else about what the White House was doing that night. This information is troubling for a number of reasons.

First, it contradicts White Press Secretary Jay Carney's claim this month that White House assertions about an Internet video were "drawn directly from talking points produced by the intelligence community." The intelligence community talking points that were used, in part, to brief Ambassador Rice were not even requested until September 14—three days after the attack and the White House's decision to embrace its storyline.

Second, former Libya Deputy of Chief of Mission Gregory Hicks—who spoke to Ambassador Christopher Stevens on the phone during the attack—indicated that it was immediately clear to him that the assault on the Benghazi diplomatic compound was a terrorist attack and not a protest of a YouTube video gone awry. Retired Brigadier General Robert Lovell, who had served as Deputy Director for Intelligence and Knowledge Development at U.S. Africa Command the night of the attack also testified that the assault on the Benghazi compound was clearly identifiable as a terrorist attack and not a protest gone awry. Former Deputy CIA Director Mike Morrell publicly testified that incorrect conclusions by his agency that there had been a protest were made as a result of analysis that took place after, not during, the attack. In fact, reports and evidence collected during the attack and embraced by some Administration officials

specifically pointed to Al Qaeda linked militia Ansar al-Shaira. A State Department draft memo for Secretary Clinton from September 12 about a condolence letter to the mother of slain American Sean Smith actually references both the White House assertion of a YouTube video and the involvement of Ansar al-Sharia.

Third and finally, the e-mail shows the White House had hurried to settle on a false narrative—one at odds with the conclusions reached by those on the ground—before Americans were even out of harm's way or the intelligence community had made an impartial examination of available evidence. According to the e-mail, the White House—at 3:11 am Libya time—had resolved to call YouTube owner Google about an Internet video being responsible for violence more than two hours before Americans Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty were killed by militants at 5:15 am.

Unfortunately Secretary Kerry and the State Department continue to try to keep this information from the public, only turning this document over to Congress last month. While the information I have cited from this e-mail is clearly unclassified, the State Department has attempted to obstruct its disclosure by not providing Congress with an unclassified copy of this document that redacted only classified portions outlining what the Department of Defense and the Secretary of State were doing in response to the attack in Benghazi that night. This tactic prevents the release of the e-mail itself. In advance of Secretary Kerry's testimony, I intend to request that the State Department declassify this e-mail in its entirety. I will also request that a small sample of other documents be declassified and the removal of redactions from other material occur so that the Oversight Committee can have a more meaningful discussion with Secretary Kerry about information that has been inappropriately withheld from Congress.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your support for this hearing and view it as an appropriate conclusion to the transition the House of Representatives has decided to make to a Select Committee. By discussing these issues with Secretary Kerry in a public forum on May 29 at the Oversight Committee, the Select Committee will benefit from an examination of tactics this Administration has employed to obstruct the investigation into the Benghazi terrorist attacks. Oversight is a constitutional responsibility of Congress, but we can only do our job when the executive branch, one way or another, meets its legal responsibilities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 2014, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 198. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on agreeing to H. Res. 568.

HONORING THE W.N. GRIFFIN, JR.,
GOSPEL CHOIR

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, many organizations strive to bring awareness and enlightenment to our community; and

Whereas, the W.N. Griffin, Jr., Gospel Choir formed in November, 1944 presents the gospel through songs of praise and inspiration touching the lives of thousands throughout the world; and

Whereas, today we celebrate the 70th Anniversary of not only a choir, but a ministry that started with the leadership of Reverend J.S. Roddy and seven (7) choir members which has now grown to one hundred twenty (120) members; and has been and continues to be a great gift by witnessing the gospel through music; and

Whereas, our beloved District has a jewel in this choir that touches the hearts, minds and souls of so many; and

Whereas, our community has been strengthened, our lives have been touched and our spirits uplifted by this anointed choir that shares so freely of themselves; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the W.N. Griffin, Jr., Gospel Choir of Saint Philip A.M.E. Church for its outstanding service to our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim February 9, 2014 as The W.N. Griffin, Jr. Gospel Choir Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 9th day of February, 2014.

FIRST LIEUTENANT DIANNE WOLF

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor First Lieutenant Dianne Wolf for her service to our country.

Lieutenant Wolf served in the United States Army Nurse Corps from September 1969 to August 1971. During her service as an Army Nurse, she served a year of duty in Vietnam with the 91st Evacuation Hospital, Republic of Vietnam. She is most proud of having had the opportunity to serve as a nurse while on active duty, including her tour in Vietnam.

After her service, Lieutenant Wolf was hired by the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs where she continued to serve for over 30 years, caring for veterans from various wars and conflicts.

Through your courageous service, Lieutenant Wolf charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to First Lieutenant Dianne Wolf for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America and the Veterans she has served.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 19, 2014, due to a family funeral, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 218, "yea;" on rollcall No. 219, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 222, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

BUSINESS WOMEN'S FORUM

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Business Women's Forum which is celebrating 20 years of supporting female professionals in South Central Pennsylvania.

Since its founding in 1994, the Business Women's Forum has brought together businesswomen and leaders from the South Central region of Pennsylvania for a one day event where they can meet with and learn from other women with a variety of backgrounds and organizations. Today, in partnership with more than nine Central Pennsylvania Chambers of Commerce, it is the largest one-day professional development and tradeshow event in the Central Pennsylvania region. By offering women with opportunities to develop their professional skills and plan for the future, the Business Women's Forum provides an invaluable resource to the businesswomen of South Central Pennsylvania and to the economic vitality of the region.

Mr. Speaker, for their efforts in creating a strong workforce of skilled and developed businesswomen, I thank the Business Women's Forum for their contributions to our state and congratulate them on reaching the momentous milestone of their 20th anniversary.

A TRIBUTE TO HAGOP AND KNAR
MANJIKIAN

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Hagop Jack Manjikian and Knar Rita Manjikian for the books they have published on the Armenian Genocide. An estimated 1.5 million Armenians perished between 1915 and 1923, but the statistics only tell part of the story. The first person accounts of the Genocide, which the Manjikian had translated to

English in order to reach a broad audience, put a human face on the violence and suffering experience by the Armenians, as well as their unflagging will to survive.

"The Fatal Night"—(Volume 2) Mikayel Shamtanchian was among the hundreds of Armenian intellectuals rounded up on the night of April 24, 1915, and deported to the interior of Turkey, where the Turkish genocide of Armenians began. The author beat the odds and survived the first genocide of the 20th century. His memoir, *The Fatal Night*, is a detailed account of the extermination of Turkey's Armenian cultural and civic leadership in 1915. Shamtanchian recorded the fates of the innocent Armenian luminaries who perished in Anatolia—the echoes of "Lord, Have Mercy," the last hymn sung by the Armenian priest and music ethnologist Komitas and a throng of exiles held in a Turkish military fort, and the pangs of authors Daniel Varuzhan and Sevak as they were slaughtered in the field of death called Ayash. The book provides a partial list of the Armenian intellectuals, civic leaders and priests who were martyred during the Genocide.

"Death March" (Volume 3)—Shahen Derderian was barely eight years old when the Ottoman Turkish government deported his family, along with the entire Armenian community of his native Sebastia (now Sivas). The uprooting was part of an elaborate Turkish plan to exterminate the Armenian population of Anatolia. In the ensuing forced marches, the Sebastia caravan—one among countless others—was subjected by the Turkish police and hired criminals to a systematic spree of murder, robbery, rape, and death by starvation and disease. Young Shahen Derderian survived the carnage through sheer miracle. In *Death March*, he tells a harrowing story of dehumanization and loss, whose enormity would eventually be matched only by the Armenian survivors' spirit of renewal.

"The Crime of the Ages" (Volume 4)—In 1919 Sebuh Aguni chronicled the large-scale plunder, deportations, and massacres that were systematically perpetrated by the Turkish government in its effort to exterminate the Armenian population of Turkey. The *Crime of the Ages*—the first English translation of Aguni's study—is an invaluable work of historiography as it encompasses not only firsthand victim accounts of the Turkish atrocities, but a wealth of evidential information culled from Turkish, European, and American official sources. Brimming with the eloquent, vivid narrative of a journalist and survivor, *The Crime of the Ages* portrays, in prodigious documentary detail, one of history's most heinous crimes, the Genocide of the Armenians.

"Defying Fate" (Volume 5)—For the fifth volume of the Genocide Library, we chose the memoirs of Mr. and Mrs. Aram and Dirouhi Avedian, both of whom were survivors of the Genocide of Armenians by the Turks. Aram Avedian's writing consisted of a small book of handwritten notes titled "The dark days I've lived." Dirouhi Avedian's memoirs comprised a relatively longer, though still compact, handwritten diary titled "My life." Originally written in Armenian and translated to English, their memoirs reveal a childhood of sorrow and anguish as they relate how they lost their families and how they survived thanks to the kindness of strangers. Their infrangible faithfulness toward their cultural identity leads them to risk their lives and escape their circumstances. Amidst the tragedy, a happy ending emerges.

"Our Cross" (Volume 6)—Our Cross is a collection of autobiographical short stories about survivors of Mets Yeghern, the 1915 Genocide of the Armenians. M. Salpi (Aram Sahakian) was a medical officer in the Turkish army during the First World War. In the course of his service, he met many Armenian soldiers and officers who recounted to him the plight of their families following the deportations and massacres of their communities by the Turkish government. After his capture by the British, Sahakian was appointed resident doctor at an Armenian refugee camp in Port Said, Egypt. Here, as well as during his sojourns in Syria and Lebanon, he met numerous Genocide survivors who struggled to rebuild their lives. Sahakian found their experiences at turns heartbreaking and inspiring, and went on to portray them in his writings. Complementing the laser-sharp observations of a man of science with the compassion and sensitivity of someone who himself had walked the path of devastation, Sahakian's stories pulsate with unforgettable images and characters, each a microcosm of a nation's cataclysm but also its irrepressible will to endure.

I hereby ask all Members to join me in honoring Hagop Jack Manjikian and Knar Rita Manjikian for their efforts to keep the memories of those who experienced the Armenian Genocide alive.

HONORING JOE CAPPUZZELLO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of an exemplary public servant, Joe Cappuzzello from Girard, Ohio. After 39 years working in the school system, Mr. Cappuzzello will be retiring from Girard High School as athletic director.

Under his guidance as assistant Athletic Director, Girard won the 1992–93 state Division II boys' basketball championship. Joe later became Girard High School's first full-time athletic director.

A Girard native, Joe is truly a leader in our community and has proven this by his dedication to educational values. Joe has advocated the importance of balancing athletics and education in schools today and has personally worked toward achieving this objective through his work as Athletic Director and teacher at Girard High School.

I want to extend my warm and sincere thanks to Joe Cappuzzello for his lifelong devotion to educating and coaching students in Trumbull County. I would like to wish him congratulations on all he has accomplished and all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF LT. COL. BILLIE OLIN LENDERMAN, JR.

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Lt. Col. Billie

Lenderman. Billie was born on May 19, 1949 in Atlanta, Georgia, attended Auburn University, and earned an MBA from Georgia College and State University. He served in the United States Air Force for twenty years. He fought during Desert Storm, served as a command pilot and instructor pilot in the KC-135, and retired in 1992 after acting as the Commander of the 912th Air Refueling Squadron. After his retirement, Billie worked as a program manager for TRW and as Chief Instructor Pilot of JSTARS training for the Air Force.

Billie served our country with honor and courage. His service to our country and his contributions to our community can never be quantified. His generation gave us the freedom that we've enjoyed all our lives. I am confident that his distinguished service record and many accolades do not even come close to telling his story. Like so many of his fellow soldiers, he returned home to start a family, raise his children, and pursue the American dream he fought for. Besides being the consummate American hero, Billie was a loving husband, devoted father, and doting grandfather.

My thoughts and prayers are with Billie's family during this difficult time. It's heroes and family men like Billie that make our country great. They will continue to bless us, and their memory will carry on. I feel honored to stand today and recognize the memory of Billie Lenderman. He will be truly missed.

LUCILE WISE, WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Women Airforce Service Pilot (WASP) Lucile Wise for her service to our country.

Lucile served in the Women Air Service Pilots (WASP) from May 1943–December 1944. She joined the military because she loved to fly and wanted to help the war effort. After an intense six months' training, Lucile received her flying wings and was assigned to the Air Force Weather Regional Office where she carried weather officers on inspection trips and to meetings. Lucile felt her WASP experience was important, because it gave the opportunity to show women could fly military aircraft just as well as men.

Lucile became a strong advocate for the WASP organization, and in 1988 she was elected their president. She was instrumental in the organization's efforts to obtain Congressional military recognition and veterans' benefits for the WASP. In 2010, along with the other remaining WASP women, Lucile was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal.

Through her courageous service, Lucile charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Women Airforce Service Pilot Lucile Wise for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 19, 2014, I was unable to be present for the last vote in a series of recorded votes. I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 219 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 685, as amended).

HONORING UNITED ASSOCIATION LOCAL 342

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, and Congressman ERIC SWALWELL to honor the United Association (UA2 Local Union 342, which is celebrating its 100 anniversary. For 100 years, UA Local 342 has trained and represented qualified journeymen and apprentices in the trades of plumbing, pipefitting and heating, ventilation, air conditioning and refrigerating (HVACR) across Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in Northern California.

Chartered on May 1, 1914, UA Local 342 started with just over 21 members, working tirelessly in support of the rights of workers in the pipe trades industries. Today, they represent over 3,200 members. Over the years, Local 342 has been essential in leading various projects and ongoing maintenance of regional infrastructure including at four refineries, two chemical plants, and ten cogeneration plants in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. In addition, their work has positively impacted major hospitals in the area, including Sutter Hospital, Highland Hospital, and Kaiser Hospital in both Oakland and San Leandro.

United Association Local 342 promotes a high standard of excellence, focusing on worker safety and providing rigorous training for each union member. The apprenticeship program has been recognized at the national level for its quality training. Many apprentices have competed and won in state, regional and national level competitions.

Moreover, UA Local 342 is dedicated to supporting and giving back to their community. Among the many donations to local high schools and community colleges, Local 342 members also participate in local food drives at Alameda and Contra Costa County Food Banks. In addition, members of Local 342 have volunteered their services to improve Shepherd's Gate, a safe haven for abused women, by installing plumbing in their facility.

We commend the United Association Local 342 for leading the charge in the fight for worker's rights. In addition, we applaud the men and women of Local 342 for their dedication to preparing and training their membership for the advancements in technology and the challenges of today's expanding and diverse industry.

On behalf of the residents of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, we congratulate the

United Association Local 342 on this important milestone and thank you for the invaluable service you provide to our community. We wish you all the best as you forge ahead toward another 100 years of protecting the rights of workers.

IN HONOR OF MAYOR JULIE
SCHRECK

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the life of former Bradley Beach Mayor Julie Schreck. Mayor Schreck passed away on May 4, 2014 after a life filled with numerous personal and professional accomplishments.

Prior to serving as the first female mayor of Bradley Beach, Mayor Schreck worked in the corporate communications and training field for 25 years. She began her career in public service as a councilwoman for the Borough of Bradley Beach. After four years as mayor, she became the Admissions Director at Voyagers' Community School, where her daughter is a student.

During her tenure as mayor of Bradley Beach, Mayor Schreck promoted her interest in the environment and the arts. Her administration focused on sustainability, community-building and equity and supported an open and accountable government.

The daughter of Pat and Ray Schreck, Mayor Schreck was born in New Haven, Connecticut on July 27, 1962. She was a scholar and an athlete in high school and college, graduating Fordham University with a Bachelor's degree in English. Mayor Schreck leaves behind a loving family, including her husband Joseph West and 8 year-old daughter Molly West, her parents and siblings Rachel Schreck, Kristina Ellis and Rich Schreck.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Mayor Schreck for her dedication to her family, leadership to the Bradley Beach community and her commitment to each endeavor she undertook.

SUPPORT OF OUR STRATEGIC
ALLY, ISRAEL

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, rise today in support of our strategic ally, and the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel.

Over 65 years ago, the Nation of Israel was founded and the Jewish people returned to their long-promised homeland.

In the Middle East, it is vital that Israel and the United States continue to protect our shared values including our commitment to liberty, equality and religious freedom.

I am pleased to see that the House Armed Services Committee restored funding to joint U.S.-Israeli missile defenses.

Israel's security should be our first priority but this includes more than just weapons funding.

I support the talks and negotiations currently taking place with Iran.

As the Obama Administration continues talks with Iran, we, in Congress, have a responsibility to continue considering additional sanctions in case the talks fail.

The Iranians must understand that weapons grade uranium enrichment will not be tolerated and that the United States and Israel's security will be protected.

We will continue to monitor the negotiations closely and Congress will not hesitate to act should further sanctions become necessary.

PRIVATE SHIRLEY BROWN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Private Shirley Brown for her service to our country.

Private Brown heard the call to join the military after President Roosevelt's speech to the country in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor. She was only 18 at the time and had to wait until she turned 20 to join the service. On her 20th birthday, Shirley and her mother took the bus to the recruiting station where she joined the United States Marine Corps and served from March 1944 to December 1945.

Private Brown's most memorable times during her military service was learning to drive in a convoy and repairing military trucks.

Private Brown served courageously, and she charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Private Shirley Brown for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF
TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this legislation.

I was a U.S. Attorney for several years.

My staff and I prosecuted a prostitution ring. There were several defendants.

All the defendants were convicted.

The convictions were affirmed on appeal.

Women and girls from in their twenties down to their teens, low teens, were kidnapped, tortured mentally and physically, and raped, repeatedly.

A wire tap revealed that the defendants were on the phone complaining that their hands hurt so much from beating the victims to get them to do what they did not want to do.

The sentences of the defendants were lengthy.

In fact, one of the ring leaders, who went by the name William "Sleazy T" Williams, an appropriate name, received 45 years in prison.

This is the quintessential reason why we must pass this legislation.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE HAM-
TRAMCK POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an important milestone in the City of Hamtramck as the community comes together to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the Hamtramck Police Department.

When Hamtramck first incorporated as a village in 1901, the tight-knit community was served by a single Marshall, Charles Johnson. For the first twelve years of its existence, Hamtramck was served by one law enforcement officer. On November 14, 1914, under the leadership of Marshall Bernard Whalen, the Hamtramck Village Police Force was formed. As the Hamtramck community entered the 1920s, the police force began to develop and take shape.

Hailed as a progressive organization for its time, the Hamtramck Police Department employed multiple African American officers beginning in the 1920s. When Officer Harry Wurmuskerken became chief in 1922, he oversaw the specialization of the department into bureaus to better serve the people of Hamtramck. Just two years later, the Hamtramck Police added a Women's Division to the department under the direction of Mrs. Susan Glinski. This division provided significant support to women and families living in the community. Thanks to its efforts, Hamtramck had one of the lowest juvenile delinquency rates in Michigan.

Over the decades that followed, the department grew along with the City of Hamtramck, reaching its peak of 120 officers in the 1940s. The department implemented many new technologies that helped increase responsiveness and public safety, including new patrol cars, a Teletype machine, a fire signal system, and a Western Electric one way radio system. During this time, thanks to the efforts and sacrifices of its officers in uniform, Hamtramck was named Safest City in America by AAA in 1946.

Following the peak of Hamtramck's population, the police department, just as its counterparts in neighboring municipalities, faced a period of tribulation where its officers faced increasing crime rates coupled with decreasing population and resources. In spite of these challenges, the men and women of the Hamtramck Police Department have been vigilant to protect their vibrant and diverse community. Their efforts are an important part of revitalizing the Southeast Michigan region and I commend the officers of the Hamtramck Police Department for their bravery and service to the community. The 100th Anniversary of the police department is a great milestone in the history of Hamtramck and I wish the officers of the department continued success and safety in their ongoing endeavors to protect their community.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JEWISH COUNCIL ON URBAN AFFAIRS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Jewish Council on Urban Affairs, JCUA, on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary.

From its inception in 1964, the enduring mission of JCUA has always been to combat poverty, racism, and anti-Semitism, working in partnership with Chicago's diverse communities. Guided by the Jewish principles of "tzedek" (justice) and "tikkun olam" (repairing the world), JCUA has reached across faith, race, and class to pursue social and economic justice for those most affected by poverty and discrimination.

JCUA has been an active and leading voice in Chicago for five decades. During that time, JCUA has facilitated the development and preservation of thousands of units of affordable housing, advocated for public policies that address the root causes of poverty, and educated and mobilized a Jewish constituency to create a more just Chicago.

During JCUA's 50 years of working in Chicago's diverse communities, it has also fostered deep relationships and built an understanding and trust with the organizations with which they partner. By bringing Jewish voices and Jewish participation to their issues—as partners and allies—JCUA continues to tackle root causes of injustice to create positive systemic change.

While the specific campaigns, issues, and challenges in Chicago have changed, poverty and racism continue as modern day plagues, creating enormous obstacles and threatening the humanity of everyone. Today, JCUA pursues social and economic justice through issue-based campaigns, community investment, and building bridges between the Jewish community and communities challenged by poverty and discrimination.

JCUA's Community Ventures Program provides zero-interest loans to spur the creation of affordable housing and economic development projects. One loan recently allowed St. Leonard's Ministries to help open the doors of Gracie's Café in partnership with St. Leonard's Ministry, providing jobs and training for formerly incarcerated men and women.

Through ongoing solidarity and partnership with grassroots community groups, JCUA demonstrates that effectively addressing the root causes of social injustice in partnerships and in coalitions with those directly impacted is the most effective way to combat systemic oppression.

JCUA's Jewish Muslim Community Building Initiative, in partnership with Muslim groups, continues to build strong bridges between Jewish and non-Jewish communities. These relationships help to dissolve barriers of potential bigotry and ignorance and to foster a culture of genuine understanding and respect.

And finally, JCUA plants seeds for a better future through its teen social justice program, Or Tzedek, engaging youth as active leaders and organizers in current social justice campaigns. Or Tzedek provides teens with inspiration and the know-how to be powerful and effective agents of social change.

The Jewish Council on Urban Affairs remains as relevant today as it was 50 years ago—serving as an essential Jewish voice for social justice. I join others in the Chicago area offering my gratitude for JCUA's five decades of service.

HONORING KEVIN BAKER

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Kevin Baker, an American History teacher from Springfield, Missouri, who led his 30th annual school trip to Washington, D.C., this spring.

On March 11, 2014, Kevin completed his 30th school trip to Washington with a group of nearly 100 students from Pershing Middle School in Springfield, Missouri. While in Washington, the students visited the Capitol, Library of Congress, Smithsonian museums, and the many monuments along the National Mall celebrating our heritage.

It is no easy task to plan and coordinate a trip involving such a large number of students and parents, but the support of the Springfield community helps make these trips a continued success, including the help of Anne Lanzlotta, the group's tour guide for the last 28 years, and his fellow teachers Scott Corn and Cale McAninch who have assisted him on the annual trips for the last 15 years.

Kevin's passion for American history runs through his family. His wife Valerie and two sons Tristan and Trevor have attended multiple trips and not only encourage his efforts, they enjoy them. Kevin continues the tour of the capital because he wants all of his students to experience the history of our country through the monuments, museums, and memorials, as well as to share that love for country, that awestruck feeling he received every time he traveled to Washington. He credits his work ethic to the examples set by his parents, Luther and Joyce, and the support he received growing up from his younger brother Dwight.

Kevin hopes that these annual trips will motivate or inspire some of his young students to return to Washington as elected officials and embrace new ideas for the future of our great nation. He credits the Springfield community for making so many of these trips possible. The education of a child is a once in a lifetime experience, and the immersion into our history and political process makes the efforts well worth it.

RECOGNIZING JOHNNY HARRIS' 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Johnny Harris Restaurant of Savannah, which will celebrate the 90th anniversary of its founding this May. This barbeque joint has been a mainstay for the people of Savannah since it opened its doors as a simple roadside establishment on May 1, 1924, and it

has always been one of my favorite spots in Savannah.

The Johnny Harris Restaurant is one of the oldest food service providers in the city. Much to the amusement of native Savannahians, the restaurant has a long history of serving its customers with entertainment in addition to excellent food and legendary barbeque sauce. When Johnny Harris, founder and namesake of the restaurant, first moved to the Victory Drive location, there was a small zoo directly behind the property. His wife, Mrs. Harris, often took of the zoo's monkeys on carriage rides around the neighborhood to the delight of local children.

For Johnny Harris, the customer has always been the number one priority. It was the first restaurant in Savannah to install an air conditioning system for its dance floor as well as a revolving bandstand. It remained in business through the Great Depression and is exemplary of hard work, perseverance, and hospitality of Savannahians. I am proud to congratulate Johnny Harris Restaurant as it celebrates this historic milestone.

CONDOLENCES REGARDING MINE EXPLOSION IN TURKEY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the recent mining disaster in Soma, Turkey, which has now claimed 301 lives, and I extend my deepest condolences to the people of Turkey who struggle to make sense of this unfortunate accident. My thoughts and prayers are with both the families mourning the loss of their loved ones, and with the injured as they begin their long journey to recovery.

Turkey is a longstanding friend and ally of the United States. From the Cold War to the fight against international terror, we have stood together against challenges and threats and we stand again in solidarity with our Turkish friends at this very difficult time. On behalf of myself and my constituents, I wish to offer the people of Soma, and the people of Turkey, our deepest sympathies.

RECOGNITION OF EXEMPLARY ACT PERFORMANCE

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 10 outstanding high school seniors from Carroll County, Tennessee. These scholars were recently recognized by the Carroll County Chamber of Commerce for their academic excellence in scoring a 29 or better on the national ACT test. This accomplishment ranks the students among the top seven percent in the nation of all the students who took the ACT exam.

I commend—Brandon Barker, Micah Bullock, Dan Hoffman, Joshua Howell, Corey Kleppe, Joshua Malley, Robert Medford, Katelyn Ridley, Lucas Simmons and Kelsey

Wallace—for their academic achievement, commitment to high standards, and as a shining example of the educational quality found throughout West Tennessee.

The American College Testing (ACT) is a standardized test for high school achievement and college admission. The test consists of four concentrations: English, mathematics, reading and science reasoning, with an optional writing component. The main four tests are scored individually on a scale of 1 to 36.

On behalf of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, I congratulate all these individuals and wish them the best of luck for all future endeavors. I am extremely proud of you all.

SERGEANT JENNIFER LATINI

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sergeant Jennifer Latini for her service to our country.

Sergeant Latini served in the United States Army and Army National Guard from 1989 to 1995. She was assigned to the Defense Intelligence Agency where she used her Arabic language and knowledge of Arabic culture during her deployment to Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. She continues to use her skills and passion for veterans' issues by serving as the Secretary for the United Veterans Committee of Colorado.

Through her courageous service, Sergeant Latini charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Sergeant Jennifer Latini for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,479,199,305,480.74. We've added \$6,852,322,256,567.70 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$6.8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I attended the funeral of a family member and missed votes on May 19, 2014 and May 20, 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of the following bills:

1. H.R. 2203—To provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy

2. H.R. 685—American Fighter Aces Congressional Gold Medal

3. Agreeing to the Conference Report on H.R. 3080—Water Resources Reform and Development Act

4. H.R. 3530—Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act

5. H.R. 4225—Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation (SAVE) Act

PAYING TRIBUTE TO COLONEL TONY KROGH'S DEDICATED MILITARY SERVICE TO OUR NATION

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the attention of the House to Colonel Tony Krogh, United States Army, for his extraordinary dedication to duty and selfless service to the United States of America. Colonel Krogh is retiring after an exemplary 28 year career in service to his country. He has been recognized with numerous awards, including the Legion of Merit Award, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service and Expeditionary Medal, and the Humanitarian Service Medal.

A native of Birmingham, Alabama, Tony earned his commission as an Officer in the United States Army from the ROTC program at the University of Alabama, where he was recognized as a Distinguished Military Graduate. He served first as an engineer and later as a Models and Simulations Officer with numerous operational assignments in Germany; Fort Drum, NY; Fort McPherson, GA; and Saudi Arabia. His combat deployments include Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom, where he served as the chief of current operations for Joint Task Force 7. He also excelled as the lead for a Partnership for Peace military exercise that involved planning, coordination, and execution with 42 countries. Because of his demonstrated superior understanding of Corps operations, he was selected by the Corps Commander as the interim Deputy G-3 and Deputy Chief of Operations.

In recognition of his superior performance, Tony was specifically chosen in 2005 to lead the Army's effort to integrate mission command systems. He skillfully led a Combat Identification effort that for the first time allowed common operating pictures across all services, reducing the risk of accidental deaths for U.S. and Coalition forces. Simultaneously, Tony led the effort for the Army's first "Battle Command Strategy," published in 2006, which created a service wide battle command architecture that is still in use today.

Immediately after his training at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in 2008, Tony was appointed as the Director of Simulation at the Aviation Center of Excellence. He leveraged his extensive technical background and operational experience to produce realistic training exercises that readied 21 aviation brigades for deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan.

He provided the leadership and strategic vision for Aviation simulators and simulation programs across the U.S. Army, while managing a \$1.8 billion service contract and the largest collection of high fidelity, full motion simulators in the world.

In 2010, having been recognized as the Army's foremost authority on training simulations, Tony became the first Colonel centrally selected to be the Director of the National Simulation Center (NSC). In that capacity, he provided the U.S. Army with state-of-the-art training simulation capabilities from individual soldier to theater level command exercises. Simultaneously, he was given the responsibility for the Army's efforts with Live, Virtual, and Constructive (LVC) Integrated Training. His direct involvement created the most realistic and affordable training across camps, posts and stations the Army has ever known.

In July of 2012, Colonel Krogh was selected to serve as the Executive Officer for the Deputy Chief of Staff for Programs (G-8) where he swiftly established much needed procedures and high standards. After an extremely successful first year, he rebuilt the G-8's Initiatives Group and as Director, focused efforts on shaping and promoting Army equities across numerous communities at the strategic level.

Throughout his successful career, Colonel Krogh has been anchored by the strength of his wife and partner, Kim. Through her generous spirit and loving support, she has selflessly stood by Tony's side, taking care of their family through countless moves and stressful deployments. At every step of the way, Mrs. Krogh has sought community leadership and volunteer positions within military and local communities. Her endeavors include major fundraising for scholarships, Toys for Tots, and renovating youth sports facilities; volunteering for school programs, local animal rescues, and animal therapy for hospital patients and the elderly; and establishing community websites to link family members. In fact, Kim was selected as "Community Volunteer of the Year" in Heidelberg, Germany. Mrs. Krogh embodies the ideals we cherish: strength, loyalty, commitment and selfless service. Her sacrifices and accomplishments as well have earned our admiration.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to recognize Colonel Tony Krogh and his nearly three decades of dignified and distinguished service. On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending his contributions and the mark he has made on the United States Army. We wish Tony, his wife Kim, and their two children, Mary Ashley and Erickson, all the best as they embark on their next journey.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 221, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
EULESS MAYOR MARY LIB SALEH

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Honorable Mary Lib Saleh who is retiring from her position as the Mayor of Euless, Texas, after 21 years of service. Mayor Saleh has been an instrumental leader in the successful growth of Euless and the greater North Texas region. Throughout her tenure, the City of Euless has developed into a premiere location where families want to live, businesses want to operate, and people want to visit.

Mayor Mary Lib Saleh was elected as the first female mayor of Euless in 1993 after serving two years as a council member and two years as mayor pro tem. Prior to her service on the council, Mayor Saleh was an at-home mother of five children. She was active in church, scouts, school activities, and the PTA where she holds a Texas Lifetime Membership. All five of her children are now married, and her family has grown to include seven grandchildren.

During Mayor Saleh's time in office, the City of Euless has greatly developed its infrastructure. Some of the developments that have occurred over the last two decades include an outstanding library, which has been voted the best in Northeast Tarrant County; a State recognized municipal golf course; a premier park with great baseball stadiums; a state-of-the-art police and courts facility; new public works and parks buildings; a new fire station; revitalization of all city buildings, including City Hall; and Veterans Park, complete with a beautiful Eagle and Liberty Bell sculpture.

Mayor Saleh serves on a number of local boards that address healthcare, business, and transportation. She has also founded community organizations such as the Women in Government organization for Tarrant County elected women and directed the formation of the Mayor's Roundtable as a branch of the Northeast Leadership Forum.

Mayor Saleh is a proponent of public art, historical preservation, and education; furthermore, she has been instrumental in bringing talented people together who have been successful in documenting the history of the city through photographs, written histories, and historical markers.

Mayor Saleh spearheaded an art program with the mission of sharing original artwork at public facilities. The art program has most notably impacted the community with ten beautiful original bronze statues created by a Texas artist. In addition to public art around the city, Mayor Saleh formed the Euless Library Foundation to enhance the artistic image of the library and provide educational programs. As a result, the Foundation has provided two bronze statues for the library grounds.

Under Mayor Saleh's leadership, the City of Euless won the prestigious U.S. Conference of Mayors City Livability Award in 2006 for a composting program developed for its citizens. In 2008, Euless was also selected by Business Week as the Best Small City in Texas to Raise Children, and Money Magazine rated the Euless as one of the Best Small Cities in

the United States. In 2009, Euless, Bedford, and Hurst jointly received the North Texas Council of Governments Regional Cooperation Award, and in 2012, Euless received the award again alongside Arlington, Fort Worth, and Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport.

Many organizations have recognized Mayor Saleh for her contributions and leadership. The distinctions Mayor Saleh has earned include the Clyde Mooney and the Gertrude Tarpley Spirit Award from the HEB Chamber of Commerce, Legacy of Women Honoree for Volunteerism from the Women's Shelter, and the prestigious title of Tarrant County's Most Influential Woman in 1998.

Mayor Saleh has also been a terrific partner with my congressional office. With her assistance, my office has been able to host numerous events for the constituents of the 24th District such as town halls, Congressional Art Competition ceremonies, community casework meetings, and veterans fairs.

Mayor Saleh has enjoyed much success during her time in public office. Her impact on the City of Euless, as well as North Texas, has been tremendous. Mayor Saleh's presence on the Euless City Council will be sorely missed, but her legacy in the area will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking the Honorable Mary Lib Saleh for her years of service on the Euless City Council.

HONORING DR. HELEN J.H.
STEPHENS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Dr. Helen J.H. Stephens. Known throughout the Bay Area and the Nation as a great gospel singer, community leader and as a dedicated mother, grandmother and great-grandmother, Dr. Stephens has left an indelible mark on our community. With her passing on May 3, 2014, we look to the outstanding quality of her life's work and the inspiring role she played in many lives through gospel music and as a spiritual leader.

Born in New Orleans, Louisiana, Dr. Helen Stephens began performing at a young age. While attending Booker T. Washington High School, Dr. Stephens played the piano for weekly assembly programs, sang in the school choir, performed in operettas and was active in the school band. After she obtained a music degree from Dillard University, she married Arnold E. Stephens in 1950, and then moved to Oakland, California three years later.

Once in California, Dr. Stephens quickly began organizing many successful vocal groups, including the "Stephens Singers" in 1965 and "The Voices of Christ" in 1969. "The Voices of Christ" began with 23 members and quickly grew to 92 within a year. The choir has recorded eight albums and has received numerous awards. "The Voices of Christ" was inducted into the Bay Area Gospel Academy Awards Hall of Fame.

Among Dr. Helen Stephens' many accomplishments, she was an active community

leader and organizer. She founded the Northern California Chapter of the Gospel Workshop of America and was the chapter representative. In addition, she taught at several colleges, including the College of Marin in Kentfield and at Dominican College, and she introduced and incorporated gospel music into the curriculum for California State University, East Bay.

Dr. Helen Stephens has left a lasting imprint on our society and communities of faith. In 1992, Dr. Stephens was appointed to the National Board of Directors of the Gospel Music Workshop of America in Chicago, Illinois. In addition, she served on the Marin Arts Council in Marin County, serving two one-year terms. For her extraordinary work, Dr. Stephens was recognized with an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Music Ministry from the Belle Grove Theological Seminary in 2004.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual and gospel leader, Dr. Helen J.H. Stephens. Her dedication and efforts have helped to spread the inspiration of gospel music and have impacted so many lives throughout the nation. I join all of Helen's loved ones in celebrating her incredible life. She will be deeply missed.

TRIBUTE TO LAURA AGLE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, twenty five years ago, Ms. Laura Agle accepted a calling to serve others by becoming a staff member with the South DeKalb YMCA; and

Whereas, she has served the citizens of our District with great care, concern and professionalism, by inspiring, educating and motivating; giving a boost to those aspiring to be in the best physical shape of their lives; and

Whereas, she has shared her time and talents, giving the citizens of our District a friend, a community leader and an inspiring servant, who ensured that physical fitness and wellness opportunities are available to all; and

Whereas, Ms. Agle is a cornerstone in our community enhancing the lives of many for the betterment of our District and our Nation; and

Whereas, on her retirement from the South DeKalb YMCA, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Laura Agle for exemplary service and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim January 31, 2014 as Ms. Laura Agle Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 31st day of January, 2014.

SERGEANT NORA MUND

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sergeant Nora Mund for her service to our country.

Sergeant Mund served in the United States Marine Corps from August 2006 to November 2012. She was the first female assigned to serve as the senior armor-small arms repair technician for the Marine Corps Infantry Officer's Course, Quantico, Virginia.

Sergeant Mund volunteered to deploy to Iraq with Operation Enduring Freedom and was selected to serve on the Marine Corps' first Female Engagement Team. She worked directly with the Afghan population and on foot patrol. During her deployment she was assigned to the 1st Battalion 6th Marines, Charlie Company, and 2nd Battalion 6th Marines, Golf Company. She was medically retired due to injuries sustained during her tour in Afghanistan, and she is currently a full time student at the University of Colorado—Denver. She is participating in a research internship with "Canines Providing Assistance to Wounded Warriors."

Through her courageous service, Sergeant Mund charted the path for future generations of women to serve in the military. I extend my deepest appreciation to Sergeant Nora Mund for her dedication, integrity and outstanding service to the United States of America.

CONGRATULATING THE 2014 U.S.
PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLARS

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 141 high school seniors across the country that have been named a part of the 50th class of U.S. Presidential Scholars as a result of their academic success, leadership, community service, and commitment to excellence.

I am particularly proud students from my District, William P. Lamb of Memphis University School and Kevin J. Sun of Collierville High School, have been selected as two of the four students from Tennessee for this prestigious honor. I commend them both for being positive role models to young people across our great state, and the country through their commitment to academic excellence and community service.

The White House Commission on Presidential Scholars selected the members of this year's Presidential Scholars class from 3,900 qualified candidates who are among the three million students expected to graduate high school this year.

Once again, congratulations to Mr. Lamb and Mr. Sun for their outstanding accomplishments. I am very proud of you both.

HONORING KENNETH J. HAMMOND

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Yeoman First Class Kenneth J. Hammond, an Enlisted Surface Warfare Specialist (ESWS), and an exemplary community volunteer for Food Forward, an organization dedicated to promoting

food justice and making change around hunger in our community.

Born in Ukiah, California, YN1 Hammond graduated from Temecula Valley High School and joined the United States Navy on July 16, 1996. Over the years, YN1 Hammond has had a distinguished career in the Navy. YN1 Hammond is currently serving the sailors and officers of U.S. Naval Mobile Construction Battalion FIVE (NMCB 5) as the Administrative Department Leading Petty Officer. His work has earned him many accolades and awards that demonstrate his personal vigor and professional work ethic.

In addition to his honorable service in the Navy, YN1 Hammond is equally as dedicated and selfless in his community. As a Pick Leader, Neighborhood Captain, and Board Advisor for Food Forward, YN1 Hammond has volunteered over 787 hours, has picked over 40,000 pounds of fruit, and has recruited over 160 volunteers to help at various events. These accomplishments are indicative of YN1 Hammond's unwavering commitment and dedication to both his community and to the ideologies of philanthropy.

YN1 Hammond is dedicated to the mission of Food Forward and inspires others through his work. With great enthusiasm, YN1 Hammond encourages others to take part in the fight against hunger through his continuous and successful recruitment of new pick leaders.

YN1 Hammond has impacted the lives of those in our community by spearheading the "picking" events with volunteer recruitment, fundraising and building awareness of the Food Forward mission. In 2013 alone, YN1 Hammond's positive attitude and determined spirit of volunteerism has helped the Ventura County branch of Food Forward harvest over 120,000 pounds or 480,000 servings of fresh fruit that would have otherwise gone to waste to help feed our hungry neighbors.

It is with sincere appreciation that I would like to recognize YN1 Kenneth Hammond and commend him on his steadfast dedication to his country and, especially, to his community.

LT. COL. JOHN MCCARTHY, USMC,
RET.

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. John J. McCarthy retired from the U.S. Marine Corps in 1975 after 29 years of outstanding service and leadership. He is the recipient of the Distinguished Flying Cross, which was awarded to him in 1969 citing his courage, superior airmanship and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of great personal danger in Vietnam. He also was awarded the Bronze Star and 19 Air Medals. Lt. Col. McCarthy was 17 years old when he joined the U.S. Navy in 1946, subsequently earning a college degree from Temple University. Because of his long-standing interest in flying, in 1952 he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps and entered flight school. In 1964, he was deployed to Vietnam, where he flew 180 missions. He would return to Vietnam in 1968 as the commanding officer at Chu-Lai and flew another 130 combat mis-

sions. He will be honored by his fellow members of the Jesse W. Soby American Legion Post, 148 in his home County of Bucks, Pennsylvania, on Memorial Day, 2014—a ceremony he will attend in full uniform. It is with deep gratitude that we acknowledge the exemplary service of a courageous leader who has honorably served his country and set an example for others to follow.

HONORING GIRLS INCORPORATED
OF SHELBYVILLE AND SHELBY
COUNTY, INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary achievements of Girls Incorporated of Shelbyville and Shelby County, Indiana.

This organization recently was recognized by the National Girls Incorporated organization with the 2014 Outstanding Affiliate of the Year Award, the highest honor an affiliate can receive.

The Girls Incorporated movement has been helping girls obtain the skills and knowledge needed to successfully navigate the challenges women face in life for more than 150 years. The network of local Girls Incorporated organizations serves over 136,000 girls across the United States and Canada. The dedicated professionals of Girls Incorporated lead programs ranging from money management to fitness and health. They also work to foster an interest in science, technology, engineering and math.

The first Girls Club in Shelbyville was formed in October 1971. Since then, the club has gone through a reorganization, name change and relocation. Through it all, the girls club has been an asset for the greater Shelbyville community touching the lives of thousands of area girls and their families. In 2014, Girls Inc. of Shelbyville and Shelby County was also recognized by the National Girls Incorporated organization as "An Affiliate Who Grew." This growth in membership and impact in the community is a testament to the hard work and the dedication of the organization's local leaders.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating Girls Incorporated of Shelbyville and Shelby County for their outstanding achievements and dedication to the community. I look forward to seeing what this incredible group will achieve in the future.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM
COTTINGHAM

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. William Cottingham of Rolla, Missouri, who retired on April 30th of this year after working 36 years as a physician at the Mercy Clinic Internal Medicine in Rolla.

Dr. Cottingham has tirelessly worked to improve his community and provide excellent

healthcare for nearly four decades. Throughout his career, Dr. Cottingham became known for making those around him laugh. Patients that entered the hospital sick or injured would leave with a sense of comfort and a smile. He held a deep connection with each of his patients. He was not just their doctor; he was their teacher, confidant and friend. I am confident his passion for helping others and making people laugh will come in handy during his retirement. He plans to stay in Rolla and spend more time with his wife, as well as travel to see his five grandchildren. I would like to thank Dr. Cottingham for his service to the Rolla community and wish him a long and happy retirement.

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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:

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The bill provides critical authorities to support our men and women in uniform.

In particular, I appreciate the leadership of Readiness Chairman, Mr. ROB WITTMAN of Virginia, and the way we have worked together to address the readiness of our United States military. Our hearings this session have highlighted some serious challenges to readiness in the coming years if we do not solve the broader issue of sequestration, which I believe is achievable if we put everything on the table for discussion.

The Readiness title of the bill recommends additional funds to address particular readiness shortfalls, such as Pacific Command's prepositioned munitions; corrosion control, prevention, and mitigation; Air Force training range improvements; depot-level maintenance; operational tempo; aviation readiness; and National Guard training, among other readiness priorities.

Additionally, the bill addresses policy issues such as prepositioned stocks, crisis response elements, regionally aligned forces, ship homeport designations and overseas maintenance, readiness metrics, and the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region, including airlift and tanker capabilities in the Pacific.

But as much as we do to enhance readiness by authorizing increased funding by some \$1.6 billion in the areas mentioned earlier, I believe this bill goes too far in cutting the operation and maintenance accounts in order to find funding for items not requested in the President's Budget in other titles of the bill.

The bill authorizes \$164.3 billion in operations and maintenance funding, which is \$1.4 billion below what the President's Budget requested. I am particularly concerned about the

\$2.5 billion in cuts from four areas: unobligated balances, civilian personnel, and contracts for facilities maintenance and for Other Services. The cuts in these areas far outstrip the \$455 million targeted reductions adjudicated by the committee staff on a bipartisan basis after careful consideration of the services' operations and maintenance budgets.

I am not a fan of using expensive contractors for functions that could, and should, have been performed by civilian personnel, contracting is a fact of life and we are nearing the end of 13 years of two wars where we were heavily dependent on contractor support for execution of those wars.

The budget request had already reduced facility maintenance to 60–70% of the stated requirement in fiscal year 2015. A further reduction of \$419 million in this bill means the military services would forego repairs and upgrades to airfield runways, taxiways, and aprons; and to mission-critical facilities and infrastructure such as electrical systems, heating and air conditioning systems, and roofs. It would mean delays in renovations, consolidations, conversions, and demolitions to more efficiently use space and reduce operations and maintenance costs; deferral of repairs and upgrades to alleviate life, health, and safety deficiencies, including fire protection systems upgrades. And it would mean postponement of repairs, replacements, or reconfigurations of gates and other installation security components.

The \$399 million cut to the Other Services account could impact the quality of life for servicemembers by reducing or eliminating food service, tuition assistance, general training, family support programs, library support, physical fitness services, laundry services, testing, general and employee training, professional credentialing for health professionals, and ROTC scholarships instructor pay and textbooks.

Unlike the \$1.4 billion in cuts to unobligated balances which are taken in an undistributed manner at the military service level, the cuts in facility maintenance and Other Services are levied in every budget sub-activity group. This means we have hit almost every readiness account in operations and maintenance, including maneuver units, force readiness operations, depot maintenance, base operations, combatant commander mission support, strategic mobility, prepositioned stocks, industrial preparedness, ROTC, specialized skill training, professional development education, training support, logistic support, ammunition management, service-wide communications, manpower management, and classified programs.

Further, I would note that contracts for Other Services includes professional services the Pentagon purchases to research, compile, and publish the reports that this committee and others require each year, including the hundreds of new reports required in this bill alone!

Because of hiring freezes, sequestration, furloughs, pay freezes, and legislative mandates, most Department of Defense components and defense agencies have been functioning at 80 percent of their authorized manpower for the past 2 to 3 years and were only starting to recover in this fiscal year. Along with the services contracts cuts, a \$315 million cut to civilian personnel funding in fiscal year 2015 makes a mockery of the Total Force Management concepts this committee adopted

and endorsed just three years ago, as defense components have told me they could not shed people fast enough and would have to undertake arbitrary reductions in force without consideration of mission requirements.

Compounding these cuts is the \$2 billion military personnel-related funding hole the Department will have to fill resulting from other actions this committee is considering today. Those funds, most likely, will come out of the operations and maintenance accounts when the Department of Defense executes the fiscal year 2015 budget.

At a time when only 50% of Air Force pilots have returned to appropriate training levels; when the Navy has been forced to propose Phased Modernization of cruisers and amphibious warships to extend their service life, when the Marine Corps is establishing crisis response task forces without programming the full funding needed to resource them, and when the Army has identified \$1.7 billion in unfunded training needs, I believe it is unwise and extraordinarily risky to fund the readiness accounts at \$1.4 billion below the President's budget request. These cuts essentially impose another level of sequestration on the operation and maintenance accounts.

As noted in a Readiness hearing this year, our top priority should be to ensure that no soldier, sailor, airman, or marine ever enters a fair fight. Our subcommittee has highlighted and documented the operations and maintenance shortfalls for the past three years and it is our duty and responsibility to ensure our men and women who serve have the necessary resources to dominate in any operational environment.

I am concerned that our bill does not address an issue that I and a number of other Members in the House of Representatives have concerns about regarding the transition of the Global Privately Owned Vehicle Contract (GPC) to a new contractor. The prior contractor performed well for the US government on the prior GPC contract. But a decision was made to change contractors to save some money, despite concerns being raised about the new contractor's ability to perform and questions about whether there were any real cost savings. I raised some of those concerns during a recent Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing, and my colleagues have also made inquiries regarding the contractor change.

Guam receives a significant shipment of privately owned vehicles, and our servicemembers rely on efficient and timely privately owned vehicle delivery to help integrate into their new units and to help their families cope with the difficulties associated with Permanent Change in Station assignments. I ask that you work with me, along with others on the Committee who have expressed similar concerns, to closely monitor and provide greater oversight on the transition to the new contractor. The new contractor assumed responsibility on May 1, and I understand some facilities were still not fully operational at that time and the contractor's logistics IT network was not fully deployed. Unfortunately, it appears that many of our concerns regarding the new contractor's ability to perform may be coming into fruition.

Going forward, I hope the Committee will monitor the transition and ensure that the best value decision was made with respect to this important contract and in support of our servicemembers and their families.

Finally, this bill continues a tradition of supporting the Department of Defense's efforts to support the Obama Administration's Asia-Pacific rebalance strategy. The bill fully funds military construction related to the realignment of Marines from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. The realignment is the most tangible aspect of the rebalance strategy and showing our commitment has a profoundly positive impact on these upgrades. Further, like the last several years, the bill eliminates restrictions on use of Government of Japan funds to support the realignment. Given the current budget constraints at the Department of Defense it is prudent that we free up Government of Japan direct contributions to support this endeavor.

I am concerned that this bill cuts over \$80 million requested in the President's Budget to support critical upgrades to civilian water and wastewater systems on Guam. I believe that these upgrades are needed to support a robust military presence on island and are needed now. However, I appreciate that the bill does include language authorizing a \$13 million civilian infrastructure project that was appropriated in Fiscal Year 2012. Specifically, the project is for the development of a cultural repository which is needed to meet federal standards for the preservation of artifacts that are discovered during military construction activities. This project was agreed to in the Programmatic Agreement signed several years ago by Governor Calvo and various federal entities. Authorizing funds for this project keeps the U.S. Government's commitment to the people of Guam.

The bill also included an amendment adopted during full committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 that requires the Department of Defense and Department of State, working in coordination with other relevant federal agencies, to develop a clear strategy for the Asia-Pacific rebalance. I offered this amendment with Mr. FORBES of Virginia and Ms. HANABUSA of Hawaii. The provision outlines what the strategy should contain and is mirrored off Department of Defense East Asia Strategy Reviews from the 1990s. It is important that our allies clearly understand what the Asia-Pacific rebalance strategy is so that there are assurances about the United States' presence in this critical region of the world.

Moreover, this provision would also require the National Security Council, working with the Office of Management and Budget, to use the strategy to develop an implementation plan for budget development. Another concern that has been articulated by a number of think tanks as well as allies in the region is about the commitment of the United States in putting real resources towards this rebalance strategy. It is important that the implementation plan give clear guidance to relevant agencies in what programs and projects they should fund to support the Asia-Pacific rebalance strategy. The rebalance to the Asia-Pacific is an important and wise strategic goal and the implementation plan should help to ensure that this effort lasts past any one Administration.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4435.

SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO
COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House's legislative efforts to combat human trafficking, a form of modern-day slavery. The sickening fact is that human trafficking is a big, booming business—trafficking a child for sex is more lucrative than drug trafficking. That is why I am glad to join my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, in taking additional steps to protect our sons and daughters from this horrible crime. This legislation makes many important changes to current law, and would help us provide additional resources to victims, strengthen law enforcement's ability to punish those who purchase sex from minors, and protect girls who are victims of commercial sexual exploitation from being treated as criminals. This bipartisan legislation will help to protect our most vulnerable children, including those in the foster care system, who are victimized through no fault of their own. These children need our help which is why I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation.

60 YEARS AFTER BROWN V. BOARD
OF EDUCATION

SPEECH OF

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 2014

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 2014, we marked the 60th anniversary of the historic Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision, which overturned legalized racial segregation. The importance of this decision for our jurisprudence and overall society cannot be understated. It was no less than a full-throated affirmation of the Fourteenth Amendment, granting all Americans full and equal citizenship.

Any account of the history and enduring legacy of Brown v. Board of Education would be incomplete without an acknowledgment of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense and Educational Fund under the leadership of their Executive Director, and future Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Thurgood Marshall. Marshall successfully argued that separate accommodations and treatment based on race necessarily leads to inequality.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I believe the 60th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education is an opportunity for our nation to reaffirm our dedication to full and equal citizenship for all and to reexamine the enduring inequalities in our society. As a nation, we must never stop striving to better realize the ideals in and promise of our Constitution.

IN HONOR OF 52 YEARS OF SERVICE TO INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Patricia Ann Payne, who recently retired after 52 dedicated years of teaching and mentoring in the Indianapolis Public Schools system.

Mrs. Payne, a proud graduate of Indianapolis Public Schools and Indiana University in Bloomington, began her five-decade career in education and public service as an elementary school teacher. In the first 25 years of her career, she brought her inspirational teaching style to young students at three different schools.

Mrs. Payne has long been a devoted advocate for teaching African American history in our schools. In 1987, she was assigned the special responsibility of designing and directing the IPS Office of African Centered/Multicultural Education. In 1998, she became Director of the Crispus Attucks Museum of African/African American History on the campus of Crispus Attucks Medical Magnet High School. She continued this important work until her retirement, and it will be a key part of her lasting legacy in Indianapolis.

Mrs. Payne's exemplary career is reflected in the many awards and accolades she has received. Chief among her many well-deserved honors was being named 1984 IPS Teacher of the Year and a finalist for Indiana Teacher of the Year the following year. In 2010, she received the Living Legend Award from Community Action of Greater Indianapolis. In 2012, she was the recipient of the Congresswoman Julia Carson Community Service Award. Most recently, in 2013, she received the Distinguished Alumni Award from Indiana University.

Throughout her career, Mrs. Payne opened the hearts and minds of our children, encouraging them to have a positive effect in their community and the world. Mrs. Payne embodies all that Hoosiers stand for—a strong work ethic, a commitment to public service and a desire to better the community. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Payne for her years of service to Indianapolis Public Schools, the City of Indianapolis and all Hoosiers.

CONDEMNING THE ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY BOKO HARAM

SPEECH OF

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H. Res. 573, condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the terrorist group known as Boko Haram in northeastern provinces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

I am outraged by the abduction in April of over 270 innocent schoolgirls who were taken from their boarding school in Borno State, Nigeria. My thoughts and prayers remain with

these students and their families as we seek their immediate safe return.

I was horrified to watch Abubakar Shekau, the leader of the extreme Islamist group Boko Haram, admit in a video message he was responsible for this horrendous act. It was painful to hear him refer to these young innocent girls as “slaves” and threaten “to sell them in the market.”

According to media reports, Boko Haram has destroyed many Nigerian schools and killed dozens of students. Boko Haram continues to show an immoral disregard for the most fundamental of human rights, thus we must do all we can to aid in the student’s safe return.

No family should have to fear their children could be abducted and placed in the human trafficking market to be sold, raped or killed. Boko Haram has to be stopped and their leader Abubakar Shekau must be apprehended and brought to justice. The Nigerian government should use all means necessary to find the girls and return them to their families.

I am encouraged that the U.S. government is already providing counterterrorism support, logistics, technical expertise and training to Nigerian investigators in this effort. I am glad Nigeria and four neighboring countries will share intelligence and border surveillance to find the students as we must combine our efforts to ensure their safe return. Additionally, I encourage the Nigerian government and leadership to strengthen efforts to protect children who are seeking an education as no student should fear for their life in an effort to further their education. We must work swiftly in an effort to find the girls and assure their safe return to their families.

I have joined my colleagues in sending a letter to President Obama urging the Department of State to use every avenue possible to assist in the immediate recovery of the missing girls and to support the welfare and safety of all women and girls in Nigeria. I urge our international partners to join with us until the girls are safely reunited with their families and Boko Haram is brought to justice.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HUMAN TRAFFICKING FRAUD ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2014

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce bipartisan legislation with my colleague Rep. TED POE.

In March of 1931 the infamous gangster, Al Capone, was indicted for tax fraud. Today the IRS Criminal Investigations division continues to play a vital role in proving criminal activity and fraud, and I believe they can play an even stronger role in cracking down on human trafficking and prostitution.

This bill is meant to enhance the Internal Revenue Service’s ability to crack down on sex trafficking by authorizing \$4,000,000.00 to establish an office within the IRS to prosecute sex traffickers for violations of tax laws. The office would focus on the willful failure of traffickers to file returns, supply information, or pay tax where the taxpayer is an “aggravated”

non-filer. In addition, the office would coordinate closely with existing task forces focused on sex trafficking offenders in the Department of Justice.

The bill also amends the Internal Revenue Code to increase criminal monetary and other penalties for attempts to: evade or defeat tax, willful failure to file a tax return, supply information, or pay tax, aggravated failure to file tax returns, fraud and false statements, and underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud. This offense will carry a maximum sentence of 10 years and a maximum fine of \$50,000.00.

The Human Trafficking Fraud Enforcement Act of 2014 the bill also establishes a new felony offense for an aggravated failure to file to include failure to file with respect to income or payments derived from activity which is criminal under Federal or State law. This will target conduct committed by those involved in the promotion of commercial sex acts—pimps and traffickers—and not conduct of exploited persons in prostitution.

Last, this bill directly benefits those that are victimized by the traffickers by revising current IRS Whistleblower provisions so that women and girls who choose to participate in the investigation will be eligible to participate in the whistleblower program and may ultimately be granted up to 15% of any fines levied against the trafficker.

While important strides have been made to address trafficking, we must still use every tool possible to take down the traffickers. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 19 and Tuesday, May 20, 2014, I regret I missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall votes 218, 219, 220, 221, and 222.

I was in my hometown of Moore, Oklahoma on the first anniversary of the devastating tornado that tore through the Fourth District. Even though the storms last May were some of the worst we’ve experienced in years, we are pulling through and showing that disaster cannot crush our spirits or break our communities. That is and always will be the Oklahoma way.

HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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:

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chair, I submit the following.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON,

Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. However, this decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4435 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,

Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,

Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Foreign Affairs Committee is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON,

Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,

Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD “BUCK” MCKEON,

Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The Agriculture Committee has a valid claim to jurisdiction over H.R. 4435.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 4435 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves

the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into both the Congressional Record and the Committee Report during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter, and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Agriculture Committee has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Agriculture Committee is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. This legislation contains a provision requiring a strategy to prioritize U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee will waive consideration of the bill. The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4435 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of let-

ters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 4435, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

While the bill was referred to your Committee exclusively, there are several provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. However, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration, the Committee on Energy and Commerce will not request a sequential referral on the bill.

This is done with our mutual understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on H.R. 4435 or similar legislation, and will be consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. The Committee on Energy and Commerce also reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such a request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4435 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman Committee on Armed Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 4435 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 4435, the Committee on

Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 4435 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HONORING WWII VETERANS AND RESIDENTS OF BELMONT VILLAGE SENIOR LIVING

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the 17 World War II veterans and residents of Belmont Village Senior Living in Thousand Oaks, CA. For their service to our country, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following individuals:

Corporal Keith Balkwill, Corporal Leslie Bedding, Bill Bouch, Daphne Forst, Harold Hertzberg, Private Don Matson, Aviation Machinist Mate 2nd Class Paul McAlister, Captain Frank McCarter, Lieutenant JG Grant Olweiler, Tech 5 Sergeant Willis Peterson, Senior Assistant Surgeon Dr. John Phelan, Robert Roth, Private 1st Class Cyril Shepro, Seaman 1st Class Bill Smith, Tech 4 Sergeant Dorothy Weems, Sergeant John Weems, Master Sargent Alex Weinper, Private First Class Robert "Bob" Yanchus.

On May 21, 2014, the Belmont Village Gallery will open and showcase the captivating stories, memoirs, and pictures of these iconic

heroes. The depth and richness of each veteran's story is indicative of the valor and sacrifice that has come to define this chapter in American history.

These men and women are members of the Greatest Generation—a generation that overcame multiple challenges of adversity and embodied the definition of resilience. These brave men and women fought heroically, inspired our nation and put us on the path to victory. They remind us that no challenge is too great when we as a nation stand together as one.

Today, as we face new and profound challenges, we must look to our past and be encouraged to carry on their legacy of keeping our country strong and free and prosperous. It is incumbent on this generation to remember the challenges of our history and reaffirm our commitment to our veterans for their bravery and sacrifice. Without their selfless service to our nation, America would not have the liberties so many of us enjoy and often take for granted.

This is why our nation has an obligation to ensure that each veteran, who fought so bravely to defend our country and our freedoms, receives all of the services they need and deserve and have so honorably earned.

It is with deep appreciation and admiration that I recognize each of these veterans for their patriotism and service to our country during World War II. As a nation, we will be forever grateful for their service.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this infor-

mation, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 22, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015.

SR-222

JUNE 4

3 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine military service to small business owner, focusing on supporting America's veteran entrepreneurs.

SR-428A

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3195–S3244

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2366–2380, and S. Res. 453–454. **Page S3237**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 1036, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the “National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office”.

H.R. 1228, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the “Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1451, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2391, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the “Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office”.

H.R. 3060, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the “Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building”. **Page S3235**

Measures Passed:

Reliable Home Heating Act: Senate passed S. 2086, to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3243**

National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 1036, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the “National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office”. **Page S3243**

Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 1228, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South

9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the “Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building”. **Page S3243**

Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 1451, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building”. **Page S3243**

Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 2391, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the “Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office”. **Page S3243**

Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 3060, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the “Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building”. **Page S3243**

Honoring the Members of the United States Armed Forces who Participated in D-Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 421, expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II. **Page S3243**

National Cancer Research Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 445, recognizing the importance of cancer research and the contributions of scientists, clinicians, and patient advocates across the United States who are dedicated to finding a cure for cancer, and designating May 2014 as “National Cancer Research Month”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S3243–44**

Cardiovascular Disease and Women’s Health: Senate agreed to S. Res. 454, recognizing that cardiovascular disease continues to be an overwhelming threat to women’s health and the importance of providing basic, preventive heart screenings to women wherever they seek primary care. **Page S3244**

Measures Considered:

Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 162, to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004. **Pages S3195–97**

Conference Reports:

Water Resources Development Act Conference Report—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that upon disposition of the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Senate resume Legislative Session and pursuant to the order of Tuesday, May 20, 2014, the Chair lay before the Senate the message with respect to the conference report to accompany H.R. 3080, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, that there be two minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the vote on adoption of the conference report, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect. **Page S3244**

Barron Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit. **Pages S3210–11**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 161), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S3211**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, May 22, 2014, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, with all other provisions of the order of Tuesday, May 20, 2014, remaining in effect. **Page S3244**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 68 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. EX. 160), Stanley Fischer, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2006. **Pages S3210, S3244**

Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2020. **Pages S3212, S3244**

Deirdre M. Daly, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years. **Pages S3212, S3244**

James Walter Frazer Green, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years. **Pages S3210, S3212, S3244**

Damon Paul Martinez, of New Mexico, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico for the term of four years. **Pages S3212, S3244**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Armando Ormar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

25 Army nominations in the rank of general. **Page S3244**

Messages from the House: **Page S3235**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S3196, S3235**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S3235**

Executive Communications: **Page S3235**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S3235–36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3237–39**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3239–42**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3231–35**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S3242–43**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—161) **Pages S3210–11**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:28 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 22, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3244.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

ENERGY SECURITY AND RESEARCH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine energy security and research, after receiving testimony from Tom Morehouse, Acting Assistant Secretary for Operational Energy Plans and Programs, Dennis V.

McGinn, Assistant Secretary of Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment, Daniel Y. Chiu, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Strategy and Force Development, and Brigadier General Kenneth D. Lewis, Jr., J-5 Deputy Director for Partnership, Strategy and Trans-Regional Policy, Joint Staff, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2015 for the Small Business Administration and the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, after receiving testimony from Maria Contreras-Sweet, Administrator, Small Business Administration; and Amias Gerety, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Financial Institutions.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel met in open session and approved for full committee consideration, those provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to mark up proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Thursday, May 22, 2014.

Also, committee ordered favorably reported 1,275 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

DELIVERING BETTER HEALTH CARE VALUE TO CONSUMERS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine delivering better health care value to consumers, focusing on the first three years of the medical loss ratio, after receiving testimony from Wendell Potter, Center for Public Integrity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Katy Fernandez, My Design Team and My Cabinet Source, Houston, Texas; Mark A. Hall, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; and Grace-Marie Turner, Galen Institute, Alexandria, Virginia.

STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions and Family Policy concluded a hearing to examine strengthening Social Security to meet the needs of tomorrow's retirees, after receiving testimony from Stephen C. Goss, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; Teresa Ghilarducci, The New School, New York, New York; Jason, J. Fichtner, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia; and Maya Rockeymoore, Center for Global Policy Solutions, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Sylvia Mathews Burwell, of West Virginia, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, Stefan M. Selig, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, and Darci L. Vetter, of Nebraska, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

MILITARY FORCE AUTHORIZATION FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine authorization for the use of military force after Iraq and Afghanistan, after receiving testimony from Stephen W. Preston, General Counsel, Department of Defense; Mary E. McLeod, Principal Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State; Harold Hongju Koh, Yale Law School, New Haven, Connecticut; and Michael B. Mukasey, former Attorney General of the United States, Debevoise and Plimpton, New York, New York.

INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs with the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs concluded a hearing to examine the escalating international wildlife trafficking crisis, focusing on ecological, economic and national security issues, after receiving testimony from Judith G. Garber, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, and Brooke Darby, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, both of the Department of State; Dan Ashe, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and Eric G. Postel, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and Environment, U.S. Agency for International Development.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2354, DHS Cybersecurity Workforce Recruitment and Retention Act of 2014, with an amendment;

S. 1744, to strengthen the accountability of individuals involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of background investigations, to update guidelines for security clearances, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2113, to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 1233, to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, with an amendment;

S. 1045, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 675, to prohibit contracting with the enemy, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1820, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of official portraits of Members of Congress, heads of executive agencies, and heads of agencies and offices of the legislative branch;

H.R. 1036, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office";

H.R. 1228, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building";

H.R. 1451, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building";

H.R. 2391, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office";

H.R. 3060, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building"; and

The nominations of Steven M. Wellner, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and Tony Hammond, of Missouri, and

Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1474, to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes, to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1603, to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians;

S. 1622, to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1818, to ratify a water settlement agreement affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe;

S. 2040, to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation;

S. 2132, to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

H.R. 2388, to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians.

INDIAN EDUCATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine Indian education, focusing on the Bureau of Indian Education, after receiving testimony from Charles Roessel, Director, Bureau of Indian Education, Department of the Interior; Thomas M. Brady, Director, Department of Defense Education Activity; Bryan Brewer, and Dayna Brave Eagle, both of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, South Dakota; Timothy Benally, Navajo Nation Department of Dine Education, Window Rock, Arizona; and Melvin Monette, National Indian Education Association, Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after receiving testimony from James B. Comey, Jr., Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4694–4713; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 115; H. Con. Res. 99; and H. Res. 591–592 were introduced. **Pages H4783–85**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4785–86**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4121, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–461);

H.R. 776, to amend title 31, United States Code, to revise requirements related to assets pledged by a surety, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–462, Pt. 1); and

H.R. 776, to amend title 31, United States Code, to revise requirements related to assets pledged by a surety, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–462, Pt. 2). **Page H4783**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Jolly to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4687**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:18 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4689**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the McGovern motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 7 yeas to 381 nays, Roll No. 223. **Page H4693**

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act of 2014: H.R. 4031, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 390 yeas to 33 nays, Roll No. 229. **Pages H4694–99, H4715–16**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the McGovern motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 23 yeas to 361 nays, Roll No. 224. **Pages H4706–07**

Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi: Representatives Cummings, Smith (WA), Schiff, Linda T. Sánchez (CA), and Duckworth. **Page H4712**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:56 p.m. and reconvened at 5:01 p.m. **Page H4712**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in our armed forces and their families. **Page H4715**

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 4435, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction and to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. Consideration is expected to continue tomorrow, May 22nd. **Pages H4699–H4706, H4707–82**

Agreed to:

Daines amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 113–455) that was debated on May 20th that strikes subsection (c) of Section 1634 of the reported NDAA, which terminates in 2021 the requirement that ICBM silos remain in at least warm status (by a recorded vote of 222 yeas to 196 noes, Roll No. 227); **Page H4714**

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 1 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460: Gosar amendment (No. 2) that requires the Department to comply with Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans for “off-installation” natural resources projects to ensure state involvement and consultation; Welch amendment (No. 3) that encourages the Air Force to consider identified energy efficiency improvements in a timely and comprehensive manner; Lamborn amendment (No. 5) that requires the Department of Defense and the U.S. Air Force to revise their current regulations on religious freedom; Cleaver amendment (No. 12) that redesignates Pershing Park in Washington, DC as the “National World War I Memorial” and will designate the Liberty Memorial at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as the “National World War I Museum and Memorial”; Runyan amendment (No. 16) that states that whenever two or more bases are formed into a DOD Joint Installation, if there are different locality pay areas, then all installation wage grade employees will be paid at the higher locality pay area rate; Turner amendment (No. 18) that expresses a Sense of Congress recognizing the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as well as ongoing enlargement initiatives; Hunter amendment (No. 19) that expresses the sense of Congress that the persons and organizations who carried out the attacks on the United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya on Sept 11 and 12, 2012 continue to pose a security

threat to the United States; Rigell amendment (No. 20) that reaffirms Congress' constitutional war powers by clearly stating that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any use of military force; Jackson Lee amendment (No. 22) that requires a report to Congress on crimes against humanity in Nigeria committed by Boko Haram; Daines amendment (No. 23) that contains findings of the importance of the nuclear triad and a statement of policy reaffirming the value of nuclear capabilities in maintaining a strong national defense; Rigell amendment (No. 32) that authorizes the DOD and NASA to execute an agreement for environmental cleanup attributable to the activities of DOD at the time the property was utilized by the Navy in the area constituting the former Naval Air Station Chincoteague, Virginia; Kilmer amendment (No. 33) that prohibits non-disciplinary furloughs of a DOD civilian employee whose performance is charged to a working capital fund; Smith (WA) amendment (No. 60) that provides the Secretary of the Army the authority to move the remains of member of the armed forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in an Army National Military Cemetery to another Army National Cemetery; Speier amendment (No. 72) that directs the Secretary of Defense to implement the recommendations of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee to prioritize prevention and increase the study of chemical and physical factors in breast cancer; Speier amendment (No. 82) that allows women-owned small businesses to receive sole-source contracts under the same terms as other small business contracting programs and accelerates the disparity study to assess industries in the women-owned small business procurement program; Speier amendment (No. 86) that requires the public release of any IG reports that find misconduct for senior executive service (SES) officials, political appointees, and general and flag officers that rank O-6 or higher level; Turner amendment (No. 100) that clarifies that the memorandum of understanding extends to those additional test ranges not initially selected by the Administration if such range enters into a partnership or agreement with a selected test range; Kilmer amendment (No. 113) that reauthorizes overtime for navy civilian employees who perform nuclear maintenance for the forward deployed aircraft carrier in Japan for one year; and Polis amendment (No. 147) that urges the Secretary of Defense to conduct successful operationally realistic tests before purchasing additional ground-based missile defense interceptors;

Pages H4718-25

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 2 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113-460: Kildee amendment (No. 14) that

allocates \$10 million to develop additional financial literacy training programs for incoming and transitioning service members; Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 25) that provides the Secretary of the Air Force the authority to enter into contracts for life-of-type procurements for commercial off-the-shelf parts for the intercontinental ballistic missile fuze; Linda T. Sánchez (CA) amendment (No. 29) facilitates the transfer of a portion of the U.S. Air Force Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, also known as the Norwalk Tank Farm, to the City of Norwalk; Young (AK) amendment (No. 30) that expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should place emphasis on strategically significant criteria when basing the OCONUS F-35A, which includes access to sufficient range capabilities and space for training, the ability to robustly train with our international partners, the presence of existing facilities to support operations, limited encroachment, and the minimization of costs; McKinley amendment (No. 31) that increases the National Guard Youth Challenge Program under Civil Military Programs by \$55 million; Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 34) that provides authority to the military services in working with civic organizations to charge the public a nominal fee to attend a military-sponsored Air Show or Open House on military bases; Swalwell amendment (No. 35) that requires the Department of Defense to allow military musical units to accept assistance from private entities for the benefit of said units; Conaway amendment (No. 36) that allows general and flag officer chaplains to be eligible for retirement deferment; Griffith (VA) amendment (No. 37) that requires DOD to fulfill former Sec. Gates' Efficiency Initiative relating to the number of general and flag officers by reducing approximately 33 positions through attrition by the end of 2015; McKinley amendment (No. 38) that requires the Secretary of Defense to establish an electronic tour calculator so that reservists could keep track of aggregated active duty tours of 90 days or more served within a fiscal year; Israel amendment (No. 39) that requires a report on the progress made to establish Army National Guard Cyber Protection Teams; Grayson amendment (No. 43) that reinserts section 1032 of the introduced version, which states: "personal property retained as evidence in connection with an incident of sexual assault involving a member of the Armed Forces may be returned to the rightful owner of such property after the conclusion of all legal, adverse action, and administrative proceedings related to such incident"; Israel amendment (No. 68) that expresses the sense of Congress in support of public-private partnerships to enhance DOD efforts on mental health care for servicemembers; Grayson amendment (No. 81) that prohibits DOD

from contracting with persons convicted of fraudulent use of “Made in America” labels; Young (AK) amendment (No. 97) that requires the U.S. Air Force to conduct a business case analysis for the creation of a personnel-only active-association for the 168th Air Refueling Wing; Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 105) that requires the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to provide a notification if telecommunications companies with close ties to foreign governments are determined to have access to (or attempting to have access to) critical infrastructure of U.S. military or intelligence facilities; Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 122) that establishes the sense of Congress that Ukraine should close off its defense industries that currently provide critical capability to Russia for its nuclear forces; Grayson amendment (No. 140) that updates the Space Protection Strategy required by the 2008 NDAA, to include the period of 2026 through 2030; Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 143) that modifies an existing statutory reporting requirement to require certain officials to report on their ability to meet operational availability requirements for delivery platforms for nuclear weapons; Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 144) that requires the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to provide copies of the prior year’s Strategic Advisory Group reports to the congressional defense committees 30 days after the budget has been submitted; Israel amendment (No. 146) that expresses the sense of Congress in support of the National Guard’s role in defending the U.S. from cyber attacks; Brooks (AL) amendment (No. 148) that requires a Plan to Counter Certain Ground-launched Ballistic Missiles and Cruise Missiles; and Kildee amendment (No. 161) that allocates \$20 million for a private study to identify challenges confronting the DOD’s care of wounded warriors and offer recommendations to improve it; **Pages H4740–46**

Hastings (WA) amendment (No. 28 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that restores \$20 million of the proposed cut to defense environmental cleanup; **Pages H4746–47**

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 3 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460: Coffman amendment (No. 40) that enhances the participation of mental health professionals in boards for the correction of military records and boards for the review of the discharge or dismissal of members of the Armed Forces; Thompson (PA) amendment (No. 42) that requires a baseline mental health assessment before any individual joins the military, in order to bring mental health to parity with physical health during recruitment screenings; Velázquez amendment (No. 44) that requires each branch of the military to develop an anonymous phone tip-line for reporting incidents of

hazing; McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 45) that directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress evaluating the progress of the Military Spouse Employment Program in reducing military spouse unemployment, reducing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts, and addressing the underemployment of military spouses; McNerney amendment (No. 46) that directs the DOD Secretary to consider how employment agencies will work with state and county VA offices and state National Guard offices when establishing requirements for a new employment pilot program for recently separated servicemembers; Cook amendment (No. 47) that creates a blueprint for a direct hire jobs placement program benefitting the National Guard and Reserves; Lamborn amendment (No. 48) that modifies some authorities for the Air Force Academy Athletic Corporation to bring them in line with similar authorities previously provided to the Naval Academy Athletic Association; Bonamici amendment (No. 49) that requires the Secretary of the Army to evaluate potential cost savings and potential effects on the National Guard’s recruitment efforts of the requirement, effective January 1, 2014, that all service members wait one year after training before becoming eligible for the Army’s tuition assistance program; Sean Maloney (NY) amendment (No. 50) that increases the authorization for Impact Aid by one additional year; Gerlach amendment (No. 51) that recognizes the Wereth massacre of 11 African-American soldiers of the U.S. Army during the Battle of the Bulge, December 17, 1944; Bustos amendment (No. 52) that asks the Secretary of the Army to review and provide a report on the Medal of Honor nomination of Captain William L. Albracht; Chu amendment (No. 53) that requests updated reporting information from each branch of the military regarding their methods for tracking, reporting, and preventing hazing, as well as a detailed military hazing report from GAO; Langevin amendment (No. 54) that requires National Institute of Mental Health to study of risk and resiliency of United States Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of Preservation of the Force and Families Program; LaMalfa amendment (No. 55) that clarifies jurisdictional confusion between VA field offices when cases are brokered out from the office of origination, ensuring that VA offices may continue to update congressional staff on constituents’ cases; Walberg amendment (No. 56) that requires the Department to implement a pilot program to provide certain contact information for separating service members to state veterans affairs departments; Bishop (NY) amendment (No. 58) that expresses the Sense of Congress that the remains of three crewmen of the Martin Mariner PBM–5 seaplane George One

should be recovered from Thurston Island, Antarctica; Farr amendment (No. 59) that designates the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the “Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic”; Kelly (PA) amendment (No. 130) that prohibits funds from being used to implement the UN Arms Trade Treaty unless the treaty has received the advice and consent of the Senate and has been the subject of implementing legislation by the Congress; Kelly (PA) amendment (No. 133) that expresses the Sense of Congress in opposition to France’s impending sale of two *Mistral* class warships to Russia; Walberg amendment (No. 139) that prohibits any new funds for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund until previously appropriated funds have been fully expended; Lamborn amendment (No. 141) that limits funding for certain exchanges with Russia until the President certifies that all appropriate individuals have been listed under the Magnitsky Act; **Pages H4747–53**

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 4 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460: Duckworth amendment (No. 41) that expands maternity leave for the active duty Service Members by an unpaid 6 weeks to be in line with the Family Medical Leave Act; Bilirakis amendment (No. 61) that allows for the transportation on military aircraft on a space-available basis for disabled veterans with a service-connected permanent disability rated as total; Ross amendment (No. 62) that prohibits the DOD from using funds to close commissary stores; Hanna amendment (No. 63) that allows memorial headstone or grave markers to be made available for purchase by Guard or Reserve members who served for at least six years, at no cost to the government; Capps amendment (No. 64) that makes available breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling under the TRICARE program; Ellmers amendment (No. 66) that corrects the lack of timely and efficient notification of changes to TRICARE coverage by requiring the Secretary of Defense to notify all affected providers and beneficiaries of any significant change made by TRICARE via electronic means no less than 90 days before the change is to take place; Murphy (FL) amendment (No. 69) that improves DOD mental health and suicide prevention programs by coordination with VA and integration of care through an annual evaluation by an independent third party; Pascrell amendment (No. 70) that directs the peer-reviewed Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program to conduct a study on blast injury and its correlation to traumatic brain injury; Loretta Sanchez amendment (No. 71) that requires a report on what steps the Department is taking to ensure military per-

sonnel and their families have access to reproductive counseling and treatments for infertility, including in vitro fertilization; Mulvaney amendment (No. 73) that maximizes competition in design-build contracts; Connolly amendment (No. 74) that amends section 4202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 to make the authority to use simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items permanent; Meng amendment (No. 75) that requires GAO to conduct a study on the effects of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative on small businesses; Hanna amendment (No. 76) that requires non-corporate sureties to pledge specific and secure assets as required from others providing collateral to the Federal Government, and requires those assets be held by a government entity to ensure payments can be made in the event they are needed; Meng amendment (No. 110) that requires a regional office to carry out certain steps if it doesn’t meet the 125 day goal of backlog claims; Connolly amendment (No. 112) that extends part-time reemployment authority under both CSRS and FERS by 5 years; Connolly amendment (No. 125) that directs the President to sell F–16 C/D aircraft to Taiwan to modernize its air fleet, 70 percent of which is scheduled to be retired within the next decade; Mulvaney amendment (No. 138) that codifies criteria developed by OMB in 2010 to clarify when military spending should be designated as contingency operations and properly be part of the Overseas Contingency Operation budget; Pierluisi amendment (No. 156) that modifies a statutory prohibition on Federally-funded environmental cleanup of certain property on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico to enable DOD to remove unexploded ordnance resulting from former DOD training activities and posing a public safety risk; Connolly amendment (No. 157) that amends titles 40, 41, and 44, United States Code, to eliminate duplication and waste in Federal information technology acquisition and management; and Connolly amendment (No. 160) that prohibits funds from being used to integrate missile defense systems of the Russian Federation into the missile defense systems of the U.S. if such integration undermines the security of the U.S. or NATO; **Pages H4753–64**

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 5 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460: Graves (MO) amendment (No. 77) that encourages Federal contracts be structured in a manner that permits small businesses to compete; Cárdenas amendment (No. 78) that establishes an outreach and education program to educate small businesses contracted by the Department of Defense on cyber threats and develop plans to protect intellectual property and their networks; Collins (NY)

amendment (No. 79) that accelerates the commercialization of Federally-funded research and technologies by establishing a grant program for participating STTR agencies to support proof-of-concept research and other innovative technology transfer activities at universities, research institutes, and federal laboratories; Poe (TX) amendment (No. 80) that establishes the sense of Congress urging the Secretary of Defense to make a reasonable effort to make certain military equipment returning from abroad available to State, Federal, and local law enforcement agencies for the purpose of strengthening border security along the international border between the United States and Mexico; Thompson (CA) amendment (No. 83) that adds American Flags to the list of items covered by the Berry Amendment; Fortenberry amendment (No. 84) that requires report as to how the Department will manage its mission related to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism; Nugent amendment (No. 85) that provides statutory authority to implement the Secretary of Defense's recommendations to reorganize the personnel accounting community of the department; Burgess amendment (No. 87) that requires a report ranking all military departments and Defense Agencies in order of how advanced they are in achieving auditable financial statements as required by law; Takano amendment (No. 88) that requires the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress, no later than 30 days after enactment of this law, on the barriers to implementing audit reporting requirements and recommendations to ensure reporting deadlines are met; Miller (FL) amendment (No. 89) that prohibits the use of funds for the Navy's permitting activities under the Sunken Military Craft Act for one year; Ross amendment (No. 90) that prohibits the Department of Defense from using taxpayer funds to provide additional or upgraded recreational facilities for detainees at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; Bridenstine amendment (No. 91) that amends Section 1045 to provide the Secretary of Defense more flexibility to meet the Aviation Foreign Internal Defense certification requirement; Braley (IA) amendment (No. 98) that directs the President to submit to Congress a report on the long-term costs of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan; Butterfield amendment (No. 107) that expands the types of documentation accepted by the federal government when a very small group of mariners that operated tugboats and barges domestically during World War II apply for veterans' status; Lewis amendment (No. 108) that Requires the Secretary of Defense to post to cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq to each American taxpayer on the Department of Defense's website; Lynch amendment

(No. 109) that calls for the observation of two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the United States; Schiff amendment (No. 111) that establishes the Sense of Congress amendment endorsing the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of the 74 sailors lost aboard the USS *Frank E. Evans* in 1969; Poe (TX) amendment (No. 116) that requires the Secretary of Defense to provide for the conduct of an independent assessment of U.S. efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, including its affiliates groups, associated groups, and adherents since May 2, 2011; and Bridenstine amendment (No. 135) that requires Secretary of Defense to report on implications of Caspian Sea-based energy resources and distribution networks for U.S. and NATO energy security strategies;

Pages H4764-69

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 6 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113-460: Nunes amendment (No. 92) that continues the use of Lajes Field (Air Force Base) in the Azores, Portugal until the completion of the European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment; Sessions amendment (No. 93) that allows the Secretary of the Army to implement previously approved engineering change proposals on OH-58D Kiowa Helicopters in a manner that ensures the safety and survivability of the crews; Broun (GA) amendment (No. 94) that prohibits any officer, employee, detailee, or contractor of the Department of Defense from using a drone to kill a citizen of the United States, with the exception of an individual who is actively engaged in combat against the United States; Palazzo amendment (No. 95) that expresses the concerns of Congress as it relates to tactical airlift following the withdrawal of combat forces from Afghanistan and requires a report on the 5-year plan for tactical airlift laydown prior to any permanent force structure changes of tactical airlift; Schweikert amendment (No. 96) that directs the Director of TARDEC to provide a report back to the Congressional Defense Committees addressing thermal injury prevention needs to improve occupant centric survivability systems for combat and tactical vehicles against over matching ballistic threats; Cole amendment (No. 99) that includes the DHS Robotic Aircraft for Public Safety (RAPS) program, or other activities of similar nature conducted by the Department of Homeland Security, as user of DOD airspace (in addition to MOU's the HASC has included for the 6 selected FAA sites); Gibson amendment (No. 101) that directs the Secretary of Defense to do a comprehensive search to determine which ships operated near Vietnam in the Vietnam Era; Latta amendment (No. 102) that recognizes the 70th Anniversary of the D-

Day landings on the beaches of Normandy, France; Posey amendment (No. 103) that allows the DOD, at the discretion of the Secretary, to transport goods supplied by nonprofit organizations to members of the Armed Forces serving overseas; Posey amendment (No. 104) that establishes the Sense of Congress that the Air Force should assess feasibility, costs, savings, and readiness implications of utilizing contractor-owned and operated very light jet aircraft for interim flight instruction until permanent replacement enters service; Cicilline amendment (No. 115) that asks that the “Plan for Sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces” through FY18 also include a description of efforts to engage United States manufacturers in procurement opportunities related to equipping the ANSF; Davis (CA) amendment (No. 118) that establishes the Sense of Congress on the importance of women in ensuring the future success of nation of Afghanistan; Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 119) that prevents the establishment of permanent U.S. Military bases in Afghanistan; Nolan amendment (No. 120) that provides auditing and inspecting guidelines for new construction projects in Afghanistan in excess of \$500,000 that cannot be physically inspected by authorized civilian personnel; Tsongas amendment (No. 121) that establishes the Sense of Congress that women should be included in conflict resolution and a statement of United States policy that the United States supports efforts promoting the security of Afghan women and girls during the transition process and requires a DOD report on efforts to support the security of Afghan women and girls; DeLauro amendment (No. 123) that prohibits the Department of Defense from entering into a contract or subcontract with Russia’s state-arms dealer Rosoboronexport unless the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and Director of National Intelligence, certifies that the firm ceased transferring weapons to Syria, Russia pulled out of Crimea, Russian forces have withdrawn from the eastern boarder of Ukraine, and that Russia is not otherwise actively destabilizing Ukraine; Engel amendment (No. 124) that establishes a U.S. policy of opposing transfers of “defense articles and services” to Russia by any NATO member country, during any period when Russia occupies the territory of Ukraine or a NATO member country; Gibson amendment (No. 128) that states that nothing in the FY15 NDAA shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against Syria or Iran; Engel amendment (No. 136) that requires the Secretary of Defense to report on activities of the Department of Defense in regards to protecting cultural property abroad; Turner amendment (No. 145) that limits availability of funds for removal or consolidation of dual-capable

aircraft from Europe; and Larsen (WA) amendment (No. 155) that requires the creation of an inter-agency plan for verification and monitoring relating to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons and fissile material; and

Pages H4769–74

McKeon en bloc amendment No. 7 that consists of the following amendments printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460: Gingrey amendment (No. 57) that expresses the Sense of Congress that active military personnel that are either live in or are stationed in Washington, DC would be exempt from existing District of Columbia firearms restrictions; Larson (CT) amendment (No. 65) that ensures access to behavioral health treatment, including applied behavior analysis, under TRICARE for children with developmental disabilities, when prescribed by a physician or psychologist; Jones amendment (No. 67) that Expresses a Sense of Congress on the use of Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy to treat traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder; Whitfield amendment (No. 106) that establishes the Sense of Congress that the President should establish and appoint an advisory board on toxic substances and worker health responsible for overseeing a portion of the original EEOICPA legislation known as “Part E”; Rohrabacher amendment (No. 114) that expands the certification requirement on reimbursements to Pakistan to include human rights concerns; Rohrabacher amendment (No. 117) that expresses a sense of the Congress that Dr. Shakil Afridi is an international hero and is owed a debt of gratitude for helping to find Osama bin Laden; Ros-Lehtinen amendment (No. 126) that authorizes the Secretary of Defense to deploy assets, personnel and resources to the Joint Interagency Task Force South, in coordination with SOUTHCOM, to combat transnational criminal organization and drug trafficking; Ros-Lehtinen amendment (No. 127) that establishes that it shall be the policy of the United States to undertake a whole-of-government approach to bolster regional cooperation with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere to counter narcotics trafficking and illicit activities; Gosar amendment (No. 129) that expresses Congress’ support for Israel’s right to self-defense against regional threats; Roskam amendment (No. 131) that requires the President to submit to the appropriate committees every 180 days a report that identifies that the United States has taken all necessary steps to ensure that Israel possesses and maintains an independent capability to remove existential threats to its security and defend its vital national interests; Franks (AZ) amendment (No. 132) that establishes the Sense of Congress that the United States work with regional partners and allies to develop an interagency strategy counter the vicious terror attacks perpetrated by Boko Haram;

Shimkus amendment (No. 134), as modified, that honors the victims of the Russian Soviet and Nazi regimes and supports the designation of a “Black Ribbon Day”; Kelly (IL) amendment (No. 137) that requires a report, not later than 90 days of the enactment, by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with Secretary of State shall submit a report to Congress on the efforts to assist in the search and rescue of the young women who were abducted from the Government Secondary School in Chibok, Nigeria by Boko Haram; Pompeo amendment (No. 142) that requires the Director of National Intelligence to certify that the recommendations of the report required under Section 933 of the FY 2014 NDAA are consistent with the cyber operations capability needs of the United States before implementing any changes recommended by the study; Foster amendment (No. 149) that requires the Institute for Defense Analyses to study the testing program of the ground based midcourse missile defense system; Sablan amendment (No. 150) that broadens the geographical scope of the existing authorization relating to Saipan for the construction of a maintenance facility, a hazardous cargo pad, or an airport storage facility so that funding would be immediately available for either of the alternative locations now under consideration; Castor amendment (No. 151) that directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a report for Congress on the prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military bases; Bordallo amendment (No. 152) that allows the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement for the purposes of establishing a surface danger zone over the Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge to support training, operations and readiness needs for ground forces on Guam; Hastings (WA) amendment (No. 153) that ensures public access at Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument; Hastings (WA) amendment (No. 154) that prevents further studies that involve bringing plutonium into the State of Washington at a time when the Federal Government is not meeting its existing legally enforceable defense nuclear waste cleanup commitments to the State; Graves (MO) amendment (No. 158) that establishes the National Commission on the Future of the Army; Franks (AZ) amendment (No. 159), as modified, that increases the amount authorized for Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense, line 30, by \$99,000,000 and decreases two other lines equaling \$99,000,000; and Young (IN) amendment (No. 162) that provides Section 330 indemnification to military installations, still under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, to facilities closed other than pursuant to base closure law.

Pages H4774–82

Rejected:

Garamendi amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–455), as modified, that was debated on May 20th that sought to direct the President, DOD, and AFRICOM to expand various programs to include combating wildlife trafficking and poaching (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the request for a recorded vote to the end that the amendment stand rejected pursuant to the voice vote taken on May 20th);

Page H4712

Blumenauer amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–455) that was debated on May 20th that sought to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to procure not more than 10 AESA radar upgrades for the Air National Guard F–15C/D aircraft, which is offset by cuts to levels authorized beyond the President’s Budget Request, spread across 9 accounts (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 225); and

Pages H4712–13

Loretta Sanchez (CA) amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–455) that was debated on May 20th that sought to allow the transfer of funds to nuclear nonproliferation, not just to weapons activities and naval reactors as is currently allowed for in the bill (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 226).

Pages H4713–14

Withdrawn:

Westmoreland amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have struck section 341, which requires the disclosure of proprietary information; and

Pages H4725–26

Heck (WA) amendment (No. 13 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have created a program to give military communities that suffer from significant traffic problems caused by base population increases the opportunity to compete for \$200 million in grants to improve transportation infrastructure, from building new roads to upgrading public transportation systems.

Pages H4732–33

Proceedings Postponed:

McKinley amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to prohibit funds for the Administration to conduct any anti-fossil fuel climate change agenda, which includes the National Climate Assessment, the IPCC report, the UN’s Agenda 21, and the Social Cost of Carbon;

Pages H4716–18

Shimkus amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to delay relinquishment or agreeing to any proposal relating to the relinquishment of the responsibility of NTIA over Internet domain name system functions by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information until GAO submits a report to

Congress on the role of the NTIA with respect to the Internet domain name system; **Pages H4726–28**

Smith (WA) amendment (No. 10 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to provide a framework for closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by December 31, 2016;

Pages H4728–30

Smith (WA) amendment (No. 11 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to eliminate indefinite military detention of any person detained under AUMF authority in the United States, its territories, or possessions, by providing for immediate transfer to trial and proceedings by a court established under the Constitution or any appropriate State court;

Pages H4730–32

Jenkins amendment (No. 15 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to create a moratorium on the insourcing of previously contracted activities within DOD. Exceptions would be made (1) if the activity was “inherently governmental”, and thereby should never have been contracted out in the first place; and (2) if DOD would employ a “reverse A–76” to itemize specific costs saved to the taxpayer should the DOD be able to perform the commercial activity more efficiently for the taxpayer;

Pages H4733–35

Lamborn amendment (No. 17 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to limit the use of funds for implementing the New START treaty until certification that the Russian Federation is respecting Ukrainian sovereignty and is no longer violating the INF or CFE treaties;

Pages H4735–38

Schiff amendment (No. 21 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to sunset the 2001 AUMF effective 12 months from date of enactment of the bill; and

Pages H4738–39

Blumenauer amendment (No. 24 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–460) that seeks to require CBO to update, on an annual basis, their report on the projected costs of U.S. nuclear forces. **Pages H4739–40**

H. Res. 590, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3361), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 228, after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Pages H4714–15**

A point of order was raised against the consideration of H. Res. 590 and it was agreed to proceed with consideration of the resolution by voice vote.

Pages H4699–H4701

A second point of order was raised against the consideration of H. Res. 590 and it was agreed to proceed with consideration of the resolution by voice vote. **Pages H4701–03**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, May 22nd. **Page H4782**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4693, H4706, H4712–13, H4713, H4714, H4714–15 and H4715–16. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on Transportation, HUD and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill FY 2015. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

PROMOTING NEW MANUFACTURING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on legislation regarding Promoting New Manufacturing. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

KEEPING THE PROMISE: SITE OF SERVICE MEDICARE PAYMENT REFORMS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Keeping the Promise: Site of Service Medicare Payment Reforms”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ALLEGATIONS OF DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION WITHIN THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU, PART TWO

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Allegations of Discrimination and Retaliation within the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Part Two”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY AT THE CFPB

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled “Legislative Proposals to Improve Transparency and Accountability at the CFPB”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BOKO HARAM: THE GROWING THREAT TO SCHOOLGIRLS, NIGERIA, AND BEYOND

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Boko Haram: The Growing Threat to Schoolgirls, Nigeria, and Beyond”. Testimony was

heard from Sarah Sewall, Undersecretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, Department of State; and Amanda J. Dory, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT OF ENERGY RESOURCES IN CENTRAL ASIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia and Emerging Threats held a hearing entitled “The Development of Energy Resources in Central Asia”. Testimony was heard from Dennis C. Shea, Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and a public witness.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SYRIA: VIEWS FROM THE GROUND

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled “The Humanitarian Crisis in Syria: Views from the Ground”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING PERSISTENT AND EMERGING CYBER THREATS TO THE U.S. HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence; and Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled “Assessing Persistent and Emerging Cyber Threats to the U.S. Homeland”. Testimony was heard from Joseph Demarest, Assistant Director, Cyber Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation; and Glenn Lemons, Senior Intelligence Officer, Cyber Intelligence Analysis Division, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4402, the “Guam Military Training and Readiness Act of 2014”. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 4670, the “Secure Delivery for America Act of 2014”; H.R. 4671, the “Public Interest Declassification Board Reauthorization Act of 2014”; H.R. 2750, the “Design-Build Efficiency and Jobs Act of 2013”; H.R. 43, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the “Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office”; H.R. 451, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the “Richard K.

Salick Post Office”; H.R. 606, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 Country Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the “Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building”; H.R. 1671, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the “James ‘Jim’ Kohnen Post Office”; H.R. 1701, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the “James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building”; H.R. 1865, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the “Thaddeus Stevens Post Office”; H.R. 2112, to designate the facility of the United States Post Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the “National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office”; H.R. 2223, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the “Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building”; H.R. 2291, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the “Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office”; H.R. 2678, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the “Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building”; H.R. 2802, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 418 Liberty Street in Covington, Indiana, as the “Fountain County Veterans Memorial Post Office”; H.R. 3027, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 Miller Valley Road in Prescott, Arizona, as the “Barry M. Goldwater Post Office”; H.R. 3085, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the “Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 3534, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the “Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office”; H.R. 4355, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the “Harold George Bennett Post Office”; and H.R. 4416, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 161 Live Oak Street in Miami, Arizona, as the “Staff Sergeant Manuel V. Mendoza Post Office Building”. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 43; H.R. 451; H.R. 606; H.R. 1671; H.R. 1707; H.R. 1865; H.R. 2112; H.R. 2223; H.R. 2291; H.R. 2678; H.R. 2802; H.R. 3027; H.R. 3085; H.R. 3534; H.R.

4355; and H.R. 4416. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 4670; H.R. 2750; and H.R. 4671.

ASTROBIOLOGY AND THE SEARCH FOR LIFE IN THE UNIVERSE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Astrobiology and the Search for Life in the Universe”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on S. 1254, the “Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2013”; and H.R. 4186, the “FIRST Act of 2014”. The bill S. 1254 was ordered reported, as amended. The Committee did not complete action on H.R. 4186, and will meet again on a date to be determined.

OVERSIGHT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH AND SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Programs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing “Examining the Federal Protective Service: Are Federal Facilities Secure?”. Testimony was heard from Mark L. Goldstein, Director, Physical Infrastructure, Government Accountability Office; L. Eric Patterson, Director, Federal Protective Service, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

USING NEW OCEAN TECHNOLOGIES: PROMOTING EFFICIENT MARITIME TRANSPORTATION AND IMPROVING MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS AND RESPONSE CAPABILITY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled “Using New Ocean Technologies: Promoting Efficient Maritime Transportation and Improving Maritime Domain Awareness and Response Capability”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

WOMEN’S RETIREMENT SECURITY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine women’s retirement security, after receiving testimony from Debra B. Whitman, AARP, M. Cindy Hounsell, Women’s Institute for a Secure Retirement, and Rachel Greszler, Heritage Foundation Center for Data Analysis, all of Washington, DC; and Brigitte Madrian, Harvard Kennedy School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D533)

H.R. 3627, to require the Attorney General to report on State law penalties for certain child abusers. Signed on May 20, 2014. (Public Law 113–104)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 22, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to adopt the fiscal year 2015 302(b) allocations, and markup proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, and Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: closed business meeting to continue to mark up the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development, to hold hearings to examine bringing our transit infrastructure to a state of good repair, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine access and supports for servicemembers and veterans in higher education, 10 a.m., SD–430.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing on legislation regarding federal and state enforcement of fraudulent patent demand letters, 9:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, continued markup on the following legislation: H.R. 4200, the “SBIC Advisers Relief Act”; H.R. 4554, the “Restricted Securities Relief Act”; H.R. 4568, the “Small Business Freedom to Grow Act”; H.R. 4571, to direct the SEC to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefits plans; H.R. 4569, the “Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act”; H.R. 4570, the

“Private Placement Improvement Act”; H.R. 4565, the “Startup Capital Modernization Act”; H.R. 1779, the “Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act”; H.R. 2673, the “Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act”; H.R. 4466, the “Financial Regulatory Clarity Act”; and H.R. 4521, the “Community Institution Mortgage Relief Act”, 9:45 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “The Gulf Cooperation Council: Deepening Rifts and Emerging Challenges”, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled “Protecting Religious Freedom: U.S. Efforts to Hold Accountable Countries of Particular Concern”, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and

the Census, hearing entitled “Examining Innovative Postal Products for the 21st Century”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Evaluating Public Housing in the U.S.: Reining in Waste, Fraud, Abuse and Mismanagement at Public House Authorities”, 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, hearing entitled “Unfair Trade Practices: Addressing Barriers Facing Small Business Exporters”, 9:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, markup on pending legislation, 9 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence House, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4681, the “Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015”, 9 a.m., 304–HVC. A portion of the markup will close.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, May 22

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, May 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 1:45 p.m.), Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit. Upon disposition of the nomination of David Jeremiah Barron, Senate will vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3080, Water Resources Development Act.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 4435—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. Consideration of H.R. 3361—USA FREEDOM Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bachus, Spencer, Ala., E802
 Barletta, Lou, Pa., E796, E798
 Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E793
 Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E805
 Brownley, Julia, Calif., E804, E808
 Carson, André, Ind., E806
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E802
 Cole, Tom, Okla., E807
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E795
 Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E801, E804
 Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E804
 Frankel, Lois, Fla., E806
 Gabbard, Tulsi, Hawaii, E797
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E793, E796

Green, Al, Tex., E806
 Green, Gene, Tex., E800
 Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E798
 Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E797
 Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E794, E798, E803
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E796
 Kingston, Jack, Ga., E799, E801
 Latham, Tom, Iowa, E793
 Lee, Barbara, Calif., E794, E799, E803
 Long, Billy, Mo., E801
 McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E793
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E802
 McKeon, Howard P. "Buck", Calif., E807
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E795, E807
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E795, E803
 Marino, Tom, Pa., E800

Messer, Luke, Ind., E804
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E800
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E793, E795, E796, E798, E799, E800, E802, E803
 Peters, Gary C., Mich., E800
 Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E795
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E799
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E801
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E798
 Sessions, Pete, Tex., E801
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E798, E802
 Smith, Adam, Wash., E799
 Smith, Jason T., Mo., E804
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E796
 Waters, Maxine, Calif., E806
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E796



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at www.gpo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office, Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.